

classes of people who, in the strict sense of the term, are not engaged in the naval service. In that statement the minister says:

It would also include the relatives of men employed in clerical positions in Ottawa, Halifax or elsewhere who never sailed in a ship and are employed continually ashore.

I submit that it is not fair to extend the franchise to the female relatives of men employed in the dock yards at Halifax or in the naval service department here at Ottawa. Proceeding further the statement says:

It would also include the relatives of officers serving in Canada on Imperial duty such as the officers of the Naval Patrol in Halifax, the staff in charge of the dispatch of convoys at Sydney,

And so on. There is no particular reason why the relatives of this class should be enfranchised. I find, according to the statement, that on the east coast of Canada there are 149 boys and on the west coast 53. Their female relatives will be enfranchised. If the minister would apply the principles upon which he justified the Bill itself, to this part of the Bill referring to the naval service, he would strike out the words "within or" at the bottom of the first page. The female relatives of men serving in the military forces of Canada, and within Canada, are not enfranchised; why should the relatives of those engaged in the naval service in Canada be enfranchised? Why not apply the same principle to both the military and naval forces? I understood last evening that the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State were rather disposed to view this application of mine favourably. No reason was given this afternoon in justification of this particular section. I hope the minister will see his way clear to restrict the application of this clause.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I regret that I am not able to agree with the hon. the junior member for Halifax and I am a little surprised that an hon. gentleman who favours the extension of the franchise to all women should wish to restrict it in this way. I should think that if he were in favour of universal suffrage he would be glad to have it extended as far as possible and that if he could not get the whole loaf he would want the half loaf to be as large as possible.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I cannot follow that line of reasoning.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am sorry if the hon. gentleman cannot follow my argument. There is a great distinction as far as the

peril and danger is concerned between the soldiers doing garrison duty, or training in Canada, and the sailors on a ship along our coast. I think there could be no more dangerous avocation than that followed by those brave men who to-day are protecting the shores and coasts of eastern Canada. They are watching out for mines, they are continually menaced by the danger of striking an unknown mine, of being torpedoed, of running into a hostile ship, and the dangers of the sea. There is no more hazardous occupation than that which is followed by the brave men to whom I desire to tender this well-deserved tribute. I believe the anguish that is suffered by the relatives of those brave men is almost as great as that which is endured by the women relatives of those who are at the front.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Where does this anguish come in? What is the cause of all this anguish on the part of the relatives of men employed on some ships in Halifax who only do about two hours' work a day?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am afraid that my hon. friend is hard of heart.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, he is not at all. Tell me where this anguish comes from.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Any good woman, when her husband is exposed to danger on the sea, naturally suffers anguish, and these men who go out even for two hours on the Atlantic coast brave the danger of submarines, hostile craft and inclement weather. They are in a most dangerous position. The suffering and anguish of their female relatives is akin to that suffered by the female relatives of men at the front.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend must be thinking of phantom ships of the enemy or "ships that pass in the night." Surely he is not talking about real ships of the enemy that are a menace to these Canadian ships of ours?

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am surprised that my hon. friend would refer to the Canadian navy as a phantom. I am astounded at the hon. gentleman contending that there are no dangers on the ocean these days. It is full of dangers and there could be no more hazardous occupation than that which is followed by these men. From the standpoint of suffering for the cause and for the flag, we are abundantly justified in giving the brave women relatives of these sailors the privilege of the franchise and