

vote, and if you give to those four, not the military vote that they polled overseas, but only the same proportion of the vote overseas as they received of the soldier vote at home, every man of them would have a majority. I think that disposes of that erroneous statement so far as Ontario is concerned.

From the province of Quebec with its sixty-five seats only three members were elected to support Union Government. Who were they? The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), who had 1,446 of a majority of the civil vote—to say nothing at all about the military vote,—and who had 1,957 of a majority on the soldier vote; in other words, had he been so disposed or could he have done so he could have handed his opponent 1,000 soldier votes and still have defeated him by a majority of over 1,400. Will any person then say that a bundle of soldiers' votes effected the election of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? Then we will take the member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames), who secured a majority of 1,583 of the civil votes. He could have given his opponent 1,000 soldier votes and still have had over 1,100 of a majority. Finally we will take the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), who had 2,099 of a majority of the civil votes, and who could have given his opponent 1,000 soldier votes and still have had over 1,930 of a plurality.

So, Sir, we can go on. Take, for instance, the province of Manitoba—and will any person say that the soldier vote was so manipulated as to elect a member from that province? Why, Mr. Speaker, every Laurier candidate except three in that province lost his deposit, so there was not much chance, I think, of applying that there.

In British Columbia, out of thirteen seats, every member but one could have handed his opponent his entire overseas vote and still won out. If we give the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) only the same proportion or percentage of overseas votes as he obtained of the home vote, he would win out with a majority of 469, and is it not reasonable to suppose that that hon. gentleman should be given at least as large a proportion or percentage of the overseas vote as he obtained of the home vote when he was not at home while voting was going on?

Let us take the province of Saskatchewan with sixteen seats, and if you credit every soldier vote to his opponent, that would not deprive any member from Saskatchewan of his seat in this House. The

same thing is true of Alberta with the exception of one seat, Edmonton West. But if we give the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Griesbach) no larger a percentage of overseas votes than he obtained of soldiers' votes at home, where his opponent was right on the job all the time, and hand the rest of his votes over to his opponent, the hon. member still wins out with a majority of 2,288. Therefore, he could give his opponent not only the percentage but another thousand votes and still be elected. That disposes pretty effectively of the statement made by the leader of the Opposition in regard to a manipulation of the overseas votes. There never was a statement made by any hon. gentleman in this House on either side further from the facts than that made the other day by the leader of the Opposition.

I should like to call attention to another little thing which, I am sure, will be extremely interesting to the leader of the Opposition. In the course of his remarks and in his hunting around for some cudgels with which to beat the Government, looking through the speech from the Throne the hon. gentleman finds fault with the paragraph referring to restrictions on the opium traffic. The hon. gentleman says that that is simply dabbling in small affairs. I should be astonished at a remark like that coming from any hon. member, but coming from this particular hon. member it is especially astonishing. Why do I say that? Because probably no other hon. gentleman in this House has been more intimately associated with an investigation of the opium traffic than the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. In 1908, the hon. gentleman who was then, I believe, Deputy Minister of Labour, was appointed to go over to England and from there to China to attend an International Conference dealing with this opium question. On that occasion the hon. gentleman, taking advantage of the opportunity which was afforded to him by the reporters of getting his name into the press, just before he took the steamer at New York, gave an interview in the course of which he said that the only way in which this matter of restricting or doing away with the evils of the opium traffic could be handled was through a conference of the representatives of all the nations concerned. He thought this conference, the one to which he was going, would be unquestionably successful. How could it be otherwise? With the hon. gentleman there, it was bound to be successful. In March, 1908, he was commissioned to go to England; he went over