

tinue to any degree as they were in the last war, the brunt of this war, the period in which the most dreadful sacrifice of life will take place, will be borne by poor boys before conscription comes in to enlist the rich man's son.

An hon. MEMBER: And his wealth, too.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes, or the rich man's pocketbook. I repeat that conscription is the poor man's friend. I talked this morning with a young man who came earnestly from Quebec. Let me say here and now that I have the greatest and deepest admiration for the people of Quebec. I have learned to recognize in them qualities I did not know were there. This young man sat across from me at my desk and began to tell me about his fear of conscription. I said to him, "Look, you know certain people in this town who ought to go but who will not go, unless they are forced to do so, do you not?" "Yes." "Do you think you ought to go and let those men stay at home?" He began naming to me certain types of people in his own city who would under present conditions, unless conscription were introduced, never go. He began to see our point of view. Conscription declares the issue between efficiency and inefficiency, between capacity and incapacity, between national security and national insecurity, between a nation at arms and a nation which lacks the power to fight. Conscription is a dreaded word in the province of Quebec—and that is partly the fault of English-speaking Canada.

Let us forget its history. Let us look at what the word means to-day. Consult your dictionary and you will find all it means is forceful enrolment of men or money that they might be available for use at the discretion of the government. It does not necessarily mean that every man conscripted will don khaki, or that he will appear in the battle lines of the world. It does mean that he shall be available to be placed where, in the opinion of those in charge, he might best serve his country. Who hesitates to be placed in that position? I do not.

What is the fight on which we enter? The fight is for christianity and civilization—freedom, religion, race and just laws. I have noticed with peculiar interest the tenacious zeal with which the French-Canadian members in the house cling to their language, and how they love that language. Is it not clear to everyone that if we should lose this war our ability and our freedom to use that language would be in jeopardy? I have noticed with admiration the touching love those people possess for their religion. What is happening

to religion in Germany? Have we any justification for supposing that there would be any more consideration for religion in this country, once it came under Germany's control?

There are altogether too many who place too much confidence in the United States as a possible saviour in the event of our losing in Europe. Let it be brought to the attention of all such persons that the number of United States people possessing our ideals is, after all, but a handful, while to the south of them are people who are very largely of the races and persuasions of some of the people who will likely be our enemies before this war is over, and who are greatly sympathetic towards the views of those against whom we are preparing to wage battle.

After they have weighed these matters with some care I think there can be no doubt as to the attitude which the ordinary citizens in Quebec will take. Let the question of conscription be placed fairly before them. Let them have time to think about it without the passion engendered by political—shall I use the word?—"shysters," and then tell me that the French-Canadian people will not rise with just as ready alacrity to support conscription as they will to support the volunteer method!

Let us begin anew. It is a fine thing to forget the past and start life anew. Those who are constantly remembering the past soon become so encumbered by burdens which have been handed down from the past that they are utterly unable to support even the present, much less look with hopefulness to the future. Let us as a nation forget the past. The point we must bear in mind is that in Canada to-day we are aiming at efficiency of service. It matters not where the service is to be given; if Canada needs it, it must be given. We must be ready to go where duty calls. When I was a small boy my mother used to impress upon me with great earnestness the connotation of the word "duty." We have not been using that word during these later years with all its connotation. It seems to me that we must go back and begin to use that word again; for now, as in times gone by, duty must be done. We must do all we can and go where we are asked to go, in order to meet the enemy of religion, of freedom and of race. It is stupid and insincere to draw a distinction between home and foreign service. There can be no distinction.

The policy of New Democracy is the same in peace as in war, in that it aims to make democracy work. I do not think there is a member of this house who will contend in his serious moments that he has ever seen democracy work. There is a need for many changes. I am not saying that I in any way decry or