

# THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY

VOL. V. No. 8.

OTTAWA, APRIL, 1918

TWO CENTS

## QUEBEC RIOTS

On Friday April 5 th. on a motion moved by Mr. J. A. Currie Conservative M. P. for Simcoe North Ont. the question of the rioting, and disturbance in Quebec was discussed in the House of Commons. We quote herewith an extract from the speech delivered by Mr. Currie.

We also give a verbatim report of the speech delivered by the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier on this occasion.

Mr. Currie Stated:

I now wish to discuss the matter of who is to blame for this state of affairs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE: I will take my friends first. I believe—I have the evidence right here—that the Government, in trying to enforce this Act with caution and moderation in the province of Quebec, have given aid and comfort to those men who are doing everything in their power to create a disturbance in that province. We all know that the man who is the prominent figure in all this anti-British trouble in Quebec is the editor of the newspaper called *Le Devoir*, Henri Bourassa. When the war broke out Mr. Bourassa was in Belgium or Strassburg, or some place over there, and he managed to sneak out under the protection of the British flag and escape to this country. No sooner had he reached this side than by some strange process he started to carry out the very policy which Bolo Pasha pursued from his headquarters in the United States as well as in France—that of creating trouble, causing dissatisfaction, doing everything in his power to prevent the people from sustaining our part in this war.

I say without reservation that he has constantly preached sedition in the columns of *Le Devoir*. During the troubles in this House over the passage of the Military Service Act, he was very silent because the public

mind was inflamed then, but at other times he has constantly preached sedition in his newspaper. Now, I can understand a patriot of the old school who fought for "liberty, equality and fraternity" preaching sedition against autocracy; I would do it myself, but that is not the case with this man. He does not want liberty, equality or fraternity; he wants reaction; his gospel is the gospel of reaction. I say further that he has commercialized sedition to sell his paper to the poor dupes who will read it; I repeat that that is his chief aim and object, and also to get a little popularity for himself. He is the leader of the Nationalist party. We on this side of the House had our trouble with the Nationalists when we were framing the Military Service Act; we know all about that trouble, but we are rid of them now, we hope. Why was not *Le Devoir* suppressed, and why was not Bourassa interned? At Sault Ste. Marie, Charles Smith, the editor of a paper there, a man whom I have known since he was a boy, the son of a respectable Methodist clergyman and a very respectable man himself, said something in his paper with reference to the manner in which voluntary recruiting was being carried on. At once his paper was suppressed, and he found himself penniless, and threatened with imprisonment. To my mind he was a much better man than Henri Bourassa. It is sometimes said that Bourassa may be more dangerous locked up than at large. The men who are the fathers or the sons or the brothers of the boys who went over Vimy Ridge are not afraid of

any cheap agitator in Quebec or anywhere else, whether locked up or free. In the United States men greater than Bourassa are being locked up and have disappeared from ken and will remain out of sight and unheard of until the war is over. But what do we find in the case of Bourassa? In this same paper with the heavy type about "Emeutes"—which I understand is the French for "riots" at all events it meant that when I was in France—are columns of Government advertising, whole pages of it. There is a three-column advertisement, for instance, on April 1st, signed by Charles J. Doherty, Minister of Justice; the minister no doubt will be able to explain that. On another page are three or four advertisements from the Public Works Department, and I am told that advertisements in connection with rural routes up in my riding have been inserted in *Le Devoir*. This is a serious matter. How can any French Canadian who reads the views of the editor of this paper escape the conclusion that as far as French Canadians are concerned, they are outside the war altogether, that *Le Devoir* has the Government approval and the Government does not intend to do anything towards conscripting them?

Now, I come to somebody else—Mr. Lavergne.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Colonel Lavergne.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not intend to call him colonel. Why has he been allowed to travel around Quebec with

(Continued on page 92)

## THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY

is issued from the Central Information Office of the Canadian Liberal Party. Hope Chambers, Ottawa.

PRICE 25c A YEAR.

### THE NEW BRAND OF MARTIAL LAW.

The reading of the order-in-council creating a new brand of martial law by the prime minister, immediately before the debate on the Quebec riots, may come to be regarded as one of those turning points in constitutional history which declare whether the spirit of parliaments and peoples is the essential spirit of liberty, or is only a supine acquiescence in whatever is decreed by a junta to which, for the moment, the supreme power has been delegated.

The house of commons, on whose confidence the very existence of the government depends, was about to discuss a phase of the administration of the law, when the prime minister intervened with a decree which, as he said, had already amended the law which the commons were about to review. Nothing like that, surely, has happened to a British parliament since Charles I denied that parliament could control, as well as advise the king.

The mace was on the table, but the prime minister might almost as well have said, "Take away that bauble." His deliverance was an intimation that it didn't matter what the house might choose to say to the government, the government had executed its own will, and there was really nothing to be said. When Sir Wilfrid Laurier protested against the new autocracy by order-in-council, the prime minister challenged him to a vote of the house. Such a vote would of course have been carried. But the implications of the prime minister's challenge must not remain undiscovered or unexposed.

The increasing autocracy of the cabinet was one of the dangers against which far-seeing lovers of freedom in Britain have been on guard since long before the war. Too little apprehension has been felt regarding the development of the like spirit in Canada. Most of us regarded Union government as a recovery of parliamentary control. Next to the mandate of the country, clearly expressed at the polls, the mandate of the house of commons is supreme. A house which is not swift to guard itself is exposed to a double peril. The power of the house to make or destroy ministries remains, even though it be understood to have remained in abeyance.

