

and before the committee I expressed that opinion, and I still hold the view that it would be absolutely impossible with any degree of fairness or justice to take the vote of the soldiers in the manner proposed.

Men have joined regiments and remained with them for a few days or a few months for the purpose of making up the number and starting the battalion. Though not physically fit these men have been allowed to join but they never intended to go overseas. Does the minister think that a man who was not physically fit but who was allowed to join to give the battalion a start should have a vote whereas a man of the same age, 20 years, who is working in a munitions factory, doing excellent work, or who is working in a coal mine, getting out the coal for the manufacture of steel, cannot vote because he is not of age? The man down in the coal mine is more deserving in my judgment than the man who may have been loitering around doing nothing for some weeks in connection with some regiment and who, because he has got the name of being a soldier, is to be entitled to vote. The points taken up by these hon. gentlemen are full of meat and call for the consideration of the minister. I make the broad statement, and I think it will be regarded as a non-partisan and fair statement, that no man should vote in Canada unless his name is duly on a list somewhere in Canada where he had a right to get his name on the list. If a man who has a right to vote in British Columbia is in Halifax, let his vote be taken there by a proper officer and sent back to British Columbia. I would not take the responsibility of requiring him to go home and vote unless that were considered best although in many cases persons under these circumstances can go home to vote. But I do submit that no man or woman in Canada should be permitted to go to the poll and poll a vote unless the name of that person is properly found on some list. I have always had the notion that the theory of this legislation is that the war should not deprive anybody of a vote who could vote if there were no war. I would not like to see anybody deprived of the right to vote who could have voted if there had been no war, but I am not very much enamoured of the idea that the mere fact that there is a war should qualify people to vote who otherwise are not qualified. Any person who has not yet left Canada has not, in my judgment, qualified himself, to be an elector if he otherwise could not be. It is for that reason I say that no man

[Mr. McKenzie.]

should vote in Canada unless his name is properly entered on some list or unless he has a right to vote in some municipal polling division. If the minister will so provide I think he will go a long way toward getting confidence for his Act; that is that no person should vote in Canada unless his name is on some list. Let him make provision that every man who is entitled to vote shall vote and let him make it plain that there shall be no wholesale vote making amongst those who, if there were no war, could not have exercised the franchise. The test should be that no man should be deprived of the franchise who could have voted if there had not been any war. Otherwise, under this Act, you are going to open the door to a class of persons to exercise the franchise because of the war who may never have any interest in this country except that they happen to be in the ranks, many of them because it suits them better than anything else. When the Civil War was on in the United States hundreds of thousands of our young men went to the United States, enlisted and fought because they wanted to get the pay and not because we in Canada had any enthusiasm as between the North and South. There are millions of men in this world who are soldiers, that is their business; that is their training. They come to do soldiering for Canada because there is no soldiering going on in any other country that suits them as well, but that does not entitle them to claim the right to have a say as to what will happen in this country. The minister was mixing two principles this evening in connection with the franchise. He said that he does not know the difference between a man who is fighting and yet had no residence in Canada and the man who has property in Canada and is a non-resident. The minister knows well that British institutions and law always recognize the right of property, almost as great a right as any which a man can possess. Wherever a man has property he has the right to vote for the purpose of protecting that property. That is why, in the smaller municipal elections, a man owning property in a certain polling district has the right to go and vote and take part in the election of councillor for this district. He has the right to see the man elected who has to deal with his property. That is an underlying principle. The man who has property in the country, if he is a British subject, although residing outside, has the right to come in and vote and to say who shall make the laws govern-