

to Canada to put on the uniform and go overseas to fight for the defence of Canada, but they say it is not right for these men to fight in defence of Canada with the ballot. We on this side of the House say if they see fit to go overseas and defend Canada with their bayonet, they should also have the right to defend her with their ballot and prevent the country getting into the hands of men not in sympathy with Britain and British institutions, and with the cause of our boys overseas.

The honourable gentleman also referred to coalition. I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, to every honourable gentlemen in the House, and every man in Canada, could any gentleman have done more than has been done by the Prime Minister of Canada, in endeavouring to secure a coalition or union government? From the beginning of the war the right honourable gentleman at the head of this Government has shown that he had before him but one object and purpose in life, and that was the winning of the war.

He has been prepared to sacrifice himself; he has shown that he has had no personal ambitions; his only aim has been the successful prosecution of this war. He made the leader of the Opposition such an offer as, I venture to say, never before was made by the leader of a government to the leader of an Opposition in any civilized country in the world. He offered him, an equal footing, a fifty-fifty basis of coalition. He did his utmost to further this proposal, but the leader of the Opposition would have nothing to do with it. Why? Because the leader of the Opposition and many hon. gentlemen on his side of the House were opposed to conscription. We have the statement of General Sir Arthur Currie, the head of our Canadian troops in Europe—a Liberal, by the way—that assistance is imperative if we are to maintain the proud position which our boys have won for us upon the fields of France and Flanders. That statement is backed up by the statement of the editor of the *Globe*, Stewart Lyon, the accredited correspondent of the Canadian press overseas, a man who a few months ago was opposed to conscription, but who, having seen conditions on the battlefield as they really are, has arrived at the conclusion that there is only one way to support the boys at the front and that is by adopting compulsory military service. We have further the evidence of other men, who are non-partisan, and have been impressed by the conditions at the front, and who regard

conscription as the only means of giving proper support to our boys overseas. We have also, in support of the contention that conscription is the only means of giving our boys proper support, the attitude of twenty-seven Liberal members of this House, who by their votes and by their speeches have shown that in their estimation the leader of the Opposition is to bring about the passing of conscription. If these gentlemen meant what they said; if their votes really meant anything they should have backed up this measure; they should have backed up the Government in every step taken to bring about the passing of conscription and to keep in power the party that will best make that Conscription Act effective. An election is pending; the issue at the election will be the question of compulsory military service. There is no other issue before the country. The question is: shall we enforce conscription and get the necessary men to support our boys at the front? The attitude taken by the leader of the Opposition is that if the people of the country should, through an election or referendum, express themselves as being in favour of conscription, then a measure of compulsory service should be adopted. But what if a referendum should have an opposite result? The men who are overseas should receive no support; that is the only conclusion that can be drawn from his argument. That is impressed upon the minds of the women of Canada, especially those who have relatives fighting in the Canadian forces overseas.

It has been said by different gentlemen on the other side that the purpose of this Bill is to win the election. If hon. gentlemen mean that, then we must conclude that they oppose this Bill because they think that by retaining on the voters' list those whom we propose to disfranchise, and by keeping off the lists the names of the wives, daughters, and sisters of soldiers, they will be enabled to win the election. Viewing the matter from that standpoint, let us suppose an election is on. The leader of the Opposition, at the head of the anti-conscription party, is reviewing those who give him their support in that election. We will suppose also that the Prime Minister, who is in favour of conscription, is reviewing before him those electors and voters who are favourable to his side of the case. Let us look at the two crowds as they pass before the leaders. In the crowd passing before the leader of the Opposi-