

extent sensitive. They have felt themselves Canadians the same as anybody else. Now that the war is over, this Parliament should not do anything that will destroy the harmony that ought to exist among Canadian citizens; and this law will to some extent do that. It will implant in these people some sort of feeling of inferiority. Because of the discrimination that would be enacted by this law some of them I am sure will not subject themselves to the humiliation of appearing before a judge. Some of them have voted in the past and they can see no good reason, and I can see no good reason, why these people, some of whom have actually voted during the war, should appear before a judge to show they are worthy of the franchise.

In my opinion a good purpose would be served, and no ill could result, if we placed the franchise definitely on the basis of citizenship, as we would be doing if we struck out this clause. Our law after all gave citizenship, and I contend that citizenship means very, very little if it does not confer the vote. It is either all or nothing. It is practically nothing if you do not give the franchise.

In conclusion, I would ask the Government not to place itself in the position of the Indian giver who gives with one hand and takes away with the other. I therefore beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs):

That this Bill be not read a third time but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by striking out in its entirety subsection (2) of section 29 of said Bill.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Acting Solicitor General): I have only a word to say in regard to this amendment. This is certainly one of the questions that have been most discussed during the progress of the present Bill through the House. The discussion arose in the first instance when the Bill was up for its second reading. My hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) on that occasion pointed out to the House the somewhat drastic form in which the clause was at that time drawn, and an intimation was given by a member of the Government during the course of the debate on the second reading that the particular language in which the Bill had been drawn at that time did not convey the real intention of the Government in regard to the matter. The Bill in that respect was modified when it reached the committee stage. In committee the whole question was very fully considered and I think the committee

was divided upon it. The clause was amended and my hon. friend from North Waterloo undertook to thank the committee for what he referred to as half a loaf. He said that half a loaf was better than no bread. The Naturalization Act again has since been amended. The clause which he most strenuously objected to has itself been amended. So that I think the clause as it appears in the Bill to-day having passed through committee is not a harsh clause, but under the circumstances a very reasonable one. I point my hon. friend also to the Ontario Act passed in April last. A clause in that Bill is very, very similar to a clause in our Bill.

Mr. EULER: Perhaps it was copied from it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Ontario Act is older than the clause in this Bill. It was passed before our Bill was introduced at all. A new Act was also introduced during the late session of the Ontario Legislature and they did enlarge a little on the Bill that is now before this House in respect to application by married women for certificates which entitled them to vote. They enlarged in one or two respects by allowing them to appear before police magistrates and one or two other officials, as well as judges. I cannot imagine that any difficulty is going to result from the provision in the present Act. It was pointed out that in large cities where there are a great many women who will have to apply and obtain certificates, there will not be enough judges to hear the applications. I do not think that at all. The moment this Act receives the consent of His Excellency, which I assume will be in a day or so, any one who so desires can make application to a judge and obtain a certificate. There is no limitation as to time. She has not to wait until until the House is dissolved. She can go at once. It is perhaps within the realm of possibility she may have two or three years before the next general election within which to obtain her certificate. At all events there is going to be ample time to obtain it. There is going to be no rush about it. I think for these reasons we should support this clause. I therefore cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. EULER: Does the minister realize that these women have to fill much stricter requirements than their husbands who were naturalized years ago?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think the requirements are severe at all. If you will read