

My hon. friend, in asking that question, was thinking only of the application of conscription for service overseas. He entirely overlooked one very important aspect of the bill. The present bill seeks to remove the limitation on compulsory military service outside Canada and its territorial waters. It will not only remove the statutory limitation on compulsory service overseas; it will equally remove the restriction on compulsory service elsewhere in this hemisphere. In so far as service in other parts of North America and the adjacent islands is concerned, the amendment of the mobilization act, once it becomes law, will in no sense be "a dead principle in our statute books."

At any moment, its application may become an urgent necessity. Recent events, no less than a glance at the map are enough to disclose that, in a tactical sense, the defence of our east and west coasts is inseparable from the defence of the adjacent territories of the United States. We have recognized from the beginning of the war that the same is true of Newfoundland and Labrador. To strengthen our own immediate defences, it will be necessary to extend the scope of compulsory service to these areas. In the event of actual hostilities on any considerable scale in this hemisphere, any restriction on the movement of troops back and forth between Canada and neighbouring territories would be intolerable.

It is true that before the plebiscite was held, I said that the government, in an emergency, would authorize such action by order in council under the War Measures Act, and would later ask parliament to amend the mobilization act. But that surely is an undesirable method to employ if parliament has the time to give to the government the necessary authority in advance.

Moreover, the government has equal power to follow the same procedure in the case of compulsory service overseas. It is because of its deep sense of its responsibility to parliament, that the government is seeking, for the one case as for the other, the requisite authority from the present parliament.

The debate has shown that objection to the present bill is due in the main to one of four reasons. There may be others, but they have not been set forth in a pronounced way in any of the speeches which have been made.

The first two of these reasons for opposition represent the extremes of widely divergent points of view. At the one extreme are those who object that the bill does not go far enough. At the other extreme are those who say that the bill goes too far. Those who hold to the first of these extremes wish to

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

have the principle of conscription applied immediately to service overseas, regardless of whether or not compulsion is needed to obtain the necessary enlistments, and regardless as well of prejudicial consequences which might arise from an unnecessary application of conscription to overseas service. Those who hold to the opposite extreme are unwilling to have the principle of conscription applied to service overseas not only immediately, but at any time, and this regardless of the consequences whatever they might be.

In referring to those who take this extreme view, I wish to differentiate sharply between hon. members who are in accord with the government's policy of a total war effort, but who honestly and sincerely believe that conscription for overseas service will not increase our total effort, and might even serve to prejudice that effort, and those others, happily very few in number, who have indicated clearly by their attitude, not only in the present debate but in the past, that they are prepared to see Canada risk defeat rather than accept conscription for service overseas. In 1937, in 1938 and in 1939, some of these hon. members opposed the preparations for the defence of Canada because they maintained that Canada was in no danger. If I interpret their words aright, they are still prepared to overlook the designs of the enemy, and to discount his strength, despite the fact that his design of world conquest is increasingly clear, and despite the continued success of his arms. They are prepared to leave to others to do for Canada, for their homes and their families what they are unwilling to do not only for others, but even for their own country, and for themselves. They refuse to see the need to bring about the destruction of the enemy as speedily as possible, and as far as possible from Canada. They are prepared to risk subjecting the Canadian people to the fate of those countries which, in such numbers, have already experienced the terrors of invasion, and of conquest, by a ruthless and relentless foe.

The members who are thus unwilling to look beyond the shores of Canada have referred repeatedly to Australia which country, at an earlier stage in the war, sent troops overseas, and has since been obliged to recall some men for her own defence. But why did Australia send her troops overseas if it was not that she recognized the need of a collective defence? Why, may I ask, was the United States so ready to send an army and naval forces to Australia in her hour of need? Was it not because the United States realized that unless the enemy were defeated overseas, he would

have to be defeated on American soil; and was it not also because Australia had earned the respect and help of other nations by sending her armed forces overseas against the common enemy?

And here let me protest equally against the deliberate misrepresentation of Canada's position which continues to come from many who represent the other extreme. Some hon. members opposite have said, and the press which supports them keeps repeating the statement, that the government is unwilling to send men overseas. They seek to create the impression that, because Canada has had no occasion to resort to conscription for overseas service, that no Canadian troops are being sent overseas. This obviously is being said solely for political purposes, for they know full well that such is not the truth, and that a false impression is thereby being created.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Will the right hon. gentleman point out a single speech by any member of this party to the effect which he has just now stated.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. The hon. gentleman, sitting I think two seats behind my hon. friend, said the other day that I was not willing to have men sent overseas. His speech was quite clear on that point, and he made the statement in this house.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: If the Prime Minister is referring to me, such a statement was never made by me, directly or indirectly.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Or by any other member.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was going to quote what my hon. friend had said to-night, but I refrained from doing so, not wishing to bring any hon. member's name into the discussion. But when the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) asked me to name any one member of this house who had made a statement of the kind, I was obliged to make the reference I did.

Mr. STIRLING: That does not make it right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall give my hon. friend the quotation.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Put it on *Hansard*.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall put it on *Hansard* to-morrow.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Put it on *Hansard* to-night.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I ask the Prime Minister to withdraw his statement or to produce the statement alleged to have been made by me.

102-1942-4

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On a point of order, the Prime Minister must accept the member's statement or quote that statement which he alleged was made. I heard the Prime Minister's statement with the greatest surprise. I have followed this debate most intently, and I do not recall any such statement on the part of anybody in this house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I might be permitted to proceed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think we ought to have a ruling.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not propose to do other than proceed with my speech at the present time.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then I suggest that the right hon. gentleman—

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Who said "sit down?" I have the right to rise on this question, and no member of the government or anyone else has a right to tell me to sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Prime Minister must accept the statement of the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) or produce the evidence upon which he bases his assertion. I do not recall anything of that sort from any hon. member on this or any side of the house.

Mr. POULIOT: An hon. member is supposed to withdraw any language that is unparliamentary. When a statement is made in parliamentary language by an hon. member and it is denied by another hon. member, the matter is closed.

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of order has been taken, and the Prime Minister has indicated that he would like to continue his speech. I suggest that the Prime Minister be allowed to complete his statement, and then the matter can be taken up.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): With great respect I suggest that that is not good enough. The Prime Minister made a statement and, when challenged to name the hon. member concerned, he indicated the hon. member for Lake Centre. The hon. member for Lake Centre denies specifically having made any statement such as that attributed to him. The Prime Minister must accept that statement and withdraw.

Mr. POULIOT: That is not according to the rules of the house.