

is not in the house, but I think it should be said of him that if anyone has shown his lack of capacity for the position which he occupies, it is General Ormond. What business had he to say that because a man had not had an opportunity of achieving promotion during the three or five years or, as a matter of fact, any period he spent in the army during the war, he was debarred from civil occupation as a gaol guard, when we have in the house men who represent constituencies and when we have throughout the length and breadth of the land men holding the highest positions in civilian life who were soldiers in the war? If only Brigadier General Ormond had been able to enter into the feelings of many of the soldiers during the war he would have known well the expression often used in the trenches when speaking of the Germans: "If they would trade red hats with us, we would be in Berlin before Christmas." In no way has this expression been more strikingly illustrated than by this report. Brigadier General Ormond should know, if he does not, that it was not the fault of many of those soldiers that they were not promoted. Many who achieved commissions did so by influence; many others did so because they went over early in the war, and he should know that in the last two years of the war there came over from Canada battalion after battalion fully staffed with officers and with not enough men. Place had to be found for those who had obtained commissions before leaving Canada and this was done to the detriment of those who had given the best service at the front. When the history of the war comes to be written, it will be found that the backbone of the British as well as of the Canadian army was the buck private in the rear rank; he showed courage, initiative and qualities that went to make the Canadian expeditionary force what it was. This house would be false to its trust to those soldiers unless many members register their protest against this report.

I do not see in his seat the Minister of Railways (Mr. Manion), but I know if he were here, he who devoted a great deal of his time gallantly and nobly to the effort of saving those men by giving them the best attention of his healing art, would take the same attitude as do many of us. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Sutherland) during the war achieved honour, but he did so—and he will be the first to admit this—because the private soldiers in his battalion backed him to the limit. I do not need to speak for the hon. member for Kingston City (Mr. Ross). He has expressed his views on

this matter on many occasions. Almost every member, whether on this side or on the other, should feel it his duty to tell General Ormond that he is not qualified for the position to which he has been appointed, the reason being, first, on account of the absolutely false statement which he made in the report and, second, if for no other reason, that he showed a remarkable lack of tact in making such a statement.

May I quote the minister himself as to the qualifications of a gaol guard? Surely if a gaol guard should have all these qualifications, the man who superintends him should have many more. I am not going to read them all, but some of them are as follows:

In the first place he must have the necessary physique, must be a strong, robust man. He must be a man of some education.

I suppose General Ormond believes there was nobody with any education in the ranks of the private soldiers. There are throughout Canada at least as many lawyers, doctors and other professional men who served as private soldiers as served with commissions.

He must be a man of intelligence and discretion. He must be a man of courage, that is very essential, because he has to deal with many very daring, reckless prisoners.

I suppose the man who dealt with many daring, reckless Germans, is not qualified.

There is a large proportion of very daring prisoners in our institutions at this time. Above all a guard should be a man possessed of an average amount of human sympathy.

I ask the minister whether General Ormond showed any human sympathy for those 600,000 returned soldiers throughout Canada when he said that because they were private soldiers they were not qualified to be good guards.

Above all a guard should be a man possessed of an average amount of human sympathy. I do not mean maudlin sentimentality, but human sympathy and discretion.

As regards discretion, I would say that General Ormond has signally failed.

I have under my hand the following resolution:

That the Kingston branch No. 9 Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League, have read with regret the insulting and ill founded remarks of Superintendent of Penitentiaries, D. M. Ormond, as reported in the Kingston Whig Standard on February 7, on page 10, which reads as follows:

Then they proceed to quote the section of General Ormond's report which I have read to the house. They continue:

That the Kingston branch of the Canadian Legion is able to give the names of doctors, lawyers, merchants, secretaries, bankers, members of parliament and men prominent in all