

cautioned them against that condition of affairs, but it was of no use. Therefore I say that the superabundance of ministers that remained in Canada plunged the country into the condition in which it is to-day.

If you must have that great military machine in Canada I would say: take the criminals from the jails and penitentiaries and gather up the loafers of every description and put them on the public works under the care of this standing army, and so put it to some use. We do not want to feed men in this country three meals a day and clothe them and keep them indolent. Let them loose and give our soldiers something to do. But we object to such an army. We say it is not consistent with the attitude of our emissaries who went abroad to build up the peace of the world. Instead we are building up a machine for "a glorious war." You cannot help it, Mr. Speaker, for when you build up a great military machine, it must give vent just as when you put a fire under a boiler. Glorious war! War cannot be glorious and never was glorious. We do not want another war, and we will not have another war if we can help it. We are not jealous of our emissaries, because they do not have much power. We take pride in the great President of the United States who formulated those articles of peace for a League of Nations. We believe that if the best part of the world—seven-eighths of it—comes into a league to guarantee the peace of the world, there can be no war, because seven-eighths of all the resources of the world will be bound together by such close ties that no nation can venture to embark on war without its preparations being nipped in the bud. We understand that in general everybody wants everlasting peace, a peace that is abundant and abiding for all time.

But what do we think of the motives in calling this House together? Let me say that those motives are not very good. We believe that we are called here for another trap. We were called "traitors" in 1911, we were called "rebels" in 1917, and we have been good students, and should be good Bolsheviks now! Why, we have seen headlines in the papers as to the dissolution of Parliament, and I believe that the Prime Minister himself has uttered the word. My conclusion is that he wants to bring an election upon this country or he would not be threatening dissolution. It is an appalling state of affairs for the Government to get the country into, to talk of dissolution at a time when we are facing cold business facts in the administration of this

[Mr. Baldwin.]

country. It is abominable. The man who sows the wind will reap the whirlwind. When the Prime Minister was putting conscription before the country he said he would rather face the conscriptionists than face the returned soldiers. Now he stands between the devil and the deep blue sea. Let me make a comparison between our soldiers and the two million returned American soldiers. I can speak advisedly because I have a son in the American army. When they returned to the United States they had a paltry sixty dollars handed over to them and were transported to the place where they were enlisted. I said to my son: "Did you see in New York, Minneapolis, Chicago, or anywhere else, an aggregation of soldiers?" "No, I did not." He said: "It took more than sixty dollars to get the barest of an outfit."

I said a moment ago that we are appropriating money without any specific system to get "value received" for that money.

Last week the United States Government appropriated \$50,000 to link up with a proper piece of road two little villages about fifteen miles south of the boundary line—\$50,000 to make a permanent road, through a sand-bank; they are even going to rubble the ditches so that the road-work cannot be washed out. They do things over there; they are offering the soldiers work and they are paying them for it. They do not simply pay their soldiers a flat rate equivalent to three, six or nine months' pay on discharge as is done in this country. But we do not do things as our neighbours to the south do. Besides, they have the money. This country is facing financial ruin; there is no question about it.

I have sat in this House for two sessions and I have seen that gentlemen on the other side are adamant when it comes to accepting any suggestions made by members on this side. The member for Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) has introduced his Bill respecting Thanksgiving Day. I said to him: "I congratulate you upon that Bill; if it passes, it will be the first Bill emanating from this side of the House to which the Union Government has paid any attention." I come to this House with the intention of doing something in a progressive way. I have often desired to present a Bill on a given subject, but there is no use; I have seen that everything is turned down. Let me tell you right here that we

have put the brakes on you
4 p.m. people. We have tried to do things, but it is utterly impossible for us to accomplish anything. And now your members are resigning; you are