

upon British soil, they became free. According to the member for Kingston, that is no longer the law; that is no longer the principle that is to govern Canadian and British institutions. According to him, a man who comes into this country and takes the oath of allegiance to the Sovereign, thereby being invested with all the rights belonging to a British subject, must be treated as an alien, as a traitor, as another Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, one moment a German and the next a Britisher. If I know anything about the manhood of this country and about our constitution, there is—to recall the story told by the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver)—“no such animal” in this country.

I cannot reconcile the doctrine laid down by the member for Kingston with the promises made by his leader. When the member for North Waterloo goes home, he will carry on one side of his horse the promise made by the Prime Minister and on the other the speech of the member for Kingston. It is unfortunate that he should have to do that, because the speech and the promise are absolutely irreconcilable; they are unmixable; they conflict with each other. When the member for North Waterloo gets home, he will have not even a grease spot of a promise to present to his people. But I suppose the member for North Waterloo understands the game. He understands that promises are made, but that they are not necessarily carried out if the party making them is returned to power. He understands that the Prime Minister is not to be taken seriously. The Prime Minister on various occasions promised the country that there would be no conscription; yet he betook himself to compulsory military service. He promised 2,000,000 women in Canada that they would have the franchise. This promise he tears up as a scrap of paper and these 2,000,000 women confront the Prime Minister and ask him to implement his promise. If these 2,000,000 women bring actions for breach of promise against the Prime Minister in the courts of this country he will have a busy time during the election. His time will be well occupied defending himself against this army of indignant women who insist upon the fulfilment of the promise that he made and so ruthlessly broke. I am sure, therefore, that the member for North Waterloo will understand that he has nothing to expect as a result of the promises made by the Prime Minister and by the Secretary of State. It was arranged that the promise should be made by these gentlemen, and that the

[Mr. McKenzie.]

logical, clear-cut speaker from Kingston should stand up and say that such a thing could not be done; that no remedy could be afforded to these people. That is for consumption in one part of Ontario; the promises of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State are for consumption in another part of the province. We on this side of the House understand how the machine works; we understand how hon. gentlemen opposite swallow all that is said by members of the Government. Recently we had an example in the other Chamber of the extent of the reason and the logic that governs the actions of the Government majority. The leader of the Government in the Senate was asked by the Liberals the other night to accept amendments to an Act passed by this House involving the expenditure of millions of dollars of the people's money. He made this concise, crisp reply: “The only amendments that you will get, gentlemen, will be thirty-seven, forty-three.” That, of course, meant the count that would be taken on the vote—and we get the same thirty-seven, forty-three in this House. We cannot expect anything but machine politics from hon. gentlemen opposite. In that machine the member for North Waterloo is a cog; he goes round with it, and I never saw him do his part better than he did this evening. I have no doubt that the member for North Waterloo was telling the truth when he said that he represented an intelligent people. But I do not think he was doing them justice when he blamed hon. gentlemen on this side for the condition of things that this Act is creating. What has Liberalism to do with the bringing forward of this Act? He tells us that the people of his county are true and loyal to British institutions. No Liberal in this House has ever said anything to the contrary. The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), since he struck the trail for the Tory Damascus across the way, has seen a good deal of light. He tells us that the people of North Waterloo are not loyal. We are not responsible for anything that he says in that regard. So far as this Bill is concerned he is not speaking for us. But, as hon. gentlemen opposite are taking the member for South Wellington to their hearts, let them settle with him the question whether or not he is giving proper testimony with regard to these men. If he is, these people have no right to apply for enfranchisement or for the rights of citizenship. We on this side are open-minded on this question. We have not asked for the disfranchisement of anybody. We are willing