

tel did not follow his men, though he promised the fathers and mothers of those French-Canadian Highlanders that he would follow them to England. Bear in mind that they were confided to his care, because he spoke their language, because he understood them, because they and their families had confidence in him. At the last moment, for reasons which I will give my hon. friend—and which I gave to the Minister of Justice the other day, who told me since that I had a very good case indeed—Martel did not go. The men who left with the Highlanders will never be accounted as French-Canadians from Quebec. Lieutenant Martel, who is in Ottawa, can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that 35 of his recruits do not speak a word of English; yet they are distributed among an English-speaking unit. I have faith in the Scotch. I love the Irish and I love the English, but I confess that I have a failing for the Scotch. These French-Canadians are in good company; I do not fear for them. But, Sir, do you not think that, in all fairness and in all justice, Lieutenant Albert Martel, who promised the fathers and mothers and relatives of these men that he would follow them to the last ditch, should have accompanied them when they marched off? I will not say why he did not accompany them.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Why do you not?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will not; I will tell the member for Kingston. The reason is stated in the letters that I sent the other day to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. gentleman agree with the reasons given?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No.

Mr. MORPHY: You dissent from the reasons?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly, and I will appeal to the fairness of my hon. friend when I tell him the facts.

Mr. NICKLE: Unless my hon. friend thinks that on grounds of public policy those reasons should be kept secret, it might be just as well to remove this air of mystery. Perhaps I may be able to give him some information and enlightenment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will tell my hon. friend. I will now unbosom myself to the House in all sincerity and in all honesty of purpose. I do not see in the Chamber any hon. gentleman representing a Toronto constituency.

If one of them were here, I would say this: What would he think if I, being Minister of Militia, or better still, if the Minister of Inland Revenue being promoted to be Minister of Militia, were to appoint as chief recruiting agent for the city of Toronto the Superior of the Jesuit Order? With all due respect for the Jesuits and for my hon. friends from Toronto, would the Superior of the Jesuit Order have any success in the cause of recruiting in Toronto or say in Guelph, Kingston or St. Thomas? The answer is only too obvious. What has happened in Montréal? As I stated the other day to Maréchal Joffre, the district and suburbs of Montreal are, outside of Paris and possibly Lyons in France, the largest French district in the world. The chief recruiting agent in Montreal, appointed by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes), is a personal friend of mine, but he is the pastor of St. James Methodist church. He is a Liberal in principle; he is a home-ruler also. I have spoken with him in his own church, and I was taunted by some of my Catholic friends that I had turned Methodist, but as I was preaching for recruiting purposes, I was easily absolved. But, in all fairness and common sense, is it reasonable to expect that a Superior of the Jesuits would meet with any success in recruiting in the city of Toronto, and is it to be expected that one of the ministers of the Methodist church would have any success in recruiting in a French and Catholic district like the district of Montreal? To put the question is to suggest the answer at once. That appointment was made, not for the purpose, I grant, of putting obstacles in the way of recruiting, but it was made all the same and there it is. I do not wish to impute motives to the ex-Minister of Militia.

Mr. ROGERS: Does he not get any English recruits in Montreal?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, he has some English recruits, but does my hon. friend think it was conducive to bringing in French recruits which he and his friends say they expected from the province of Quebec, to so appoint a Methodist minister in that large French and Catholic district? It is useless to play upon words. My hon. friend must be credited with common sense. He might have appointed a Jesuit as recruiting officer in St. Boniface, but he would not have appointed a Jesuit in the city of Winnipeg. The matter is too self evident; it seems, Sir, as if every obstacle were put in