

of the Canadian Press, which I will read:

Mr. Blondin then proceeded to read the report herein before quoted in that article and which can be found in Hansard on page 187 and, then added:—
military service.

"First of all, as for Mr. Desrochers, I beg to state that he did not act as my secretary or lieutenant, and that during the whole election I had no connection with him whatever. I never spoke to him concerning the matter referred to in the report which I have just read. I never authorized him to make any statement for me, and I never was informed by him or anybody else of the statement reported to have been made by him on my behalf. I have inquired from Mr. Derochers about the correctness of the statement, and he denies, and authorizes me to deny in this House, the last part of that report, namely, that part which relates to conscription.

"As to the statement itself, to wit, that I advised people to cross the boundary, which I am informed was freely commented on by the hon. member for Assinibois (Mr. Turriff), the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Copp), I must say that there is not a single particle of truth in that report. The facts concerning the matter are very plain. I was replying to a speech in which my opponent had strongly endeavoured to show that conscription was coming by means of the National Service cards, which, he said, meant nothing but conscription, and that very soon coercion would be used by the Borden English-Protestant government against the Catholic French-Canadians, and that very soon armed soldiers would come and force their husbands and sons to go to war.

"Those are the very notes that are still fresh on the paper on which I wrote them when preparing my answer.

"My answer to these arguments was that the National Service cards did not mean anything of the kind and were only an appeal to the patriotism and good-will of every citizen whose duty it was to sign them; that if conscription had to come it would come openly; that this Government could not promise or declare that conscription would never come, as it would be cowardice on the part of the Government to make such a declaration or promise; that it might have to come; but that for the present there was no question of conscription, and the Government did not by the National Service cards intend any coercion of the people, and that the best proof of this was that the stretch of 4,000 miles of frontier had been left unguarded and open. And this I said in order to show the stupidity of the contentions of my opponent. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that any other construction of my words is purely and simply gross misrepresentation."

It will be noted that the denial authorized by Mr. Derochers is confined to Mr. Blondin's alleged remarks about conscription. He authorizes no denial of the statement regarding the Allison deals being of no moment to Canadians, because it was British money, not Canadian that was paying for them.

Furthermore Mr. Blondin's own explanation of his remarks about conscription, will hardly hold particularly when he referred in the same breath to the stretch of 4,000 miles of frontier had been left unguarded and open." Was it left open so that advice from high authorities could be utilized in a practical manner?

It is further stated that two gentlemen acting as campaigners for the Conservative candidate availed themselves of the stretch and crossed the border with \$11,000 in their pockets.

Mr. Cannon's Platform.

On the other hand Mr. Cannon's attitude in the campaign was of a vastly different character. We quote from the Montreal Gazette of January 30th, 1917:—

"I ran against Mr. Sevigny on account of his Nationalist opinions, I though he was not fit to sit in the Dominion Cabinet during war time."

"In my campaign I adhered strictly to the Liberal policy of my leader as regards war questions. I declared myself decidedly in favor of Canada participating in the war. As to the National Service, I told the electors that I had signed my card and advised them to do the same, and added that if it did not mean eventual conscription I had no objection to the scheme. I do not believe we shall need conscription here.

"To show how little I appealed to prejudice or pass on, I may say I did not mention the bi-lingual question in a single speech. My speeches were directed solely against the Nationalist principles of my opponent and the bad administration at Ottawa.

"Although defeated, I still hold that my fight was in the best interests of the country. My opponent had recourse to every known method of election corruption; and unfortunately for the dignity of Canadian politics, this corruption was carried on under the direct supervision of the Hon. Messrs. Blondin and Sevigny.

"In the last days of the campaign, my adversaries reverted to the Nationalist tactics by stating in public meetings and in private canvassing, that Laurier was worse than Borden on the War question; that he was in favor of conscription, and that he was sold to England. In short, the Nationalist-Tory party made use of every unpatriotic argument and every dishonest method to defeat me. I am sorry that some electors were carried by these means."

(Signed) Lucien Cannon.

WHY AN EXTENSION TO THE LIFE OF PARLIAMENT IF THE WAR IS TO BE FINISHED IN 1917?

Speaking in the House of Commons January 22nd, the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden stated:—

"In the first year the Allies held the enemy, and could do no more. Opportunity for victory passed from the Germans in the first six months of the War.

"The second year was for the Allies almost wholly a year of preparation.

"The third year, upon which we have now entered will be the year of action, of victory and of peace."

Notwithstanding this statement Sir Robert Borden has informed the House and the country that it is the intention of his Government to apply for a further extension of the life of Parliament.

At the last session of Parliament a unanimous resolution was passed by the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada which was acted upon by the Imperial Parliament and accordingly the life of the Canadian Parliament was extended from October 7th, 1916 until October 7th, 1917. Therefore the present Canadian Parliament need not be dissolved until October 7th, 1917 and the general elections need not take place until December 1917. In 1896 the elections were held over two months after the House had been dissolved by time. The Governor-General in that year dissolved the House a few days before the Parliament had lived its full period.

If according to Sir Robert Borden's statement above referred to the War is to end in 1917 why is it necessary to have an extension of the life of Parliament?