When the Quebec riots broke the calm of the Easter recess, it was inevitable that the subject should be debated in parliament. With a fear that has become characteristic, the government tried to burk discussion—so far has respect for the cardinal function of parliament descended, and so confident is the assumption that the house of commons cannot be trusted to deal with a difficult national question in a restrained, dignified national way.

What could have been done? On Tuesday, the prime minister had announced that the government would propose, (to parliament, it was assumed), amendments to the Military Service Act, calculated to facilitate the operation of it, which had been unsatisfactory in the province of Quebec. It was then known that there had been bloodshed in the city of Quebec. It seemed that the military were in adequate control of the situation. There was no clamant urgency for orders-in-council to deal with the possibility of rioting elsewhere, to cause the government to exceed the provisions of the existing law. Nor was there greater urgency on Thursday, when the prime minis-

ter asked for the Quebec riots debate to be postponed another day. On Friday the situation was still better.

The government, if it desired to be fortified with every possible authority and to show the country the strongest possible hand, might have seen to it that the inevitable debate would take the form of recommendations to the government for action. It would then have been seen that parliament counted for something, especially when it was so fresh from the people. But the government, overnight, accomplished a revolution in military law and in parliamentary practice, with the object, as one newspaper said, of taking the wind out of Colonel Currie's sails. It was not worth while for such a cause to knock the breath out of the Constitution.

There was the order-in-council—what was the use of discussion? The commons were presented with an accomplished martial law, as soon as they proposed to discuss martial law.

What does the order-in-council do? It gives to the official commanding a military district absolute authority to decide that the circumstances of any "civil disturbance" justify his interference, and to do whatever he pleases to supersede the civil power. After he, on his own initiative, has created a situation which it may be dangerous to sustain and still more dangerous to abandon, the government may suspend the operation of every civil court and process in any area it declares to be affected; the military officer may try whomsoever he pleases by court martial, whose sentences only shall be subject to the review of the government. If the officer does not want to lay a charge, all the machinery of habeas corpus can be suspended, and anybody the military chooses to arrest in any part of Canada, on the allegation that he ought to be arrested, in consequence of any riot, can be held in custody, without bail or trial, as long as the minister of militia chooses. The silence of the tomb may fall upon him, as surely as it did upon many of those who were committed to the Bastille in the worst days of Louisian autocracy.

The case for the firm hand when disorder appears is simple. But, if the necessity for firmness is the result of an aptitude for blundering, the presumption is apt to be against enduring a weakness that only looks like strength. It cannot be denied that the order-in-council means the array of eight provinces against one. It carries the sinister implication that the judiciary of a province of two millions of Canadians cannot be trusted to operate justly the immemorial safeguard of British liberty, which was embedded in Magna Charta, and received its final embodiment in the Habeas Corpus Act, which was aimed at the tyranny of the second Charles.

Psychologically, at least, all Quebec is under martial law. If there is no escape from this consequence of the Military Service Act of last session, if a new parliament is to throw its protection over more drastic measures than were deemed advisable when the Act was passed, parliament should have been asked to face the situation, in full knowledge of all the facts. It should have given proof that it understood what was expected of it.

As it is, parliament is presumed to accept, without a murmur, the most extraordinary discount of its majesty that the war has brought—a discount which detracts from the qualifications for statesmanship of governors who seem not to understand the genius of the institutions for whose salvation forty thousand Canadian lives have already been laid down.

*The above is a letter written by Arthur Hawkes and appeared in the Ottawa Citizen of Thursday, April 11th, 1918.*

### W. F. O'CONNOR, RESIGNED.

The High Cost of Living Commissioner, Mr. W. F. O'Connor resigned on April 4th, 1918, which brings to a close in this branch of Governmental work a career of one man in whom the public at large had absolute confidence. For seventeen months, or since November, 1916, Mr. O'Connor had held the position of High Cost of Living Commissioner. While dealing generally with the problems of the High Cost of Living as it relates to the Dominion, his most effective work was the inauguration of a system in the Labour Department whereby Cold Storage and Meat Packing companies, and others, were compelled to submit to the Department each month sworn statements of their food holdings.

Mr. O'Connor analyzed these statements and from them compiled some most interesting statistics which, when incorporated into a report, startled the Public. The inside workings of these Meat Packing Companies were laid bare. The hoarding of food was proven, excessive profits, due to exorbitant prices charged, were shown. In all this work the congratulations of the public were extended to Mr. O'Connor, but, alas, there was another side to the question. The packers had been dealt a blow which would take them years to overcome. Mr. O'Connor's reports had contained information which was not intended for the public. In short the cat was out of the bag, and Mr. O'Connor's resignation was demanded by those who were affected. At first the Government stood firm, but eventually things became so uncomfortable that Mr. O'Connor has been obliged to resign, and the consumer and wage earner have lost the services of their best friend. It is hoped the whole matter will be ventilated in Parliament. The packers and Big Interests must not rule.

### SACRIFICE REWARDED.

The new Postmaster at Ottawa, Mr. A. G. Acres, appears to have been heavily endowed by the Borden Government. Just prior to the outbreak of war he was paid, according to a question asked by Mr. Proulx and answered by the Hon. Mr. Sifton on April 3rd, \$22,260.42 for purchasing some property in Ottawa upon which the government intend some day to erect a public building.

From August 1st, 1915, to December, 1916, Mr. Acres was an Honorary Captain and Paymaster of the 77th Battalion and drew as his regimental pay \$3.00 per day, plus travelling expenses \$867, plus separation allowance \$680, and all this time he was able to look after his own business in Ottawa.

