

man with a wife and young children, who, because he was of high heart and had a strong sense of duty, responded to the call that his heart and conscience put upon him, or yielded to the pressure of public opinion that necessarily existed under what we call the "voluntary" system, went under the distressing circumstances so pathetically enlarged upon. How many and many a father has left this country and gone over, to give his life in this great struggle, or to return crippled and unable to support that family; while men with no dependents, men of leisure, men with money, men who did not need to devote themselves to production, men without ties, with no one dependent upon them, sat at home—and, under the voluntary system, sat at home in the exercise of their absolute right. I say that this is a measure for the protection of the family; it is not a measure that threatens them with the dire consequences that have been spoken of.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

#### After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) (resuming): When the House rose I had been dealing with what I conceived to be the principle of the Bill, and I had endeavoured to make clear what some of its principal dispositions were. I had taken occasion to make some observations in regard to certain insinuations that some of its dispositions revealed a desire to create or make possible discriminations in the administration of the Act. May I just add upon that subject one observation? Hon. gentlemen suggest that the measure, in some of its terms, makes discrimination possible and they impute to this Government therefore the intention to bring about that result. Do they quite realize that the first thing this Government did, after the Bill was drafted, was to make a proposition that hon. gentlemen from the other side should come into the Administration, displacing a number of those who are here now and that, unless they were going to be parties to the working out of this discrimination which they say the Government contemplated, it would be absolutely impossible. Could there be any more manifest evidence that there could have been no ulterior purpose at all events in the working of any of these dispositions than the readiness and willingness to confide their administration to the newly constituted government which would be equally represen-

tative of what is now the Opposition and what is now the party that happens to be in power and that would be not merely composed for one-half of it, of gentlemen who would be nominated by the present leader of the Opposition, but if my memory serves me aright, would be composed for the other half of gentlemen who would sit in that Government subject to the veto of the right hon. gentleman who represents the Opposition? Surely, at all events, we can claim that we have an absolute defence against this insinuation of some ulterior purpose hidden or—I do not know whether hon. gentlemen go so far as to say—apparent, on the face of this measure. Furthermore, this invitation, of suggestions to meet possible objections to any particular provision, or series of provisions, has been extended and certainly will be acted upon.

Before I pass to another phase, may I just, by way of transition, say one word upon the fact that certain hon. gentlemen have taken occasion of the discussion of this measure to refer to what they consider the numerous sins of omission and commission of this Administration. How can that bear upon the question we are called upon to deal with, the question of whether the method proposed is necessary and advisable and is the one which the conditions in which we find ourselves impose upon us the duty of adopting? Again, I point out that simultaneously with the presentation of this measure the Government offered to disappear and allow it to be administered by a newly constituted Government composed in the manner which I indicated a few moments ago. Surely that makes it evident that we have just one question to deal with, and that we may pass without further observation from the objections, grievous as they may appear in the eyes of some hon. gentlemen and which have no bearing upon the question as to whether this measure should or should not be adopted.

Now, I pass to the consideration of another matter that calls certainly for an observation from me and which has arisen out of this debate. We have heard a great deal about pledges and promises. We have heard something about broken faith and we have listened to very eloquent denunciations of this Government whose pledged honour, hon. gentlemen say, has been violated. I think we even heard something about scraps of paper. I, in particular, had the pleasure of sitting here and hearing the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), the hon. member for Laval (Mr.