

sentiments of both national honour and self-preservation the Prime Minister indicated in no uncertain terms what he believed and knew to be in the best interests of the people; and the response to that appeal is an indication of how these sentiments of honour and self-preservation were considered in various parts of the country. The record, therefore, shows that of 185 Liberal constituencies, 63, or more than one-third, voted "no". In the province of Quebec, where 64 of the 65 seats are represented by Liberals, 57 constituencies voted "no", including three represented by ministers of the crown. What retribution for the false political leadership which the Liberal party has given that province for over twenty-five years!

Now the Quebec Liberals refer to the bargain, the contract, the promise which allegedly was made at the time of the declaration of war in 1939, at the time of the Quebec provincial election and again at the time of the general election in 1940. Did the Prime Minister authorize the making of a bargain with French Canada to the effect that Canada would wage only a free, moderate and voluntary war? And did he do that at the same time he was telling the rest of Canada that we were waging total war? It is little wonder that to-day the Liberals in French Canada have no trust in the word of the Liberal party. Knowing the intentions of Germany, as they were known to everyone after the invasion of Poland, how could the Prime Minister have believed that the democratic world was not faced with the greatest struggle for its existence that it had ever known? Having watched the course of international events, the seizure of Austria, the Munich agreement and the violation of Czechoslovakia; having personally visited Hitler in Berlin and seen how Germany had been waging a total but undeclared war for five years prior to the firing of the first shot, how could the Prime Minister not realize that we were faced with the bitterest and most sacrifice-compelling struggle of all time? But what do we find? In his opening campaign speech over the radio he said to the people of Canada that a national government would bring about conscription. Well do I remember when those fateful words were uttered. As one who had tried to keep abreast of international developments and to understand their significance, my heart sank within me that anyone, for base purposes, political purposes, would trifle in this manner with the destiny of our nation.

The most immature politician knew that the people of Canada, after two decades of peace talk and of pacifism, were not prepared to accept in those days, when the false

[Mr. Jackman.]

security of the Maginot line was uppermost in their minds, the bitter necessity of conscription. There was always the hope that economic strangulation of Germany might bring about an early termination of the war. Nor am I proud of the record of other political parties in regard to the issue of conscription, which issue was forced upon them by the Prime Minister.

Let me continue, sir, with an analysis of the plebiscite and the effect on the national spirit where Liberalism prevailed.

In the province of Ontario, out of 84 seats only 2 voted "no"; these two constituencies were represented by Liberals. As regards the Ontario constituencies of Cochrane and Nipissing, we find, in the first one, 15,536 "yes" votes and 11,730 "no" votes, and in Nipissing 22,252 "yes" and 17,468 "no" votes. Only by a slight margin did they come into the "yes" bracket. We find that the province as a whole voted 84 per cent "yes". In Hamilton West, represented by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gibson), we find a vote of 21,531 for and 3,937 against. Compare this with the constituency of Lincoln, represented by a Conservative, and similar in many ways to the other; there the vote was 23,702 for and 2,771 against. Take two other constituencies which are closely parallel and represented respectively by a Liberal and a Conservative. Waterloo North, represented by a Liberal, gave 13,077 "yes" votes, 7,055 "no" votes; Waterloo South, represented by a Conservative, 13,297 "yes" votes, 2,334 "no" votes—about the same number of "yes" votes but less than one-third the number of "no" votes.

I go across the country to Manitoba and point to the "yes" votes recorded in the Conservative constituency of Souris—8,046 "yes" to 479 "no"; the second highest percentage in Canada, as compared with that represented by the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar), with 8,829 "yes" against 1,870 "no" votes. Contrast either of these with that of the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson): 11,873 "yes" to 5,860 "no". Truly, Mr. Speaker, leadership counts in this country.

