

the part of the resolution with which you are complying and ignore the other part. That resolution cannot be used at all unless it is used in its entirety, and I submit, therefore, that the resolution is no authority. Let me say that I hope and trust that the Government will come to better reasoning about this matter and will steer a course that will answer the purpose which no doubt they have in view of bringing the war to a successful issue and filling up our ranks; but let them do it without breaking up Confederation; do it without having civil war in this country; do it by having peace and unity and going forward hand in hand, as this great people have done in the past and as they hope to do in the future.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAM S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey): Mr. Speaker, as hon. members of this House know, I have not of recent years, troubled them much by expressing my opinions upon the various matters which have been brought before Parliament, but the Bill, the second reading of which is now before the House, is of such tremendous importance that I feel impelled to express my views on it. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie), who has just spoken, made several references to the question of a referendum. I do not purpose to follow him through the devious courses of his speech, but I should like to touch upon one or two questions with which he dealt, more particularly, as I observed, that at the conclusion of his speech he seemed to be heartily congratulated by some of his friends upon the argument he advanced in favour of a referendum. I should like to preface my remarks by saying that I desire that anything I say may be received in the most kindly spirit, which is certainly the spirit by which my remarks shall be inspired. The hon. gentleman from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) cited as a precedent for submitting this Bill to the people by referendum, thus following the amendment of his honoured leader, that in 1910, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier introduced his Naval Service Bill for the establishment of a permanent naval policy for Canada, we on this side voted that the matter should be submitted to the people. I should like to point out to the hon. gentleman, in the first place, that he begs the question, because the passage of the Naval Service Bill in 1910 meant the enactment of an en-

[M. McKenzie.]

tirely new law on the statutes of Canada, while the present Bill is merely a variation of the law as it stands on our statute-books to-day. In other words we are not now introducing any new principle or any new law; we are simply taking a portion of the old law, and making it conformable to the circumstances and conditions now existing in our country. But, even if that were not so the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton has again begged the question in this respect. In 1912, when Sir Robert Borden initiated his policy for immediate contribution of money for the purpose of providing ships for the British Navy to meet the emergency, he did not ask the Government to go to the country. But in regard to the permanent policy, which the Government in 1910 proposed to impose upon the people of Canada, he urged that the Government should consult the people.

And so, to-day, we are not introducing any new permanent policy. Any man who looks within the four corners of the Bill can see that the present Bill is simply a temporary urgent measure to enable the selection of 100,000 men for a particular purpose, namely to fill up the gap and assist those gallant Canadians who voluntarily have gone overseas to defend the principles of freedom and justice. There is no parallel whatever between the two cases, because the only instance in which we voted for the submission of a question to the people was not by way of a referendum, but by way of an election in order to have the people approve of it. The only case in which we said that the matter should be submitted to the people was in regard to a permanent policy, such as the Naval Service Act introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1910. Upon that question we said that they should consult the people by means of a general election, and, when we came into power, we took exactly the same ground. Then Sir Robert Borden proposed to provide three dreadnoughts as an emergency contribution to Great Britain, and he introduced and passed that through the Commons but was unable to put the measure through Parliament by reason of the action of the Senate. But at the same time he said:

Then, Sir, as to the permanent policy, I think the people have a right to be consulted.

So that the argument of my hon. friend from Cape Breton falls to the ground for two reasons. This is not a new thing, and it is not a departure from the statutory law. It provides for the selection of 100,-