

to put ourselves in the hands of the people who live in this country and who have enjoyed our institutions. We are not afraid to compare our institutions with those of any other country in the world. We believe that the men and women who come into Canada and enjoy the rights and privileges and educational advantages of this country for fifteen or twenty years—aye, for three years, the period set out in our Naturalization Act—are so seized with the benefits of our institutions and the superiority of our laws, that they will be loyal, true and faithful to Canada. We believe that they are not willing to exchange the conditions under which they previously lived for those which they now enjoy in this country, no matter what country they came from.

That is the principle of Liberalism; that is the principle which we are willing to follow, and if there are any heartaches in this country because men and women are being disfranchised, the parties who have introduced this Bill, and other Bills almost as drastic, must take full responsibility; it is unworthy of the hon. member for North Waterloo to state that the trouble created by this Bill is attributable to us.

My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has given us a piece of logic which I cannot very well digest. He says that the foreigners in the West and in Ontario and other parts of this country would be excellent and loyal citizens under a union government, but they are disloyal under the present Administration.

Mr. TURRIFF: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member said that if a union government had been formed this Bill would be absolutely unnecessary. What am I to understand from that? I am sure my hon. friend, with his well-balanced mind, must see that when he tells us that under a union government this law would not be necessary it means nothing else but that the creation of a union government would make loyal those whom he to-day brands as disloyal. I cannot understand or accept any such logic. If they are loyal and true to-day to the institutions of this country, then, no matter what kind of a government we have, they will be loyal to-morrow, because they are still the same people. Therefore, I cannot understand the reason by which the hon. member for Assiniboia is bringing himself to support this measure, and support the Government that is behind it.

Mr. TURRIFF: I must ask my hon. friend not to put words in my mouth that I did not use. I did not say that any settlers in the West or any other place were disloyal. I am voting against this Bill. My hon. friend is altogether wrong. He is away off.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know whether I am wrong or away off, but I do know that my hon. friend is not on the track where he used to run. So I think it is he that is off, and being off in one thing, he may be off in the whole. My hon. friend is not quite at home in the new element with which he has surrounded himself, he is not quite comfortable upon the diet on which he feeds.

A good deal of what would be regarded as deception outside of the House has been practised upon us by hon. gentlemen opposite in explaining the origin of this Bill. We were told at every turn that this Bill followed the Australian Bill. There is one peculiar provision in our Act to the effect that if a man goes into a booth to vote with a grey coat on, and white shoe laces, the presiding officer can declare him to be an alien and not entitled to vote, whereas if the same alien appears in a black coat and with black shoe laces, his appearance would justify the presiding officer in saying that he is not an alien, but a British subject and entitled to vote. When we found fault with that absurdity we were told by the Secretary of State that the provision followed word for word the terms of the Australian Act. I refer any hon. member of this House to page 5 of the Australian Act, a copy of which I had in my hand to-day, but which the Secretary of State required for some purposes of his own, and I have not got it now. There is only one copy of the Act in the city of Ottawa, I believe. If you will turn to page 5 of the Act you will see that there is no such provision in the Australian Act at all. The presiding officer in Australia has nothing to do or say as to the appearance of the men who appear before him to vote. So that when the minister stated that he had followed the Australian Act in that respect, he was deceiving us. Another thing is that there is nothing in the Australian Act creating a new franchise or machinery for a new Act. The old Act is followed in every particular. If it is thought a man is not entitled to vote, he has to take the oath when he comes up to vote, as has been the case in this country at all times. I submit, therefore, that it was not fair for the