

realize what a burden of responsibility we are placing on these volunteers. I recall that last year the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) criticized those who suggested conscripting an army in Canada, just as is done in Europe. No one in Canada wants to do that, but we may very well be fighting armies raised and trained on that basis.

The honourable senator also spoke about the way children had been snatched from their homes in the First Great War. Well, in my community I know of no snatching of schoolboys that was done when this so-called conscription was in effect. A board made up of fathers of local families, men of all political beliefs, was established. A life-long friend of mine, who happens to be a staunch Liberal supporter, told me just recently that he had never had any complaint when he served on that board. Talk about snatching children for the army! Just look at what happened during the last war. One of the most humiliating and soul-stirring things was to give a university lad such a difficult examination that he would fail, and then turn his name over to the military authorities. Young men of military age were unable to secure employment unless they could get a certificate to the effect that they were unfit for military service. You may call that a voluntary system, but I have another name for it. I think it is a most disgraceful method. In my humble opinion this country should immediately institute a draft system similar to that being used in the United States.

Honourable senators, I do not intend to say anything more. I just wanted to express my opinion on the raising of our armed forces.

Hon. Wishart McL. Robertson: Honourable senators, I should just like to refer to one remark made by the honourable leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig). He intimated that when I asked the house to consider the estimates for national defence, I had conveyed the impression that Canada's armed forces would not be ready to fight anywhere. If by any stretch of the imagination I gave the impression that in addition to the general organization of the armed forces across the country no forces would be raised beyond what is required for the defence of vital parts of Canada, and that such forces could not be moved immediately into some trouble spot, I certainly have no recollection of it whatever.

Our national defence structure is a very costly one, as was indicated by the remarks of my friend opposite. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being appropriated in this country, and billions of dollars in the United States, for defence purposes. This fact brings

home the fantastic cost of our armed forces. Rightly or wrongly the amounts voted by this parliament and by the American Congress are, as my honourable friend from Carleton (Hon. Mr. Fogo) pointed out, to provide for a relatively small number of Canadian and American land forces, to be immediately ready for action under any circumstances. The general plan of organization as respects national research, the navy, the air force and the army, is to provide for a force that in case of trouble could be immediately expanded into a larger civilian force. There is no doubt about that. If any honourable members opposite, or any persons outside this house, had any other impression, they certainly were not paying as much attention to public information as they should have been paying. If they felt that there should have been a material increase in our armed forces, they should have raised the question last year and not waited until now. Canada has acted calmly and, I think, with a due sense of its responsibility. It may be that the provision which is now being made will not prove sufficient for our requirements in the near future, but that is something which only the future can show. In the provisions which we formerly made for our armed forces there was, so far as I know, nothing at all which would indicate an intention to have a large land force trained and ready for dispatch abroad at a moment's notice.

Hon. Felix P. Quinn: Honourable members, I am not going to take long. I had not intended to say anything, but I cannot refrain from expressing my amazement at the attitude of the honourable member from New Westminster (Hon. Mr. Reid). It is impossible for me to follow the argument of the honourable gentleman, coming as he does from British Columbia, a province which would be the first in line of attack if Russia started an invasion. For him to advocate a policy of isolationism, a stay-at-home policy—

Hon. Mr. Reid: I rise to a point of order. I do not mind criticism of my remarks, but I object to having attributed to me words that I did not say. I never advocated isolationism.

Hon. Mr. Quinn: In the honourable gentleman's remarks there was not definite advocacy of isolationism, but the inference I drew from them was that he supported that policy. In drawing an inference I am following the precedent set the other day by the honourable senator from Vancouver South (Hon. Mr. Farris).

Hon. Mr. Reid: I never intended to advocate isolationism.