

debar anybody of Japanese, Italian, Finnish nationality, or any of the nations with which this country is at war. The only province I can recall is British Columbia, but I do not pretend that my information is complete. I should like the minister to give us concretely what the effect of this subsection is. Who specifically will be debarred from voting under it?

Mr. McLARTY: I wonder whether my hon. friend requires me to read the paragraphs of section 14 of the elections act. I think they pretty well speak for themselves.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have all that, but I am speaking particularly of paragraphs (b) and (c). What is their effect?

Mr. McLARTY: The effect of paragraph (b) is, it applies only to those who have applied or who shall, prior to the taking of the vote, apply under the national war services regulations, sections 18 and 19, for exemption or postponement of military training. If my hon. friend will refer to those regulations, I believe he will find that section 18 applies to Doukhobors and Mennonites, and section 19 to conscientious objectors. It was deemed desirable to follow that form so as to identify clearly those affected by this disqualification.

In connection with the matter of race, or who would be covered by paragraph (c), I would say there is only one province in Canada which has passed legislation disqualifying any person whose origin is in a country at present at war with Canada: that province is British Columbia, and my hon. friend is quite correct in his interpretation of it. I do not think I can be more specific than that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then this refers concretely only to those whose racial origin is Japanese?

Mr. McLARTY: Correct.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But there is an exception to that, namely, those who served in the military, naval or air forces of Canada in the war of 1914-1918. Is there any information as to how many Japanese nationals there are who would have the right to vote under that?

Mr. McLARTY: That matter was brought up in the special committee by the hon. member for Cariboo. He went to some trouble to find the number who would be involved. He advises me that the number involved is 43.

Mr. TURGEON: And they will not be at their own polling division and therefore not entitled to vote.

Mr. NEILL: It applies to Chinamen in some provinces.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): With respect to section 18 of the national war services regulations 1940, which applies to Doukhobors and Mennonites, if a young Doukhobor is called up under the regulations and applies for postponement, under those regulations he gets postponement but he has to perform certain other services or duties. If he applies for a ballot in this plebiscite he will get the ballot.

Mr. STIRLING: In eight provinces.

Mr. McLARTY: Under section 5.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But there is some regulation in British Columbia.

Mr. STIRLING: Yes. Paragraph (j) cuts him out.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then in eight of nine provinces if he applies for the ballot he gets it and is entitled to vote, but loses his right to postponement. There is not one chance in a hundred that that young man will ever ask for a ballot, but it is left wide open for his father and his mother and his sisters and his cousins and his aunts to get a ballot and do all the dirty work he might have done.

Mr. McLARTY: If I might interject a remark there, this subsection to which my hon. friend is referring applies only to the extent that the application has already been made, or will be made before the plebiscite is held. I think the argument he intends to direct to the committee might come appropriately under section 5.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But I think we have to read the two together. The young Doukhobor is unlikely to come forward and vote, but all his relatives who are of non-military age will have the right to vote. Did the minister consider excluding those people? They are now excluded in British Columbia by virtue of provincial legislation, but I am thinking of other provinces. These people are conscientious objectors. It is against their religious tenets to fight. Why should they be allowed to vote on a question of war? Has the minister thought of that; and, if so, what is the answer? Why should they be allowed to vote? Why should the relatives of that young man who will not fight, who will not ask for a ballot for fear he will lose his postponement, be allowed to vote on a question of this kind?

Mr. TURGEON: May I say a word before the minister does, I have personal knowledge of one case—and I should think there would be