

justified in accepting the resolution presented by the hon. member for Wright. It looks to me as if the representatives of the people in Parliament are convinced that the proposal is a sound one, and I cheerfully support the resolution presented by my hon. friend.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): This is not a temperance proposal, although, incidentally, its acceptance would be a great step along temperance lines. The proposal, as I understand it, is the diverting of certain food supplies from channels that are non-essential to channels that are essential. I say that it is not a temperance measure, because unless we make the provinces which have passed prohibition bone dry, liquor will be imported. We are asking boys at the universities to go out into the harvest fields and help to produce. In the city of Toronto there is a suggestion that the schools be closed prematurely in order that the young men may go to the farms. In the United States they are taking measures to mobilize, in a way, all the young men between sixteen and eighteen, not so much in order that they may take part in the war at the front as to have them go out into the country places and help production. We are gladly permitting our sons to do this, but should we permit them to do it if the very thing that they are producing is to be diverted from the useful purpose to which the nation intended that it should be devoted?

If the proposal of the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) were adopted by the Government, a little jar might 4 p.m. result to certain lines of business.

But the winning of the war is the paramount issue, and all private interests, even though they be far-reaching, must come under subjection to this one great end. There is not a man in this House who does not feel in some way the effect of this war, and the Canadian people, including those engaged in the business affected by this resolution are, I believe, prepared for sacrifices. If the figures just given by the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) are correct—and I assume they are—we see in this proposal an opportunity of carrying out in a marvellous way the declaration of the Finance Minister with regard to saving. Over \$4,000,000 can by this means be diverted into channels contributing to the winning of the war which, to put it mildly, do not now tend to that end.

The question of the manufacture of liquor for explosives has been mentioned. Undoubtedly any measure adopted by the Government would have to exclude from its provisions the manufacture of liquor for explosives. As a matter of fact, several of the distilleries in Canada are manufacturing largely for war purposes, and no one would suggest that these industries ought to be interfered with; rather, they should be encouraged to the fullest extent. I am of the opinion that the use of grain for the manufacture of alcoholic beverages in Canada should be stopped and the grain sent into proper channels for the sustenance of the people, thus assisting in the great end which we all have in view, the successful carrying on of the war.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): As the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has very justly observed this is not a temperance or prohibition measure. Such measures, I understand, are to come before the House before the end of the session, and we shall then all have an opportunity of stating where we stand with regard to them. This is a purely economic proposal. If I were assured that the adoption of the resolution of the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) would shorten the war by ten minutes, it would have my very hearty support. I am not, however, at all clear in mind that that would be the effect of his proposition. It might have some effect upon the war; it is conceivable it might remove the excuse that no doubt some slackers are finding and thereby increase the number of recruits, but even that I think is doubtful. I am not clear that it would shorten the war by ten minutes.

There is an aspect of the case that has not been touched upon by any preceding speaker that I should like to place before the Government before they tell us their views upon the subject. My hon. friend from Assiniboia, (Mr. Turriff) very properly pointed out that we are threatened with a very short season this year in Canada. In the northern portions of Alberta that is particularly so; large districts around where I live, including my own farm, did not have a furrow turned ten days ago. In other years on the same date, most of my own seeding and most of the seeding in that district has been finished. The House will at once see that the question of the short season is one which will come very close to the mind of the farmer when he is deciding,