

zens. I have taken that position and I cannot but maintain it at the present time, and I think that ought to be the position of all true Canadians for a good many years to come.

Hon. J. G. TURRIF: I do not agree altogether with the remarks of my honourable friend who has just sat down. The view I take is this. If the Canadian citizens of enemy alien birth who are in Canada now are not good citizens, they ought to be deported; if they are good citizens, they ought to be allowed the franchise. You will not have a harmonious population if you make a distinction between those who are naturalized and those who are British subjects by birth. During the war there were in my judgment some grounds for refusing to allow citizens from alien enemy countries to decide whether we would send soldiers to the front or not; but now that peace times have returned, the bad citizens from enemy countries should be deported, and naturalized citizens who have done nothing to deserve deportment ought to be treated as British subjects.

I have not yet been able to examine this Bill throughout, but I take it that under this measure the enumerators will have authority and power to put on the voters' list citizens of foreign birth irrespective of whether they have their naturalization papers with them or not. Under the War-time Elections Act the worst abuse that occurred or that could occur was along these lines.

For instance, a Scandinavian who had been in the country for thirty years and was in every respect a good citizen, applied to be put on the voters' list. The enumerator pointed to a clause in the Act stating that a citizen of foreign birth could not be put on the list at all unless the produced his naturalization papers. As a matter of fact four out of every five men who were naturalized ten, twenty, or thirty years previously, had lost their naturalization papers, and therefore could not be put on the list at all unless the enumerator took it upon himself to disobey the provisions of the Act; and many thousands of good voters were kept off the list on those grounds. In a cursory glance over the Bill I do not see anything of that provision; so I take it for granted that it has been eliminated. Generally speaking, I think this Bill is a fairly good measure for the by-elections.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED moved:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be amended by striking out the word "however," in the ninth line of paragraph 11 of Schedule B, and by inserting after the word "officers" in the tenth line the words "to act."

He said: What might be termed a typographical error has entered into the Bill, in the 9th line of paragraph 11. The word "however" should not have been inserted there. It was inserted inadvertently by some one in the House of Commons. It does not make sense. The paragraph should read:

—shall be and shall be known as revising officers under this Act, one only of such officers to act within each city or town.

The Parliamentary Counsel points out that this is what should occur.

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Hon. Sir James Lougheed, the Bill, as amended, was read the third time and passed.

POWER COMPANIES BILL.

RULED OUT.

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill 168, an Act respecting Electric and Power Companies.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: Honourable gentlemen, I rise for the purpose of raising a point of order with respect to this Bill. I call your attention to a paragraph which has been added to rule 25 of this House, in these words:

(u) No question or amendment shall be proposed which is the same in substance as any question or amendment which during the same session has been resolved in the affirmative or negative, unless the order, resolution or vote on such question or amendment has been rescinded.

You will all remember clause 374 of the Railway Act, which we voted on and passed in the affirmative this session and sent to the House of Commons. To the proposition that was submitted to us by the House of Commons we of course disagreed. This Bill is simply a proposition to re-enact that section 374, on which we have already voted, and I submit that it is a violation not only of rule 25 of this House, but also of parliamentary practice. If a question which this House has determined in the early part of the session could at any time be brought up again, there would be no end to it. It is a good, wise rule that provides that during the same session of Parliament a matter shall be voted on only once;