

*Plebiscite Act*

more—of a young man who is a conscientious objector. His father is a seriously wounded veteran of the last war. Because that young lad is a conscientious objector you would not stop that seriously wounded veteran and his wife from voting?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not the case I have in mind at all. That is not under section 18; that is under section 19, and I am not referring to section 19. I am referring to the sect known as the Doukhobors. Why should they be allowed to vote?

Mr. TURGEON: They are not in British Columbia.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am told they are in eight out of nine provinces.

Mr. POWER: No one has ever defined what a Doukhobor is. I have been trying to find that out for years. It is not a race; it is not a religion; it is not a sect—

Mr. NEILL: Oh, yes, it is.

Mr. POWER: I have not been able to get anyone to tell me just what a Doukhobor is.

Mr. STIRLING: Surely that is the reason why this description was given some years ago, with the orders in council enumerated. Unquestionably it is a sect.

Mr. BOUCHER: It seems to me there is something of an anomaly as between (b) of subsection 2 of section 4, and section 5. It will be noticed that section 5 refers to any person who shall have voted at the plebiscite taken under the provisions of this bill, and provides that such person shall be ineligible to apply for or to be granted, on his application or on the application of another, postponement under the regulations. Paragraph (b) of subsection 2 of section 4 provides that every person who shall have applied personally—the word “personally” is not there, but that is the meaning—for a postponement, shall not be eligible to vote. In other words, we have one section saying that a man who has personally applied for postponement shall not be allowed to vote. Then in another section we say that a man who personally, or through an agent, has applied for a postponement, is in a different category. Therefore I say that if the wording of section 5 conveys the intention of this house, the same wording should be inserted in paragraph (b), which should provide that every person who shall have applied personally, or through someone else, for postponement, shall be ineligible to vote. I think the argument in the one case applies equally to the other. I should like to bring that to the attention of the minister, and to ask why the wording of the two sections should be different.

[Mr. Turgeon.]

Mr. McLARTY: Under paragraph (b) of subsection 2 of section 4 it is provided that the application for postponement either is in now or will be in before the vote on the plebiscite. It does not matter whether the application is made by the man himself or by another person; the application is in. In section 5 the provision relates to those who, subsequently to the taking of the plebiscite, may apply for postponement notwithstanding the fact that they voted.

Mr. BOUCHER: If that were the meaning I would quite agree with the Secretary of State, but actually paragraph (b) says, “every person who shall have applied.” I say a man may not have applied himself but someone else may have applied on his behalf, and under this section he would not be disqualified. That is the point that is brought out in section 5.

Mr. McLARTY: I think under paragraph (b) the man has to apply personally, bearing in mind the very grounds that are laid down for postponement. An application would have to be made on those grounds, and it would have to be made personally. I wonder whether my hon. friend would object if, instead of dealing with section 5 at the moment, we leave the point he has raised for the time being, and I shall endeavour to deal with it when we come to section 5.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Very good.

Mr. MacNICOL: Some time ago I asked the minister a question with regard to Japanese nationals. Under this bill are Japanese barred from voting in Ontario, Quebec, or any other province?

Mr. McLARTY: The answer would be yes.

Mrs. NIELSEN: Paragraph (a) of subsection 2 of section 4 provides that those disqualified from voting shall include:

(a) every person who at the date fixed as polling day at the plebiscite is detained or interned under the defence of Canada regulations.

I think every hon. member will realize that those who are detained or interned under the defence of Canada regulations fall roughly into two groups, those more or less pro-fascist and those more or less anti-fascist in their ideas. It is with particular reference to the anti-fascists that I should like to ask a question. These anti-fascists, who have already presented a petition to this house, have stated in no uncertain terms their desire to support the government's plebiscite, to vote in the affirmative on the question. These