These sacrifices have been rewarded by his appointment as Postmaster at Ottawa.

### ENLISTMENTS FOR OVERSEAS SERVICE.

On March 25th, 1918, the Hon. Mr. Doherty, Minister of Justice, in answer to a question asked by Mr. J. Demers, M.P. for St. Jean-Iberville, Que., informed the House that the total number of voluntary enlistments in Canada from the beginning of the war to date was 448,062, that out of this number 47,727 had voluntarily enlisted between the dates of January 1st, 1917, and September 1st, 1917.

### THE DESTRUCTION OF FOOD.

An investigation at Winnipeg proved that 5,000 pounds of poultry were destroyed on account of being unfit for human consumption, the William Davies Packing Company having held them too long in cold storage. Subsequently 2,000 additional pounds were destroyed by the same company, a great tribute to Sir Joseph Flavelle, head of the company.

The papers of April 12th contain a remarkable statement headed from Toronto, April 11th, to the effect that between April 4th and April 10th, 100,000 pounds of vegetables and apples were destroyed in a crematory situated in the Western part of the City of Toronto, near the Don. Turnips and onions were the principal vegetables destroyed. The report says that this announcement is made by Street Commissioner Wilson of the City of Toronto.

Again on July 22nd, 1918, a Vancouver paper The British Columbia Federationist stated "If the high cost of living investigations are carried far enough it is expected that it will be shown that a considerable number of persons ought to be in jail. For instance more than 800,000 pounds of fruit, vegetables, and eggs have been destroyed in the Vancouver incinerator. Why was this held up until it was unfit for consumption."

Surely here is an opportunity for the Food Control Board, and we wait with much interest the action they will take in the matter.

### HOW THE GOV'T. PROTECTS ITS OWN.

The story of the dynamiting of Lord Atholston's (Sir Hugh Graham) residence in Montreal by agitators who were supposed to be not in sympathy with the Military Service Act, was recently revived in the House of Commons on a question asked by P. F. Casgrain, M.P., for Charlevoix-Montmorency.

It will be remembered that during the summer of 1917 demonstrations against the Military Service Act were frequent in the City of Montreal. It was obvious that someone was attempting to incite the people against the Conscription Bill. Orators would appear on street corners, and in some instances halls where meetings were advertised, and openly advocated resistance to the Military Service Act. Eventually the residence of Lord Atholstan was dynamited and the family narrowly escaped instant death. The Montreal police took hold of the matter and several arrests were made. The guilty were brought into court where it was proved that a detective, in the employ of the Dominion Government, by the name of Charles Desjardins, was the leader of the gang of agitators who were working in Montreal, which gang was responsible for the dynamiting.

In the House of Commons on March 25th, the Hon. Mr. Doherty, Minister of Justice, informed Mr. Casgrain, that this same Mr. Charles Desjardins was employed by the Dominion Police as a detective at \$2.50 per day and that after he (Desjardins) was arrested in Montreal and awaiting trial the Justice Department deposited \$10,000 in lieu of bail for him, pending his trial.

This is the same Desjardins referred to in the speech of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, reproduced in this issue of the Monthly.

the stars and crown of a colonel on his shoulders, when right from the beginning he has been opposed to the war, and stated so publicly while I was at Valcartier. This man, who has been virtually accepted as the leader of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec, should have been interned. The country could very well afford to do without him; there is nothing he is needed for; he is not making munitions, or farming—helping to do something that would assist Canada or the Allies in this war—nor is he soldiering, though he is called a colonel. Why, in Toronto recently, a man got up on

a public platform and said that the soldiers at the front had taken a little too much rum on Christmas day. He was locked up and his badges and uniform stripped from him, and he was thrown out of the army. While that was happening in Toronto Lavergne has been allowed to roam at large in Quebec, preaching seditious doctrines, and generally doing as he pleased. What is more, when the Government decided to end these riots in Quebec, the representative of the Department of Justice, if we are to believe the newspapers, went to Quebec and sent for Lavergne and his partner to find out what could be

done. Lavergne laid down his terms. First he wanted the troops withdrawn. Then he wanted the police withdrawn, and what in the world else was there for us to do but leave the country to him and his friends. I understand that the officer of the Government refused to entertain such a proposal, and I am very glad that this Government had a man with backbone enough for that; but I am sorry he called on Mr. Lavergne at all. Lavergne should have been utterly ignored; in fact he should have been the first man placed under arrest in Quebec when the riots broke out.

## Speech Delivered by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier

Mr. Speaker:

The mover of this motion was kind enough in his remarks to say that at one time he had some regard for me but that I have sadly fallen from grace in his eyes. May I say to him that on the present occasion the hon. gentlemen has sadly disappointed me. I thought he moved his motion in order to discuss the riots and disturbances which took place recently in the city of Quebec, but he discussed altogether another question. He discussed the enforcement of the Act and the action of the exemption tribunals, but as to the riots in the city of Quebec he hardly said a word.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think it my duty, Sir, to speak of the riots that have taken place in Quebec. I have the honour to be the member of the constituency in which these riots took place and that honour I have enjoyed for now upwards of forty years. I know the people well, and I repeat what I said on a former occasion: that there is not to be found in any part of Canada a more peaceable or law-abiding population. I think I may also add that they are a sensitive population, sensitive to resent injustice, and perhaps more sensitive yet to resent a harsh act and an unkind word.

