

This amendment is contained in the report. Since the committee adjourned it has been suggested that "enrôlement" would be a better expression than "mobilisation," but the mover of the amendment stands by his decision that "mobilisation" is a better word than "enrôlement." Since "mobilisation" effects its purpose and inasmuch as we have the Mobilization Act, it is useless to discuss the matter further.

THIRD READING

Right Hon. Mr. Dandurand moved, seconded by Right Hon. Mr. Graham, that the Bill, as amended, be read a third time.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Honourable senators, it is moved by Right Hon. Mr. Dandurand, seconded by the Right Hon. Mr. Graham, that this Bill, as amended, be now read a third time. Is it your pleasure to accept the motion?

Right Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Do I understand that the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. Hayden was accepted?

The Hon. the SPEAKER: I understand so, with leave of the Senate.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Yes.

Hon. ARTHUR SAUVÉ (Translation): Honourable senators, I wish to say a few words on the third reading of this Bill.

Right Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Would you please speak a little louder so that we may hear you?

Hon. Mr. SAUVÉ: I will try. I know time is precious, and I do not want to waste it by repeating what has been said a hundred times in the other House. Still, I wish to say that I remain opposed to the measure at present undergoing its third reading.

I am opposed to it because I consider it ill-advised, devoid of constitutional authority and contrary to the fundamental principles of responsible government. Moreover, the arguments advanced in its favour are, to my mind, mere political pretexts and expedients.

The Government ask to be released by the people from their past commitments relating to the war and to participation therein, that is to say, to be released from their lack of foresight and, it must be said, their electoral exploitations.

I am opposed to this measure because the Government, in proposing it, offer no guarantee for the future. They refuse to state what they intend to do should they obtain the freedom of action they seek. That is why, honourable senators, this measure seems to me ill-advised. The Government also refuse to state the real reason for the plebiscite, thus continuing a

political game that has already cost the country too much. The plebiscite will cost \$1,500,000—perhaps more before we are through with it—although the country needs every cent it can raise to meet its increasingly heavy obligations.

We are going to spend \$1,500,000, though the war has already cost us \$3,000,000,000 and will require a still greater expenditure during the current year, and though the Government, without consulting Parliament, have made to England an outright gift of \$1,000,000,000 and a non-interest-bearing loan of \$850,000,000.

The Government's methods are, to my mind, a series of contradictions and violations, from the moderate participation which they promised to the extremely costly and badly organized system of voluntary enlistment, dangerously administered by too many favourites or obviously incompetent officials.

Of course, this statement is not meant to include all the officers, all the chairmen of boards and all the ten-per-cent contractors. There are notable exceptions.

Before proceeding by way of a plebiscite, with the unavowed object of establishing conscription, which the party at present in power has already shown to be so odious and revolting, the Government would have been better advised to institute an inquiry with the sole object of ascertaining the real needs of Canada and of the allied nations, the existing and potential capacity and requirements of our production for the protection of this country and of the allies, the extent of our military preparedness and the real needs of our defence. For it is essential to know our true position, our strength and also our weakness. We are reminded of the admiration expressed for our war effort by authorized representatives of our allies. These representatives are doubtless authorized, but are they authorized to make statements that are not within their province?

Hon. Mr. DAVID: Will the honourable senator permit a question? I think he sat in the Quebec House in 1917. Will he say how he voted on the matter of conscription?

Hon. Mr. SAUVÉ: I knew beforehand that the honourable senator was about to interrupt me without knowing what I was going to say.

Hon. Mr. DAVID: I beg the honourable gentleman's pardon. He has no right to impugn my fairness in this House. I think I have always been fairer towards him than he has been towards me.

Hon. Mr. SAUVÉ: I have been hearing this profession for twenty-five years. The honourable gentleman has not changed.

An Hon. SENATOR: However it may be, he has not answered your question.