

and correspondence produced at a Military Court-Martial held in Halifax, N.S., in connection with said escape.

And will inquire of the Government whether any criminal proceedings were taken or are contemplated against the officers in charge of said camp?

He said: The matter referred to in the inquiry was first brought before the House on the 14th day of this month, by the hon. member for Victoria division (Hon. Mr. Cloran), who made very serious charges against the officer in charge of the detention camp at Amherst, N.S. I was naturally shocked at the time to think that any person holding the position that that officer occupied should have been so remiss in his duty as the hon. gentleman from Victoria division alleged. I made it my business to make some inquiry into the matter and, in order to present to the House some facts which I think should be presented in order to clear his character and re-establish his reputation if it has been taken away from him (which I very much doubt) by the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I have seen fit to address this Chamber very briefly on this matter. The hon. gentleman from Victoria division in his speech, to which I have already referred, used these words:

It is a well known fact, not to the general public of the Dominion, but to the people living in the neighbourhood of the Amherst detention camp that Germans have escaped, and what is more lamentable, were allowed and encouraged to escape, by the commanding officer in control of that camp. That is a very grave and serious condition of things, which I with six or seven senators in this honourable House, endeavoured to confront.

The hon. gentleman did not see fit to name the senators who were associated with him in his very grave and laudable purpose, and on account of that fact they will not be entitled, and are not to be given the credit which accrues to the hon. gentleman for the speech which he made on that occasion. Further on he used these words:

The statement has been broadly made, not by a newsboy in the street singing out his papers, but by hon. senators on the floor of this House, by ministers and ex-ministers of the Crown, that the officer responsible for this condition of things in the Amherst detention camp was shot by order of a court-martial held in Halifax.

That surely must have been known to the people of Nova Scotia and to the neighbouring people of New Brunswick. Further on in his speech the hon. gentleman said:

Of course I am not responsible for your understanding—

Hon. Mr. GIRROIR.

speaking of Senator Dennis who had asked a question which the hon. gentleman declined to answer. The hon. gentleman then proceeded:

The other statement is this, that instead of being shot the commanding officer of that camp was sentenced to 12 years in the penitentiary.

So you see, hon. gentlemen, that the hon. member for Victoria after having this poor officer shot, then sentenced him to 12 years in the penitentiary.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—After he was shot.

Hon. Mr. GIRROIR—Further on he says:

Prisoners of war, our bitter enemies, are not only allowed to escape, but can pay \$50 or \$100 for being allowed to escape from the detention camps in Canada. It is a national disgrace for which the Government must be held responsible.

So you see that the charges made against this officer were of a very serious nature. On another occasion, later on, the hon. gentleman spoke again upon this same question, and said he was sorry that he had been misunderstood in connection with the charges he had made against Col. Morris. He said:

Col. Morris, one of the Empire's soldiers, a man with a reputation as an honest, honourable, upright citizen, and with a record as a soldier that does him credit and his country credit both abroad and at home. I never named any officer particularly as responsible for this condition of things in that detention camp, but the Government's friends in Amherst put him up as a man of straw to say that there was nothing against Col. Morris. I never said there was. I did not know Col. Morris, and have no intention of naming him, not knowing him.

Evidently the hon. gentleman had made some inquiry into this matter, and found that his statements, which were founded upon newspaper reports and anonymous letters, were not justified, and he deemed it his duty to say something to offset the injury which he had done to the good name of this officer. I give him credit for his apology upon that occasion, and for his repentance as an hon. gentleman suggested, but after all it may be that while the charges which were made by the hon. member against this officer have been published throughout the country, possibly the act of repentance of the hon. member, on the occasion to which I refer, has never been mentioned in the press, and this officer may be still lying under the charges that were made against him on that occasion. Speaking for myself, I think it would have been far better had the hon. gentleman waited