It was my duty, upon learning of the disturbances that had taken place in Quebec, to try to inform myself as to the facts, the reports being so little in accord with what I know of the constituency of Quebec East. I wished to inform myself as to what were the causes which could have brought about a condition of affairs so utterly at variance with the character of the constituency, as long as I have known it. Sir, I think now that I pretty well know the genesis of the disturbances which took place.

### Fault with Men Enforcing the Law.

I said on a former occasion to the Prime Minister that if there have

been disturbances, the fault was largely with the men who were entrusted with the duty of enforcing the Act. I do not complain at all of the higher officers in the district. So far as I know them, they are men of honour and have tried to do their duty. But, Sir, as to the men who were entrusted with the duty of putting into force Section 15 of the Military Service Act., a more unfortunate selection could not have been made. Section 15 of the Act cited by the Prime Minister empowers any officer of the law to ask any man whom he meets for his papers. This is an inquisitorial power, and everybody knows—and in saying this I am sure that I place myself in the judgment of every member of this House—that this inquisitorial power, to be effective, and not to be resented, must be executed with proper regard to the dignity and honour of the man who is subjected to it. My right hon. friend said that the origin of the riots was the arrest of a young man named Mercier by the officers of the law. I had better quote the words of the right hon. gentleman:

"It appears that a young man named Mercier had been asked by the Dominion police engaged in the enforcement of the Military Service Act for his exemption certificate, which he did not have with him. He was taken into custody until the certificate could be produced. As a matter of fact, under the provisions of section 15 of the Military Service Act, it was his duty to produce it when called upon to do so. The certificate was sent for and produced, whereupon he was immediately discharged.

### How the Trouble Started.

These words are true, but that is not the whole story, and I will now endeavour—and I am sure that what I say will not be gainsaid by subsequent information received by the Government—to give the facts. Mercier is a young man who resides on Notre Dame street in the city of Quebec. There is on that street a bowling alley and billiard room called Salle Frontenac. On Thursday of last week, about half-past eight in

the evening, he went to the bowling alley. He was in company with a man named Deslaurier. I have his affidavit here, but it is in French, and perhaps I may summarize it. He says that he saw as he came in two of the constables who had been entrusted with the enforcement of the Act in the city of Quebec. One is known as Major Evanturel, because at one time it is said he was connected with the militia. The name of the other constable was Belanger. When Mercier saw Evanturel, and was told that Belanger was in the room, he said to his friend: "We had better go out." Why did he say that? Having seen with his own eyes this man Evanturel, and having heard that this man Belanger was there, he said: "Let us go out." The fact is that this man Belanger is as well known in the city of Quebec as was Barabas at Jerusalem. He is known to be a boxer, a pugilist, a bully and a disturber of the peace, always fond of showing off his strong muscles. His career is this: He has been most of his life a bartender. Some two or three years ago he obtained a license as a tavern keeper, and his license was subsequently taken away from him for cause. This is the character of the man who in the city of Quebec is entrusted with the enforcement of such a delicate law as the Military Service Act. Evanturel belongs to an old and respectable family, but unfortunately he is one of those degenerates who have gone down and down and down in the scale of life until to-day—for the sake of his family—I would not say what I think of him. At all events, he is not acceptable as a respectable citizen. He also is one of the officers entrusted by the Government with the enforcing of the Act. If such be the character of the officers of the law it is no wonder that this young man Mercier said to his friends: "Let us go out." As they were nearing the door they were met by two spotters, evidently under the control of Belanger and Evanturel, and were asked for their papers. Deslaurier produced his papers at once. Mercier fumbled in his pockets, but it so happened that he had not his papers with him. He had left them in the pocket of

another coat. Thereupon he said to the officers: "I have not my papers with me; they are at home; will you come with me to the telephone; I will telephone to my parents at once to bring the papers." The officers would not grant this very reasonable request. Now, Sir, would it not strike everybody that the duty of those officers should have been to wait until he had telephoned to get his papers. But they insisted on bringing the man to the station. A squabble ensued, and this was the origin of the trouble. Now, Sir, I do not at all intend to excuse the squabble which ensued in which there was a free fight between the Dominion police, the men I have just mentioned, and the crowd. Violence is always to be deprecated and must be condemned whenever it occurs. But, after all, there is some excuse to be given for a man who is provoked into violence. I believe that if nothing else had followed in the succeeding days there would have been peace in Quebec. This was the first act of the drama; this was the origin of the squabble on the 28th of March.

### Leaders not Quebec City Men.

The following day the disturbance continued and on a far greater scale. I must say that upon this, my conclusion is—after having investigated the matter for my own sake, and having been in communication with my friends and my constituents in the city of Quebec, that the trouble which took place on Friday the 29th of March was caused by a secret association of some kind. What it is, I do not know. I am sure of one thing. The origin of that association is not in the city of Quebec. The instigators of the trouble are not Quebec men.

Some hon. MEMBERS: hear, hear

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: They are not Quebec men. I asked my friends and constituents to tell me who were the leaders of these riots, and one and all tell me that they did not know them. It is known as a fact, that on that Friday evening there was a motor car in which there were four persons who appeared to be the leaders of the movement, and so far as my information goes at the present time, those four persons do not belong to the city of Quebec. Who are those men? That the movement was organized is undoubted. Who were behind it? My impression is—I have no information upon this, but I will give my reasons for believing what I am going to say—that it is the same gang which attempted to terrorize the city of Montreal last summer.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

