

The words, "in this connection", in the paragraph I have just read, refer of course to the words "the methods of raising men for military service" in the preceding paragraph. I am, therefore, as I said in my reply to the former minister of public works, unable to agree that there has been any change of policy or attitude on the part of the government. No new policy has been adopted.

Policy regarding overseas service announced before plebiscite

The government's policy with respect to the method of enlisting men for service in the army overseas was set forth clearly and unequivocally, on February 10, by my colleague the Minister of National Defence, in discussing the 1942-43 army programme. The minister of defence said that he wanted to see voluntary enlistments kept up, and that he believed it was better for our voluntary army if the men coming to reinforce it were also volunteers. After giving figures which clearly showed that, up to that time, the voluntary system had not failed, the minister added these words:

I have faith in the success of the voluntary method if we all do our part. With the background and tradition which this country possesses and which it would be folly to ignore, I prefer the voluntary method if it works, and I shall do all I can to make it work.

This statement is by no means the only statement of the position of the government with respect to the method of enlistment for service overseas. I desire particularly to draw attention to and to repeat the words I used in this house on February 25, in the debate on the second reading of the Plebiscite Bill. After setting out the reasons why the government believed the request for a release from any commitments should be submitted to the people, I explained the position the government was then in with respect to the adoption of conscription for overseas service and, in plain and unequivocal language, why it was the government desired to have that position changed and to be given a free hand to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they might arise. Here are my words—and I am quoting from what I said on February 25:

The position is that the government has full power with respect to everything, excepting one thing; and that one thing is that commitment, that obligation, with respect to the enlisting of men for overseas service. There the government is not free. You may ask why the government should come forward at the present time and ask to be made free. First of all, may I make it clear that it is not because of any situation that exists at the moment. The Minister of National Defence has made it perfectly clear that with respect to voluntary enlistment, we are obtaining men for overseas service at the present time as rapidly as we can train them.

And these are my words:

For our programme this year, and up to March, 1943, there is an honest belief on the part of the government that we will be able to get the men by voluntary enlistment for service overseas, and will not have to resort to conscription. But no one can say how long this war is going to last. No one can say what particular turn it is going to take. None of us knows what the conditions are going to be in a few months hence, or several months hence, or a year or two hence. . . .

Nothing, I think, could be plainer than that. It was made perfectly clear that the government had no thought of resorting to conscription for overseas service so long as the voluntary system continued to produce the necessary recruits; also, that we honestly believed the voluntary system would suffice to secure the necessary enlistments for the 1942-43 programme. The government, however, wished to be free, without any breach of faith, to resort to conscription for overseas service should that become necessary to our national security and to the effectiveness of our war effort.

If the bill is amended as proposed, it is not the intention of the government to resort to conscription for service overseas unless circumstances should arise which would render the use of compulsion imperative, such, for example, as the maintenance of the necessary reinforcements for Canada's army overseas.

In saying this, let me make it equally clear that, having regard to the stage the war has reached, the government is asking parliament now, just as it did at the time of the enactment of the National Resources Mobilization Act, in June, 1940, to give to it the powers it believes it should possess, quite independently of any powers the governor in council may possess under the War Measures Act. The power to which I refer is the power to decide if, when, and to what extent the use of compulsion may be necessary for military service outside Canada and to exercise that power accordingly.

Debate on conscription for overseas service welcomed

The amendment before the house necessarily opens up the whole question of conscription for overseas service. The government welcomes this opportunity of having the subject debated. Now that the question can be discussed upon its merits, it is well that it should be so discussed. As I pointed out on January 26 in the debate on the address, and again on February 25, in the debate on the plebiscite bill, parliament is the place for that discussion.

With reference to the specific question of enlistment for service overseas, I said, on February 25:

When we find that we cannot raise the required numbers of men for enlistment overseas by the voluntary method, and it is absolutely necessary to raise more men by other methods, then we will make our decision, present it to parliament and have it discussed on its merits.

Unless the question of conscription for overseas service is to be twice debated, that, as I see it, is the stage we have now reached. The government is making its policy with respect to the raising of men for service overseas, fully known. We are presenting that policy to parliament, and, as I have just said, we welcome the opportunity of having the whole question discussed upon its merits.

In order that the government may have the power if required to resort to the compulsory method of raising men for service overseas, if it is found that men in the numbers required cannot be raised by the voluntary method, as well as for the other reasons I have mentioned, the government has reached the decision that it should now ask parliament to amend the National Resources Mobilization Act by the deletion of section 3 of the act.

If the powers for this purpose are to be conferred upon the governor in council at all, it is well they should be given as long as possible in advance of the time at which it may become necessary to exercise them, should it ever become necessary so to do. Also, it will, I think, be generally agreed that discussion on so important a subject should not be left to a time of crisis. As between debating the issue now or later on, obviously the wisdom and advantage is wholly in favour of the earlier moment.

What really is important is that the government's policy should be fully known, presented to parliament, and agreed to by parliament before any action is taken. In this way and in this way only, the people's representatives in parliament can be afforded a full opportunity to discuss the whole subject upon its merits.

Extension of application of compulsory service in western hemisphere

While not seeking the deletion of section 3 because of any present need of applying conscription for service overseas, the government is desirous of having the power immediately to move some of the men who have been called up and trained under the National Resources Mobilization Act, to Newfoundland and possibly to other islands in the western hemisphere, and to territories adjacent to Canada, including the territory of the United States. If that power is to be ex-

ercised under authority of parliament, apart from the authority contained in the War Measures Act, the section would have to be immediately amended. The amending of the section to any extent would, in the light of discussions that have already taken place, open up the whole question of conscription, and we should have here and now a full debate thereon. As I already have said, I am certain that with war on every side, hon. members of parliament would not wish two debates upon the subject of conscription when one should suffice, and I am even more certain that the people of Canada would not view with patience any such action on the part of their representatives.

Method of exercising extending powers

There remains the question as to how, should the necessity of resorting to compulsion for service overseas arise, the government proposes to proceed in exercising the powers which parliament may confer. Here, again, the government intends to continue the practice which it has followed under the powers it at present possesses under the National Resources Mobilization Act.

The decision of the governor in council will be communicated to parliament in exactly the same manner as orders and regulations are communicated to parliament under the act as it stands. The procedure, in this particular, is set forth in section 5 of the act, which reads:

5. Every order or regulation passed under the authority of this Act shall be tabled in parliament forthwith if parliament is in session and a copy thereof sent to every member of the House of Commons and of the Senate; and if parliament is not in session, then every such order or regulation shall be forthwith published in the *Canada Gazette* and copies thereof sent to every member of the House of Commons and of the Senate forthwith; provided that any of the steps specified in this section may be omitted or deferred if the governor in council considers such omission or deferment necessary in the national interest having regard to the special circumstances.

Clause 5 was inserted in the mobilization act only after very careful consideration of the situation as it existed at the time the act was passed. It must be apparent that the reasons which governed at that time, as to the procedure to be followed by the administration in exercising the powers given to the governor in council under its provisions, would obtain with equal, if not greater force as the war situation becomes more critical.

I notice that it has been said, that once the amendment is adopted, the decision respecting conscription for overseas service will rest solely with the military authorities. I wish, therefore, to make it wholly clear