

not strike them, or what is the answer to this argument: the Dominion Act is based entirely on the provincial Act, and we merely say in accordance with a long established custom, if it has the force of law, that whatever the restrictions are that are placed on the province will be carried into the Dominion franchise. Would it not appear to men of the intelligence and education of these men that the proper place to initiate this agitation would be in British Columbia?

Professor HAYAKAWA: Sir, do you happen to know that the women of the province of Quebec have a vote?

Mr. NEILL: I know. That proves the exception.

Professor HAYAKAWA: There is no reason why there cannot be two exceptions.

*By Mr. Neill:*

Q. You have not answered my question. Why do you not begin in British Columbia? British Columbia is the place which puts the exception on; why do you not agitate there?

Professor HAYAKAWA: We have been agitating there for years, sir.

Q. With any success?

Professor HAYAKAWA: No, of course not. We are protesting again here.

Q. Why do you come here to protest?

Mr. HEAPS: I think that is a most unfair question. I do not think it is up to any member to tell the delegates where they should go to make their protests. It is up to them.

The CHAIRMAN: I think I had better explain just what the situation is. When I was first brought into the matter in connection with the delegation coming down, I explained at that time that it was not the intention at this session of parliament to amend the Franchise Act. The only reference to this committee is to study and make a report on amendments which we thought might be necessary or advisable, and that the work of this committee would in all probability continue into the next session of parliament; in any event, there would be no change made until the next session of parliament. The delegation thoroughly understands that that is the situation.

Professor HAYAKAWA: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: They came here personally to appear before the committee and present the brief and also to state what additional matter they could to the committee. They have plenty of copies of this brief available for distribution among all the members of the House, I think, and we shall have an opportunity of studying it and possibly calling in other witnesses. As a matter of fact, as chairman of the committee I feel we are in duty bound to investigate and study the brief thoroughly and call other witnesses on matters that we are in doubt about. So that this morning the delegates who are here are simply presenting their case, which may be answered in a dozen different ways at a later time.

Mr. MACNICOL: We might ask the Japanese voters to send delegates.

Mr. GLEN: I have not had an opportunity of reading over this brief, but it seems to me that there is a legal question involved of which this committee should be seized. I think the question put by Mr. Neill to Professor Hayakawa as to why the case was not presented to the British Columbia legislature is in point. Does it mean that this committee will be asked to amend the Dominion Franchise Act and that it will have a bearing on the provincial franchise act of British Columbia?

The CHAIRMAN: No, not the Provincial Act of British Columbia. It is only a matter of the federal parliament, if it sees fit to amend its franchise act to extend to British subjects of Japanese parentage the right to vote at federal elections.

[Dr. S. Ichie Hayakawa.]