

life, in the army of Great Britain, Ireland and the Empire. He stands aghast at the Act. He says: "I am Commander in Chief of the Army for military purposes, and I will not allow any disturbance of my military orders on account of any political, civil or other affairs. The men under my command are here for military or war purposes and these alone." That will be the decision of the Commander in Chief of the British armies, at the present time General Haig. Will he be right in stating so? All men who are not tied up with partisanship and other views regarding party will say: "Certainly; the Commander in Chief is master of his men, and if he thinks that the introduction of civil, political or domestic questions is going to interfere with his right of command over these men, why should he not have the right to say to any Government on earth. You shall not interfere with my command; if I allow domestic, civil, political, labour or other questions to be discussed in the ranks of my army, where is my control to begin or to end?" Therefore, the Commander in Chief of the British forces under the King's orders and regulations governing military practice, military service, military obedience, military discipline, will say to the man who presents this Act: "Get away from me; get away from here; I want no interference in the conduct of my army for civil, political, domestic or any other questions; all my men are here for is to obey my orders and to fight the enemy." It is admittedly an elementary military principle in England that no man in military service can participate in the discussion of public or political affairs. And here, a little colony called Canada, with six or seven millions of people, intervenes to tell the British Empire that it is going to rule the discipline of the army. What attitude do we assume before the civilized world? The idea of a little colony like Canada, with only 7,000,000 people, dictating to the Commander in Chief of the British Forces what he shall have his soldiers do. That is the effect of this Bill. France is the country that is suffering most, the one that is spilling most blood on behalf of democracy, and is losing a large portion of its historical buildings, of its fruitful lands, of its courageous people. Our emissary goes over to France, goes to General Petain, and says: "We have a certain number of Canadians in the army on the soil of France and in Flanders, and we want you to introduce this question of politics into the

army, and we want to have these questions discussed in the trenches, so that the soldiers will be able to cast an intelligent vote; and we want our soldiers in the hospitals and camps to be able to discuss all the economic and political questions of Canada." That is the mission of the Canadian emissary to the Commander in Chief of the French army.

Nor does the French Republic, any more than England, give a vote to the soldiers, those gallant men who are dying by the thousand every day. But little Canada, with seven millions of a population, goes over to the Commander in Chief of the French forces and says: "We are going to go into your ranks and preach politics, preach elections, and so on." What attitude does Canada assume before the great French Republic? Why, that of sham patriotism from bottom to top, claptrap legislation to protect the present Tory party, which hopes to get votes from that source.

The great powers in this war are against this policy of introducing politics into the ranks, into the trenches, into the hospitals, into the camps of the Allied armies; yet we are going to persist. Italy gives no votes to its soldiers on the firing line, neither does Austria or Hungary, neither does Germany, above all. There is only one country on the firing line of this universal conflict that to-day gives the right to the soldiers to vote, and that is poor Russia. With what result? That there are rebellions, riots, the chasing of ministers from office, and even the Commander in Chief of the Russian army taking over that army to fight the present Government—all on account of the soldiers' vote in the trenches.

Can you face these facts and decide in your soul and conscience and heart, on behalf of Canada and the Empire, and the cause for which we are fighting, that this is democracy, that this is wise legislation? Is it wise in connection with those sacred causes affecting the best and most vital interests of humanity? This Bill is intended to promote simply the vital interests of the Tory party, which expects to get an undue vote from these sources. Honourable gentlemen, you are made up of the same blood as I am; you have the same ambition for Canada's progress and security as I have; why not drop party pride, party interests and fight for that unity and progress of Canada that we all desire? But no; the Government of the day, composed of persons who come and go, and honourable gentlemen of the highest intelligence, men