

cannot be enforced unless hon. members are ready to abide by them. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HANSELL: I am not going into a long dissertation in this connection, but the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has spoken on my amendment and I feel I should say a few words. I said yesterday that I was confused with respect to the question, but I think it would have been better if the Prime Minister had not spoken. I am worse off now than ever. I am not only confused; I am befuddled, befuddled, bemused, bewildered, perplexed and confounded. I do not know what explanation can be given to the question now. I am so confused I won't attempt to answer the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister has said that the proposed amendment will give rise to unwarranted suspicion. That is the term used. I contend that the question as it now appears on the ballot paper is bound to give rise to unwarranted suspicion. The amendment clarifies the situation so that the people will know exactly what they are voting for.

The Prime Minister also made the charge—perhaps I should not say it was a charge, but he said that in the discussion of this matter some of us wanted to make out that there was some trick or trickery in the question. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is the question as it is now worded that gives rise to suspicions that there might be some trickery. We are not claiming that. We simply want to relieve the minds of the people of Canada from that very thing by having them vote on a definite question. The Prime Minister has talked a good deal about being released from any past commitments, any past commitments, "any" past commitments. If he said that once, he said it a dozen times. Then why not simply put a period after the word "commitments" and strike out the rest of the question?

I believe that the government should be given a free hand in time of war, subject of course to parliament and to proper legislation. We do not desire the government's hands to be tied. We simply want to clarify the question that is to be submitted in the plebiscite.

I did not quite catch the implication of the Prime Minister's remarks with regard to what he termed a nazi mentality. I am not going to speak of that now, but I shall read *Hansard* to-morrow to see just exactly what was meant by it. He was looking at me when he said it. I do believe this, that there was no reason for the Prime Minister bringing any such thing into the discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may say that my hon. friend flatters himself when he says I was looking at him when I said that. I was not even thinking of my hon. friend or of his mentality. I was thinking of the methods.

Mr. HANSELL: Thank you. I could really see no reason for bringing such a thing into the debate. I do not want to capitalize on this but I have two sons in the air force. I said that the other day. I have only three sons, and I have a letter now saying that the third son has enlisted. That is more than the Prime Minister can say.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question, question.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have not taken up very much time on this question, and perhaps those who are calling "question" will bear with me for a few minutes.

This afternoon the Prime Minister gave a lecture to the leader of the opposition. I think that at a time like this personalities are altogether out of place. The leader of the opposition, throughout the last two years that he has occupied this position, has not desired any of us to give eulogies to him, nor does he now. But let me say to the Prime Minister that the leadership which the leader of the opposition has given has been of material benefit to the war effort of this dominion, and his record has been one of cooperation with the government to improve the war effort in an earnest desire to give patriotic service, and I think the time has come for us on this side of the house to pay a tribute to the work he has done.

This afternoon the Prime Minister defined the meaning of the question to be submitted in the plebiscite. As the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) said, where is the logic in this question? What does it mean? The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) asked the Prime Minister the question as to when he ever made a commitment to the people of Canada during the last election campaign that distinguished between conscription in Canada and conscription beyond the confines of Canada. The answer of the Prime Minister was not a categorical one. His answer was, in effect, that everybody was thinking about conscription as it existed in 1917. I have looked over the speeches of the Prime Minister, and while I am not saying that they have been read sufficiently carefully for me to be able to say definitely that he never distinguished between conscription for service within Canada and conscription for service beyond Canada, I have not been able to find any such distinction. Certainly there was a pledge made before parliament, but the Prime Minister pointed out the other day that so