

might be living for some years, say in the United States? My view of that, from letters I have received from a few friends, is that these people have kept a very close touch on their home life through their home papers and the large daily papers.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I rise to correct my hon. friend. The hon. member for Westmorland, like myself, was not dealing especially with Canadians. This Bill allows British subjects who have never been Canadians, whose fathers may not have been Canadians, men from Australia or other places, to vote. That class of people would be just as numerous, perhaps even more so, than those who themselves, or whose parents, came from Canada. The hon. member for Westmorland said they would be ignorant of our affairs, and I say so too.

Mr. MORPHY: I am particularly referring to Canadians who have never lost their nationality although living in the United States. I understand it is from that country that we get the largest number of outside enlistments. These men individually and in the aggregate, universally, especially men who did not forsake their allegiance, invariably kept in touch with their home towns, with the provincial life, and to say that they are ignorant, when they get their home papers and so on, is quite incorrect.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I was very much surprised at the attitude of the hon. gentleman from Pictou, in reference to this section. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), and the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) argued that because these men had never been in Canada, notwithstanding the fact that they had fought in Canadian armies, they were not entitled to the franchise. Are these hon. gentlemen aware that, by the law of Nova Scotia, it is possible for a British subject in England, Australia, New Zealand, or any other part of the Empire, to have a vote in Nova Scotia, without ever having been a day in the Dominion of Canada, and without having resided a day in Nova Scotia?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would the hon. gentleman make his meaning a little clearer.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Under the present law in Nova Scotia, residence is not a qualification for a voter. If a man is a British subject, and owns \$150 worth of real estate in the province, he need never have spent one

day in Canada. These gentlemen are perfectly content to allow that condition of affairs to obtain, and that has been the law in Nova Scotia for a long time. If a man invests \$150 in land in Nova Scotia, it is all right for him to have a vote, but if a man risks his life in the defence of the Dominion of Canada, he has no right to citizenship at all. It seems to me a very extraordinary doctrine, and I do not believe it will be accepted in the province from which I come.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is there not a residence qualification?

Mr. DAVIDSON: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is a residence qualification for some class of voters. The hon. gentleman from Annapolis may be right in regard to citizens qualifying as landowners, but a residence is necessary for some class of voters.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am quite sure I am right, and my hon. friend from Halifax is right in saying that residence qualification is required by some other class of voters. A person voting on income requires a year's residence in the province, but the owner of land, irrespective of residence, has the right to vote. That was the law in Nova Scotia during the time my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) was Attorney General of the province.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the law of Nova Scotia not provide that the voter must vote in the district where he resides?

Mr. DAVIDSON: No, the law of Nova Scotia provides that if a man resides in a certain district, and has a vote in that district, he must exercise the franchise there, but if he is a non-resident, and owns lands in various districts, he can elect in which of the districts he can vote. I believe the same is true in the province of Quebec. A man in Australia owning land in Quebec, even though he never saw the shores of Quebec, is entitled to vote in the province. After all, when a man is fighting and risking his life for his country and its institutions, has he not the right to have some voice in the administration of affairs of the country, and to exercise his franchise?

Mr. BURRELL: This has been rather a controversial question, and I desire to ask my hon. friend a concrete question. Suppose a British subject in New York State never set foot in Nova Scotia, but bought property in that province, would he be