### Was Montreal Gang Operating in Quebec?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This gang was composed of the scum of

the city of Montreal such scum as is to be found in every large city and is ready to create disturbance in every civil community. The leaders of it were penitentiary birds, convicts, who had been released by the Department of Justice some months previously. In saying that I do not desire to impugn the good faith of the Minister of Justice, but I do say this: if he had exerted the least caution before releasing these men; if he had taken the trouble to secure information from the police officials of Montreal, he would have been told that these convicts were habitual criminals, penitentiary birds. They were arrested a short time afterwards. One of them committed suicide before arrest; he belonged to a very respectable family, and I shall not bring the name of that family into this House. Everybody in Montreal knows to whom I refer. The other man, an ex-convict, was a man of the most pronounced criminal tendencies—tendencies which he had inherited; he was a degenerate. The third man, Lalumiere, is now in jail in Montreal awaiting trial. He was tried once before, but the jury could not agree. The other man was Desjardins, a detective employed by the Department of Justice; and it has been proved that he was one of the instigators of all the acts of violence which occurred in Montreal. This man is of such a character that he could not get bail in Montreal, and the Department of Justice accordingly deposited a cheque for \$10,000 to guarantee his appearance in court. I may add that he too was tried, the jury could not agree, and again he has been freed on bail furnished by the Department of Justice.

What makes me say that these men are the instigators of all this trouble in the city of Quebec? This fact is certain; the leaders of the movement were not men from the city; they were strangers, wherever they came from. I speak positively with regard to this; I am quite satisfied that the statements which I now make cannot be contradicted. My reasons for believing that this is the same gang which operated in Montreal are as follows: on Friday or Saturday of last week placards were posted in the city of Quebec around the Canadian Pacific Railway station and in most of the principal streets in the division of St. Roch. These are the same placards which were posted in Montreal during last summer at the time of the agitation which then took place. They are the same print, on the same paper, showing the same cartoons and containing the same words. The friend from whom I have this information is in a position to know that these placards are the same as those posted in Montreal, and must be some which had not then been used. If this be the case, you have a clue to the circumstances which have brought about that riot.

### Other Disturbance.

Is the city of Quebec the only

place in the Dominion where disturbances have occurred? Have there not been disturbances in Toronto, in Calgary, in many other places? Perhaps these disturbances were not of the magnitude of those which took place at Quebec, but they were almost as bad. Is it not a fact that the Premier of Ontario had to take refuge against a hostile crowd not more than a month ago? All these things have happened. I do not say that by way of excusing what has taken place in Quebec; I say it simply by way of explanation. An hon. gentleman—I think it was the member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens)—seemed to be astonished when I said there was no inclination on the part of the province of Quebec to disobey the law. I say that there is no inclination on the part of the people there to disobey the law. The law is not popular; that I admit, but every man of official standing in the province, from the Attorney General down, has stated to the people that the law must be obeyed, unpopular though it be. And we want to obey it.

Sir, the trouble is not at all on one side. There seems to be an inclination somewhere to put the blame on the civil authorities of Quebec city; to establish that on the part of the French-Canadian population there is a disposition to evade or to break the law. I see in the Montreal Gazette of to-day—a very respectable paper usually—a despatch from Quebec with the following striking heading:

"Civil Powers Make Trouble For Military".

It is a very serious indictment, to say that the civil powers are making trouble for the military. I received, a few hours ago from the office of the Attorney General of Quebec, this statement with regard to this very despatch:

"Article in Montreal Gazette, page 1, column 8, entitled "Civil Powers Make Trouble for Military," is untrue and misleading. Both the civil and military authorities are working in perfect harmony and this statement can be confirmed by General Lessard himself".

### A Step in the Right Direction at Last.

The Government have availed themselves of the services of General Lessard, whom they have brought to Quebec to quell this disturbance. I congratulate the Government upon this step which they at last have taken. General Lessard should have been used long ago. If he had been called to service in the early months of the war, perhaps there would have been no trouble to quell to-day in the city of Quebec. If recruiting in Quebec has not been as for my part I would wish, it must be remembered that after all the trouble is not on one side only. The Government is not free from blame in respect to their method of dealing with this

matter in the province of Quebec. I do not wish to create any more bad blood than exists; I simply say in good faith to my friends on the other side of the House, that it would be unfortunate if the Government attempted to pass the city over to the military authorities and not to use the civil authorities. Let the military and the civil authorities work together, and I make bold to say that there will be no further trouble in the city of Quebec.

### Law Must be obeyed, Property Respected, Peace Preserved.

Speaking with what authority I may have as representative of Quebec city and as holding the position which I now occupy, I can say that in Quebec the people are prepared to accept these three principles first, that the law must be obeyed; second, that property must be respected; third, that peace must be preserved.

### Henri Bourassa.

That is the spirit in which I intend to discuss this matter. Heaven is my witness that on this occasion I have no intention of endeavouring to create further difficulty or further trouble. What I want is what I have always wanted in this war—to help so far as I can to win the war. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) was kind enough to refer to some ideas which I expressed in the city of Quebec many years ago. These ideas, Sir, I have never departed from, not even in the position which I took in this House against the Conscription Bill. As my hon. friend was good enough to quote from a remark which I made in Quebec, he might have quoted also from my last speech which I delivered in that city, when I opened the campaign in the last election. Did I there say anything at all to which he can take exception? Did I encourage the people of Quebec not to respect the laws? On the contrary I said that the law must be respected, must be obeyed. My hon. friend asked me why I did not continue the course which I previously adopted; why I opposed the policy of conscription, and he linked my name with that of Mr. Bourassa. I see he is a close reader of Mr. Bourassa's paper. That being so, he must know that Bourassa is no longer a friend of mine; we parted company long ago, and we have never resumed it again. Let him read *Le Devoir* and he will see that ever since the beginning of the session Bourassa has been very severe on me. But I am not responsible for that. I follow my own course, whoever finds fault with it, or whoever approves; I am what I have always been.

