

shall be efficiently carried on; when upon the register at the poll is found the name of John Smith, a loyal citizen of Canada who has taken the oath of allegiance to his sovereign, has enlisted in the forces, has gone to the front and has made the supreme sacrifice, and when he is not there to answer for it at the poll, his wife is there. She, who gave the husband of her youth, the support of her family, the father of her children says: "My husband has passed over in doing his duty, his name is called and I am here to answer." There is not an honourable gentleman on that side of the House and there is not an honest, straight forward, lover of his country in the whole domain of Canada, who would refuse that appeal of the wife of the husband who had given his life and was no longer here to say what should be the policy that should follow his sacrifice.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have admitted the justice of that appeal and they have little or no objection to this part of the Bill. But they cavil and find fault. They forget again, as I said at the first, that this is an abnormal condition of things under which we are acting. Although the mothers, wives, sisters and daughters of the soldiers who have gone into active service are admitted to have the right to represent their kith and kin, they will cavil, as my hon. friend from St. John does. He does everything possible to defeat this Bill, to minimize its importance, to raise objections to it, and to excite prejudice against it by doing what?—by saying: You have not been consistent; if you give to some women the right to vote, you should give it to all. The hon. gentleman opposes this measure because we did not go so far as to give it to all. There is where, I think, he makes the mistake of not taking into account that this is an extraordinary condition under which we find ourselves and that we are not legislating under normal conditions.

There is one point I want to make about that. There are noble, devoted women outside of those who have sent relatives to the front, who have done splendid service, but there are degrees in service and in sacrifice. There is the service and sacrifice of sympathy, which while it is not one of personal interest in the war, it is yet sympathetic with those who go to the front. There are hundreds and thousands of women who have made sacrifice and done service through sympathy. But there is a degree that is

still higher, and these women would be the first to acknowledge it. That is the service and the sacrifice which is not simply emanating from sympathy, but which comes from heart strings wrung, which looks out of tear-bedimmed eyes, which comes from sleepless nights and anxious days, which comes from the part of flesh and blood and family that is far from them and which is exposed to constant danger. No one doubts that this kind of sacrifice and service is far higher than the other. That is the distinguishing line upon which we base this franchise Bill, and we trust to the good common sense of the people of this country to do away with those little refinements which the hon. member for St. John is so fond of indulging in and upon the main, broad question of distinctive right say that, "This is all that can be expected in war time, this is a right we freely concede to them and we will await our time until under normal conditions the whole franchise of this country can be put upon a permanent basis."

Let me go on to the other part of my right hon. friend's speech. My right hon. friend speaks of disfranchisement. You would think to listen to the speech of my right hon. friend to-night, that before a single Buckowinian or Slav started from his home in Europe, we sent an accredited member of this Government to sit down with him and that we concluded a treaty, signed, sealed and delivered, as to what he should get when he came to this country. An attempt is made to prove that because a man has certain information put into his hands in regard to the country to which he comes, that country enters into a solemn compact with him as an individual which might be comparable to a contract or treaty entered into between sovereign powers. Of course, nothing like that takes place. The man who leaves his distant home leaves to better himself. Probably the last thing he thinks about is what vote he is going to get or what voting power he is going to have in the country to which he goes. He goes to that country, becomes a citizen, has all its privileges. What is the use of trying to make it appear that those who are disfranchised under this Act are shorn of every right and privilege they had in this country? The man simply is asked to stand aside when the destiny of this country is being determined, to stand aside for the time being on account of relationship, of possible prejudice, of possible active sympathy with the enemies of this country.