Then we go on to Saskatchewan. There we find that Lake Centre, so ably represented in this house by a Conservative, polled 8,673 "yes" votes to 2,165 "no"; while in the constituency of Melville, represented by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), the voting was 8,599 "yes" and 6,470 "no". About the same number voted "yes", but three times as many voted "no" as in the other constituency to which I have referred, in the

same province. Then we find at Prince Albert, represented by the Prime Minister, 9,884 "yes", 3,195 "no"; Saskatoon City, represented by a Conservative, 16,710 "yes", 2,074 "no". In an area adjacent to Saskatoon City, that of Rosthern, represented by a Liberal, we find 3,527 "yes" and 3,988 "no"—the only constituency in Saskatchewan failing to come under the "yes" banner.

In British Columbia we find the same thing. In Vancouver Centre, represented by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), the result was, 21,961 "yes" and 4,922 "no", whereas in Vancouver South, so ably represented in this house by a Conservative, there were 31,986 "yes" against 4,680 "no"—about the same number of votes in both constituencies, but the Conservative member polled 10,000 more "yes" votes.

It is the same story from one end of the country to the other, and nothing is more indicative of the lead which a party or a member can give to the people than is the vote on the plebiscite.

Let me take the results in my own city of Toronto. There the same tendency is shown. The highest "yes" vote in that city, as well as in the whole of Canada was recorded in the riding of Eglinton, represented by a Liberal, but by a Liberal, as we found out last evening, to the chagrin of every right-thinking member of this house, who has found it necessary, on this nation-saving principle of conscription, to differ from a government which refuses to give voice to the will of the great majority of the people. He has given a leadership equal to that which has been forthcoming from Conservative members who refuse to put party before principle. The constituency of Eglinton adjoins on the north my own constituency, and in the north end of that constituency, I am glad to report, there was at least one polling subdivision where not a single "no" vote was recorded.

The other two ridings in the city of Toronto which are represented by Liberal members are Trinity and Spadina. The hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) made a speech in this house on the plebiscite which was the most perfect example of mugwumpery that I have ever seen. It was in two parts, one being a high-class exposition of the merits of conscription, and the other an equally high-class exposition of the merits of the continuance of the voluntary system. The people of Trinity, however, returned a vote of 90 per cent in favour of the affirmative. The hon. member has seen fit to be led by rather than to lead his people. How typical of the whole attitude of the Liberal administration. As a result of such leadership, Trinity and the

neighbouring riding of Spadina returned the two lowest "yes" votes in the great city of Toronto.

Although apparently the need is still great, time does not permit me to appeal to some quarters of this house on the reasons why we are at war and what we have at stake. With the enemy knocking at the gates, there is time only for action. As I said in the plebiscite debate on February 5, 1942, the Prime Minister and the other ministers of the cabinet failed, without even trying, to inform the people of Quebec of the true issues at stake in this struggle for survival, and the effect on them personally should we not carry the war to a successful conclusion.

Why are the ministers of the crown not telling the people of Quebec what the issues are and what defeat will mean to every one of us? I do not think this government has failed in any more signal instance than in its refusal, its complete failure, to tell the people of Quebec just what are the issues at stake—just as the hon. member who preceded me made a perfectly splendid case not only for Quebec but for the war, and then went on to show that the war is still not Canada's war, and that we are better off in building up an army to defend ourselves on the shores of Canada. I could quote a memorable passage from a speech of the hon. member for Richelieu-Verchères (Mr. Cardin) to the effect that we cannot possibly defend ourselves on the shores of Canada against an enemy if that enemy breaks through the line either in Great Britain or on the Pacific.

The leadership which the Prime Minister has given has been far short of what the people as a whole expected. Certain elements in the community have been appeased by the result—of the government's incredibly slow and unrealistic policy which has brought about a feeling of complacency and dampened the ardour even of the most loyal and patriotic citizens. This slowness of action and the policy of playing for time recalls one of Pope's great verses, which I shall quote with the substitution of one word:

Complacency is a monster of so frightful mien,
As, to be hated, needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

On the other hand, the Conservative party has not only given leadership to the people but it has not hesitated to advise its supporters, as well as all the people of Canada, in connection with what it believes and knows to be in their best interests, no matter what the sacrifice may be. And the Conservative party does this, not on a single occasion when the enemy is already knocking at the gate,