### Armand Lavergne.

As to Mr. Lavergne. He was at one time a very close friend of mine, but we parted company also. Mr. Lavergne was a candidate in Montmagny in the last election, but the

young man who was elected in that county with my support, sits in this House to-day behind me. The views of Bourassa and Lavergne are not my views. The separation is not of to-day only; it goes back to the years 1910 and 1911, when I was opposed by Bourassa and his friends. And upon what ground? I took the stand that it was within the power of the Parliament of Canada to decree whether or not we should take part in the wars of Great Britain. Bourassa and Lavergne held that under no circumstances should we take part in the wars of Great Britain. For this difference of opinion I incurred their enmity, and they fought for the Conservative party; and my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) sitting there amongst the large majority in this House, owes a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Bourassa.

He may ask me, why did I oppose the policy of conscription? I will answer him. I opposed the policy of conscription because I am a man of common sense; because I know human nature; because I know the conditions in this country. I knew that compulsory service would not bring the same results as the voluntary system. My hon. friend has alluded to the fact that the province of Quebec has not done as much as it should have done. I agree; I wish it had done more. But there is one way and one way only to deal with my fellow-countrymen. If you attempt to coerce them, they have too much of the Celtic blood not to resent it; but appeal to their heart and their imagination, and you will find them responsive. If that had been done, there would have been very different results.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE: Then why did not the hon. gentleman, as the representative of the French-Canadian race, speak to his French-Canadians in that way?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I did speak in that way to my French-Canadian countrymen. Let the hon. gentleman read my speech in the city of Quebec in the month of November last, and he will see if I did not speak in that way. My hon. friend may say that I have not succeeded as well as I might have done; I agree, but I have had to fight extremists at both ends, the jingoists at one end and the Nationalists at the other. The stand I always took on conscription—and I think I can appeal to the memory of those of my old friends who are now sitting on the opposite side of the House—was that under existing circumstances it would not produce the results that were expected of it. It is said that the voluntary system failed. Sir, if we compare what has been done under the voluntary system with what has been done under the compulsory system, I think it will be admitted that we could have obtained better results if we had persevered with the voluntary system. But I did not come prepared to discuss that question to-day; we may have another opportunity later on. I thought

that to-day we were going to discuss the riots in Quebec.

### British Statesmen Have Been Accused of Being Traitors.

My hon. friend has attacked the attitude of French-Canadians towards the war, and my own in particular, and I have this to say to him: On this question he and I are at the very antipodes; he is in favour of a policy that I am not in favour of. Sir, is this the first time that in a British Parliament a man has been branded as a traitor as I have been in the press during the last election and since? Is this the first time that a man standing in a British Parliament has taken a stand on his country's war which was not in accordance with the passions of the moment? I remember that during the South African War a young man of great promise in the British House of Commons took the position that England was in the wrong, and demanded that the war should be abandoned. He arraigned the Government for their policy, and was insulted in the House of Commons and in the streets and mobbed. On one occasion he escaped violence only by escaping from a meeting in the disguise of a policeman. That man to-day, Sir, is the Prime Minister of England, Lloyd George himself. Sir, the shame is not on Lloyd George for having followed the dictates of his conscience. But, his judgment was wrong. I believe—nay, I am sure—that England was right in that war. I stated so at the time, and I state so now; England perhaps was not free from fault, but, Sir, it was Kruger himself who drew up the insolent ultimatum that brought on the war. There was another occasion upon which one of the greatest men of the last century opposed the Government of the day in carrying on a war, and that man was John Bright. With all the splendour of his majestic eloquence he arraigned the Government for entering on a war that he said was senseless and causeless, and the judgment of the historian will be that John Bright was right, and that Lloyd George, on a later occasion, was wrong.

There is still another occasion which I might recall to the memory of my hon. friend. When the American colonies were goaded into insurrection by the British Government of that day, the great Earl of Chatham, who had done more for the glory and prosperity of England than any other man in many generations, came before the House with a resolution to the effect that the troops which the British Government had sent to fight the Americans should be recalled from America and endeavours be made to satisfy their grievances. What is the language of the historian upon this proposal?

It was in fact a proposal as startling and unexpected as that other very different one for an immediate war with Spain which he had sub-

mitted to a trembling Council, and it was the more courageous of the two. The man of decisive action was seen in both, and the wisdom of both proposals was justified by the event. It was the moment of crisis, and though the voices of the street and market place—

Mark the words—

—would have derived the withdrawal of troops, as an act of cowardice, of weakness inexcusable in a mighty people, yet this was the one solution, and it was offered at the last available hour.

Sir, it was unfortunate, that at that time there was in the British Government men of the stamp of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) who were inclined to talk loudly and bully and brag. That is not my method. If the British Government had followed the advice of Lord Chatham probably they would have been able to obtain by conciliation what they failed to obtain by coercion. Why do I bring this up? For this reason:—

### A Policy of Conciliation Best.

Standing here, in the closing years of my life, but still able to defend myself, I say that the policy that alone can unite this country is a policy of conciliation, and an appeal to all the best elements in us. That has been my policy for the fifty years that I have been in Parliament, and it shall remain my policy so long as God gives me health, and I hold a seat in this House.

