

to learn about the constitution, and with all due respect, I may be allowed to differ from him. I say that this Act is illegal, because we have no mandate to pass it. In the first place, it is unjust. Why is it unjust? Because, as a result of that Act, you mean to impose obligations we are not held to assume. We have indeed agreed to help, and I still wish to help, but from that does not mean that we will agree to do what you now want us to do, when we are in no-wise obliged to do it and I say: your law is entirely unjust.

This Act is discriminating. Why? Because we are asked to do in this country what is not demanded from other countries. The law is discriminating, because it is not universal. I very well understand, if the Empire should ask every British subject to do, each and every one of them, one and the same thing, that would be equality; but, in the present case, Canada is asked to do what they dare not ask any one else to do.

I was reading, this very morning, that the Premier of Australia had just declared that enlistment would remain voluntary. So there is no compulsion in Australia, another colony of the Empire, but they must impose it in Canada first, in this dear old Canada they love so well, they are so fond of, yes, Canada will be first. Well, I am chary of your preference, of your favours, of your gifts, I am apprehensive when you thus ask Canada to do what others are not asked to do. I say it is a discriminating law.

What would you say, Mr. Speaker, if, in a city like Montreal, the mayor, who is here just now, would have his municipal government pass a regulation by which he would say: the carters of Chaboillez Square will pay so much a piece, the carters of St. Mary's ward another amount, and the carters of St. Jean Baptiste still another amount of money? He would be told: You are mad; you should know and you must know that, be it in virtue of a law or a by-law, all must be treated the same way, no favour, no favouritism, no privileges, every one has equal rights. Well, then, I say that we, the British subjects of Canada, we are not put on the same footing as the subjects of the other colonies, by the imposition of a law which they do not want to impose elsewhere.

I say that every discriminating law is unconstitutional, and the power of disallowance, of which we are so jealous, and which His Majesty has the right to exercise, His Majesty may, at any given mo-

ment, exercise his right to annul such an Act. The laws enacted here, Mr. Speaker, must be ratified on the other side. The laws of the province of Quebec are ratified within two years by the Dominion Parliament. The laws passed by the Dominion Government must be sanctioned by His Majesty, by the Imperial Government. Well, I wonder if the Imperial Parliament would sanction such an unjust, such a discriminatory law as this one. I do humbly say no. This law is unconstitutional and should not be adopted, because such was the understanding, when the lease of life of this Parliament was extended one year.

I was reading, this morning, the speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and I found therein a most serious charge made against the Government. The right hon. gentleman states that this extension was granted with the formal understanding that it was only for the guidance and the good administration of the affairs of the country and that the proposal would never have been entertained, if this Bill had only been mentioned. I do repeat it, that is a very serious charge, in my humble opinion, for it means that the hon. leader of the Opposition and his followers, who have agreed to this extension, have been deceived. In other words, it means this: you have induced me to grant you an extension of time and to ask my followers to support you on this question, and you have deceived me. "Well, Mr. Speaker, if we cannot find any good faith in those who govern us, if honour and integrity cannot be found in our rulers, I now ask you the question: what will be the outcome? I do hope that the hon. Prime Minister will give us some explanations on this subject.

I say that this law is vexatious for us French Canadians, as well as for the English and Scotch Canadians of this country. Is it not sad, indeed, to find that, in spite of the sacrifices made, after contributing to the Canadian expeditionary forces more than 423,000 men, we are nevertheless charged with not having done our duty? Is that what the hon. member for Chateaugay (Mr. Morris) calls the failure of voluntary enlistment? Let him beware of failure for himself, of the discomfiture which awaits him in his country? A man may go into bankruptcy and still the sum of his assets be greater than that of his liabilities; he may be in straitened circumstances only temporarily, but I don't believe that is the case of the member for Chateaugay. He will have to give a strict and true account