

try should have a Minister of Finance, and that he should be as free from embarrassment in the discharge of his duties as possible. So my honourable friend from Kingston was permitted to take his seat unopposed. It was not the same, however, with the other honourable ministers. In the case of my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Tolmie) his majority as a Minister was reduced, in the city of Victoria, from 8,764 which he obtained when returned as a private member, to 2,134 when returned with the prestige of a Minister. In the case of the present Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue (Mr. Wigmore) as my hon. friends know, he was only opposed at the last moment and a good deal was said and promised by my hon. friend and others to encourage the electors of that constituency during the campaign. His majority was reduced, in the city of St. John and the counties of St. John and Albert, from 7,917 when returned as a private member, to 4,155 when returned as a Minister of the Crown. Then, in the case of the present Minister of Public Works, (Mr. McCurdy) in the county of Colchester he was elected by acclamation as a private member in 1917; but in the by-election, running as a member of the present Administration, he was strongly opposed.

Let it not be forgotten that in the case of all the ministerial by-elections, the Government had the choosing of the constituencies and the opening of all of them. They were careful to select what they conceived to be their strongholds in the respective provinces. In all these elections, they only retained seats previously held.

Coming now to by-elections of the second group, what does the record show? In the case of constituencies won by the Liberals in 1917, not one has been lost.

There was the constituency of Prince, P.E.I., which was contested in the general elections. The by-election there was won by acclamation. In Quebec East an election was fought in 1917, but the Government did not dare to put up a candidate against my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) in the by-election. In Kamouraska, where there had been an election in 1917, my hon. friend (Mr. Stein) was returned by acclamation in the by-election. In St. James, Montreal, in that great metropolis and industrial centre, my hon. friend (Mr. Rinfret) was elected without opposition from a Government candidate.

That is the record in regard to the voice of the people in the case of hon. members who were returned for constituencies held by the Liberals in 1917. Contrast that with

the constituencies won by the Government in 1917 and see what the voice of the people is when it gets the only expression possible. We have been denied general elections but the by-elections serve to give some indication of the will and wishes of the people.

There have been eight by-elections held in constituencies that were won by the Government in 1917.

Of the eight they have retained one, and lost seven. The one retained was Yale. In the by-election which was held in that constituency this year the Government received only 389 of a majority, whereas their candidate, a minister, in the general election in 1917, had been returned by acclamation. That is all they received. Now what about the other constituencies? Here are the results so far as the Government is concerned. In Glengarry and Stormont an election was held on the 27th of October, 1919. In the general elections of 1917 the Government's candidate was returned by acclamation: in the by-election there was a majority vote of 2,376 against the Government. In Assiniboia the Government's candidate received, in the election of 1917, a majority of 4,524. In the by-election there was no Government candidate. In Victoria-Carleton where in the general election of 1917 a Minister was returned by acclamation, there was a majority against the Government in the by-election on October 27th, 1919, of 3,544. In Timiskaming, in the elections of 1917, the Government candidate was returned by a majority of 2,150. In the by-election on April 7th, 1920, there were three candidates running; the Government candidate came in at the foot of the poll, a total vote of 5,316 having been registered against him. In North Ontario, in the general elections, the Government candidate received a majority of 1,555 while in the election on December 9, 1919, the Government lost the constituency which was carried by an Opposition candidate by a majority of 185.

Now we come to the period since the assumption of office by my right hon. friend. Two by-elections have been held since he has become Prime Minister in each of which he has made a special appeal to the people for support and confidence in his government. In 1917 the Government candidate in the constituency of East Elgin received a majority of 308. In the by-election, as my hon. friend will remember, there were three candidates running, and the total majority against the Government was 2,263. Then there is West Peterborough, in which there were five

candidates. In that riding the Government candidate, in the election of 1917, had a majority of 3,418. In the election just concluded, as my right hon. friend knows, the combined majority of the four candidates against the Government was 7,331. I ask my right hon. friend to say whether it is possible to have a plainer expression of public opinion than that evidenced in these several by-elections?

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that since the armistice Canada is the only country among the nations of the British Empire and among the countries that form the associated and allied powers wherein the Government has denied to its people the right of a general election in order that they might return a representative parliament? I think my right hon. friend, if he has not given attention to that aspect of the question, will find it perhaps the most serious of all. Of all the self-governing countries that compose the British Empire, including the United Kingdom, the governments have permitted their people, since the armistice, to return representative parliaments. The people of Canada alone have been denied that right by their government. Of all the countries of the allied and associated powers, that took part in the war, this is the only one in which the people have not been accorded the right of returning a representative Parliament. Not only that, Sir; even countries in the Orient and in South America, even enemy countries, have given to their peoples the right to choose representative parliaments since the signing of the armistice.

Let me give my right honourable friend the record in this respect. In the United Kingdom a general election was held in 1918. Is the example of the British Parliament not one worthy of being emulated here? The people in the Old Country were not more interested in after war conditions than we are. The Government that had been formed and carried on in England during the war was a Unionist Administration, but the Prime Minister of England had a very different sense of obligation to the people from that which my right honourable friend has shown, because he did not lose any time before he gave the people a right to return a new parliament to deal with post-war questions. In Australia a general election was held in December, 1919. Are the people of Canada so inferior to those of Australia that they cannot be given the same right to return a representative parliament? Are they not

to be trusted as much as the Australians to choose representatives who will do their duty by the public? Come to New Zealand. General elections were held there in December, 1919. Again, I ask, are the people of this Dominion not to be given the same right as the people of New Zealand in this respect? What about South Africa, the latest country to come within the Empire? South Africa has had not one but two elections since the signing of the armistice. The first election was held in February, 1920, and the other has been concluded within the past week. Are our people so inferior in calibre and in appreciation of the rights and duties of citizenship, so incapable of administering their own affairs, that they are not to be trusted in the same way as the citizens of South Africa? Take the island of Newfoundland. It had its general elections in November, 1919. Why should our people be denied that right?

Now, let us go outside of the British Empire and look at the nations that compose the allied and associated powers. France suffered in the war, and she has her post-war problems to deal with. She had a general election in November, 1919. Italy had a general election in November, 1919; Belgium had a general election in November, 1919; The United States had a general election in November, 1920. Japan had a general election in November, 1920. Every one of the countries that comprise the allied and associated powers has given to its people rights which have been denied the people of this country by the present administration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Even Mexico has given the people that right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Even Mexico, as my honourable friend states. But we may go further and say even China. China in 1917 had a general election; Argentina in 1918; Denmark in 1918 and 1920; and Greece and Germany in 1920. Yet my right hon. friend denies the citizens of this country rights which even enemy countries have granted their peoples.

In addition to that, there is not a single province in this Dominion—with the exception of Alberta and Saskatchewan which provinces had their elections a little prior to the signing of the Armistice—that has not had an election since the signing of the Armistice. The electors throughout the country are the same people, for Federal purposes, and if the Provincial Governments have found it possible to appeal to the people, on what ground does