It is true that to-day there are disturbances in Quebec, and I regret them as much as any man in the House, but if we are to accomplish what we desire in the province of Quebec—that is to say, the enforcement of the law, obedience to the law, preservation of property, and the maintenance of peace—for Heaven's sake let us drop once and for all these fatal divisions and endeavour to create unity among our people. To-day, instead of this policy of conciliation, what have we? We have this Order in Council presented by the Government, and this Order is not calculated to effect any good purpose towards winning the war. I desire as much as my hon. friend that England and France should be victorious, but I deprecate the methods which are adopted by this Order in Council. What do we find here? The first paragraph of this Order reads:

"Whereas on the 28th day of March 1917, the opposition of a large number of the population of the city of Quebec to the enforcement of the Military Service Act, 1917, and the regulations thereunder, broke out in open violence and serious riots ensued on that day and on subsequent days, in which the rioters destroyed the office of the Deputy Registrar appointed for the district of Quebec under the said Act, and moreover caused great damage to other prop-

erty, and threatened further damage and it became necessary for the restoration of order, the protection of property and the preservation of the King's peace that these riots should be suppressed by military authority;"

"And whereas at common law it is the duty of a military officer with the troops under his command to interfere when such interference is necessary to put down riot, insurrection or civil disturbance."

With this statement of the law I have no fault to find. It is in fact the common law of England, as I have always understood it. The military authorities are not bound to wait until the civil authorities call for help, if, in their own judgment and conscience, they believe the civil authorities are not doing enough, and that the peace should be preserved by military authority. In such case, they have a right to interfere. I do not dispute that, and, so far as that goes, I agree with it entirely, but what I am not prepared to agree to is that the common law can be amended by Order in Council. It can be amended only by the power of Parliament, and Sir, what a falling down of the Government within the last three days. The Prime Minister referred to this very question three days ago, and he said:

"Further than that, if in any part of this country it appears that, by reason of the enforcement of this Act, the municipal or local authorities are unable or are not disposed to preserve public order, it will devolve upon the Government of this country to see that public order is preserved, and we intend to perform that duty."

### Military Authorities Have Certain Rights.

The military authorities can step in, if they think the civil authorities are not performing their duty. The question then remains that if the military authorities proceed without reference to the civil authorities, it is for a jury to determine whether they are within their rights. If the military authorities are endeavouring to perform their duty, they may be amenable to a civil jury to say whether they have performed their whole duty. The statement of the Prime Minister proceeds:

"The incidents which have taken place have made it apparent to the Government that some amendments will be necessary to the Military Service Act. One of those which is now in preparation in this: That persons who engage in active or forcible resistance to the enforcement of the Act shall be forthwith enrolled in the military forces of Canada, without regard to whether their class has been called out."

Three days ago the Prime Minister speaking in his place, stated that, in

order to put in uniform a man who is not to-day called upon to go on service by the law, it was necessary to have an amendment to the Military Act. To-day this is done by Order in Council. Where is the authority of the Governor in Council to amend the statute? My hon. friend will tell me he has that power under the War Measures Act. If he tells me that, I will tell him if he has that power under the War Measures Act, he has the same power to conscript everybody, without the authority of Parliament, simply by Order in Council. But he has not that authority, and he knows it well. He had to pass a statute last session in order to enforce conscription. That law has been passed, and now when he tells me that this law which was placed on the statute last year can be amended by Order in Council, I say it is simply an abuse of the powers which are vested in the Governor in Council, and it is assuming a power which the Governor in Council does not possess.

### The Will of the People is the Law.

We are here to-day, proud to say that we are British subjects. At all events I am proud to say so. I have always proclaimed myself a British subject. No man is a greater admirer of British institutions than I am. And why? Because if there is one authority in the British Empire which is the supreme authority, it is not the power of the King, but it is the majesty of the law; and a law can be destroyed only by another law. But let me call attention of my hon. friend to this precedent: In 1798, when Ireland was in a state of rebellion, the French had sent an expedition to Ireland under the command of General Hoche, and Wolfe-Tone, a member of that expedition, was captured by the military authorities, court-martialled and sentenced to death. But habeas corpus proceedings were taken, and Wolfe Tone was taken out of the custody of the military authorities and declared a free subject—free from the military authorities altogether. My last word is this: We must have peace, we must have order, we must have protection for our property and the law must be observed. I say this with the greater authority in that I am not a believer in the law. I thought it was a mistake, but it has been adopted by the Canadian people, and the will of the people is the law.

## PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

### Part II.—How the Method of Voting is Worked.

In the preceding article it was briefly shown that our present system of representation—electing one representative for each constituency—is responsible for many a grave injustice, and that it curtails very seriously the freedom of electors, candidates, and members of Parliament. To remove these evils we must make two necessary changes in our present electoral machinery.

#### The Multi-Member Constituency.

The first step must be the abolition of the single-member constituency and the substitution thereof of larger constituencies, each electing several members. These larger constituencies will at once make it possible for the representation to be apportioned among all the more important political groups within each of them. The number of members to be elected in any one of these enlarged constituencies would depend upon the density of population within its area. The late Hon. F. D. Monk, in a speech in the House of Commons on March 15th, 1909, went so far as to suggest that the whole Island of Montreal might be polled as one constituency. Mr. Turriff M.P., in a speech on April 30th, 1917, suggested that five or seven of the present constituencies would, if grouped together, form the ideal constituency for purposes of proportional representation.

The creation of these large constituencies is only the first step; for the result of an election would still depend upon the method of voting employed. We must then adopt a method that will give fair results.

#### The Single Transferable Vote.

In the Government of Ireland Act, passed by the British Parliament in 1914, the following Clause 9 (2) appears:—

**“In each constituency which returns three or more members the election shall be held on the principle of Proportional Representation, and each elector shall have one transferable vote.”**

In the Representation of the People Bill (1917) which has recently become law in Great Britain a similar clause also appears.

