

men who left civil employment to join the services felt very uneasy because there was no guarantee of reinstatement in that employment. I am also satisfied that many occupying positions in civil life did not volunteer for service prior to that time because there was no guarantee that they would be given proper consideration in regard to reinstatement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would the hon. member allow me to say a word?

Mr. SHAW: Certainly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was going to ask my hon. friend if he would agree, provided the house is agreeable to his doing so, to adjourn the debate at the moment in order that the house may consider the amendments to the Plebiscite bill which have been made in the senate. They are amendments which, I believe, will meet with the approval of the house, and if that were done it would enable assent to be given at six o'clock.

Mr. SHAW: I am pleased to accede to the Prime Minister's request.

On motion of Mr. Shaw the debate was adjourned.

### PLEBISCITE ACT

#### PROVISION FOR THE TAKING OF A VOTE ON ANY QUESTION SUBMITTED BY WAY OF PLEBISCITE—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the senate to Bill No. 10, respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes at such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada.

He said: While there are a number of amendments, I believe they are of a nature and character that the other house thought would improve the draftsmanship of the bill. With this I believe there can be no quarrel whatever. It makes the bill perhaps more acceptable. There is no change whatever, in so far as I am aware, in principle.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): In the main I would say that the statement made by the Secretary of State is correct. I received these proposed amendments only a few moments ago; there are a great many and it is difficult to follow them all quickly.

The senate have changed the definitions; they have compressed them in a degree, and some appear to have been eliminated.

Mr. McLARTY: I think those that have been eliminated have been reinserted, elsewhere, if the hon. leader of the opposition would refer to amendments to section 8.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, they have been taken out of their context. Some, perhaps not all, have been placed in other sections. Section 4, subsection 2, paragraph (b) has been changed in what, it seems, may be a substantial degree by inserting the provisions of section 17 or 18 of the national war services regulations. I have not those before me at the moment. The present bill, dealing with the question of disqualification, provides that persons disqualified from voting as ordinary voters shall include:

(b) every person who shall have applied pursuant to sections 18 or 19 of the national war services regulations, 1940 (recruits), or any amendment thereto for an order or direction of the board, as defined in the said regulations, postponing his military training, whether or not an order or direction shall have been granted, and unless and until it has been refused.

They propose a new paragraph (b) in which they substitute sections 17 or 18 in lieu of sections 18 or 19. I have not those sections before me, and my memory does not carry what they are. I think the minister should make that plain. Then section 5 has been redrafted, and at the moment I am unable to determine—

Mr. McLARTY: It has been redrafted in the same way.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But as yet we do not know the effect of it. With respect to the other items, section 8 has been redrafted, and there have been superimposed upon that section certain subsections defining the duties of the chief electoral officer. I do not think there is anything objectionable in that, but what is the effect of the addition of section 17 of the war service regulations?

Mr. McLARTY: The purpose that was in mind in making this amendment to this section, which also applies to section 5 of the act, is this. In the original bill we described sections 18 and 19 under the consolidation which took place in 1941. The other house felt that it might be of advantage to go back beyond the consolidation and refer to the original orders in council that were passed in the first instance. There is no change whatever in the intention, but in the original orders they were sections 17 and 18, while in the consolidation they are sections 18 and 19.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Should we not adhere to what is the law to-day under the regulations?