In order to analyze the single transferable vote method we will divide it into two parts and consider each in turn.

#### Why a Single Vote?

Because the single vote enables a coherent body of electors of reasonable size to obtain representation. Suppose that in a constituency which returns five members 10,000 electors go to the poll. As each elector has only one vote, only 10,000 votes can be recorded, and if a group consisting of 2,000 electors all vote for one and the same candidate they can secure his return. For only 8,000 electors remain, from whom not more than four other candidates

can each obtain 2,000 votes.

#### Why a Transferable Vote?

The fact that votes are transferable ensures that the majority and the minority parties shall each receive their fair share of the representation.

The elector entering the polling booth does not know whether his favourite candidate will receive more support than he requires or whether he will receive so little as to have no chance of election. Thus a popular candidate of any party may receive, say, 3,000 votes when he needs only 2,000. The votes given in excess would be lost to his party; the votes would be wasted.

Or again, a party may have scattered its votes over too many candidates and might lose the representation which it otherwise would gain; more votes would be wasted. The transferable vote provides against both these contingencies. It enables the elector to indicate the candidate of his second choice (and even further choices), to whom his vote can be transferred, either

- (1) when his first choice has more votes than he requires, or
- (2) when, after all excess votes have been transferred, the elector's first choice is at the bottom of the poll.

Thus, the transferable vote preserves the secrecy of the ballot, and yet allows the electors to combine into groups of the necessary size. If a party contains three such groups it will win three seats; if a party contains only two such groups it will obtain two seats.

#### What the Elector Has to Do.

The elector votes by placing the figure 1 against the name of the candidate he likes best. He indicates his further preferences by placing the figures 2, 3, 4, etc., against the names of the other candidates he selects. That is all that the elector has to do—to vote exactly as he feels, without having to consider whether or not his favorite candidate stands any chance of election; in either case the vote will not be wasted.

#### How the Successful Candidates are Chosen.

The elector's vote is credited by the returning officer to the candidate whom the elector has marked with the figure 1. Every candidate who obtains a certain proportion of votes (this proportion is called the Quota) is elected. If a candidate has obtained more than a quota of votes the Returning Officer carries forward the votes in excess to those candidates marked on the ballot papers by the voters as their next preference. If a second-choice candidate does not need the vote the Returning Officer transfers it to the third choice, and so on. The votes transferred to a candidate are added to the votes originally obtained by him, and whenever a candidate's total reaches the quota he is elected. After all surplus votes have been transferred there may still remain vacancies to be filled. In that case the candidate at the bottom of the poll is excluded, and his votes instead of being wasted, are transferred to those



candidates who are marked on the ballot papers as the voter's next choice. Again the votes transferred to candidates are added to the votes already obtained by them, and whenever a candidate's total is equal to the quota he is declared elected. In this way each quota of electors obtains one representative, and in building up these quotas the Returning Officer is guided always by the wishes expressed by the electors on their ballot papers.

#### How the "Quota" is Ascertained.

The "quota" is the minimum number of votes which necessarily secures the election of a candidate. At first glance it would appear that the quota would be obtained by dividing the number of votes polled by the number of seats to be filled. But a smaller quota would suffice. If only one candidate is to be elected, it is quite clear that the quota is one more than half of the votes, for no other candidate can obtain this number. For instance, the candidate who obtains 51 out of 100 votes in a single-member constituency is sure of election. Similarly, in a two-member constituency any candidate who obtains more than one-third of the votes must be elected. The quota in this case would be one more than a third. If there are 100 votes, only two candidates can poll as many as 34 each. Similarly, in a three-member constituency, the candidate who obtains more than one-fourth (26 out of 100) is sure of election; and so on. In general terms, the quota is found by dividing the total number of votes polled by one more than the number of seats, and by adding one to the result so obtained.

#### How Surplus Votes are Transferred.

Every transfer of surplus votes is carried out in such a way as to do even justice to all candidates who

are marked as the next preference on the ballots of the successful candidate.

Suppose in an election a popular candidate "A" obtains 3,000 ballots when he only requires 2,000 ballots. He will be able to spare 1,000 or one-third of the whole of the ballots on which he has been marked with the figure "1".

The Returning Officer re-sorts all the 3,000 ballots according to the names marked "2".

Suppose the result is that

Candidate B is marked "2" on 2,400 ballots and Candidate C is marked "2" on 600 ballots.

Candidate A can spare one-third of all his 3,000 votes. He can, therefore, spare to B one-third of the 2,400 in which B is second preference, i. e., 800. He can similarly spare to C one-third of the 600 on which C is second preference, i. e., 200.

Accordingly, 800 votes are transferred to B, 200 to C.

#### The Scheme Works Easily and Fairly in Practice

There have been no practical difficulties in applying proportional representation in any of the many parts of the world in which it is in operation. The elector's task is quite simple. The details are for the returning officer only, and for those electors who care to study them. According to official reports returning officers have always made a point of executing their duties with accuracy and dispatch. The results are always fair. Every quota of votes elects a representative.

**Proportional Representation gives freedom of choice to electors, it gives justice to all parties, and will yield a House of Commons which will be a true expression of public opinion on the main issues of a General Election.**

#### STAFF OF CENTRAL APPEAL JUDGE.

We hear a great deal these days about the work of the Central Appeal Judge of the Military Service Act and the Government is being criticized for the slow manner in which the appeals are being dealt with.

From a Return brought down and laid on the table of the House on April 4th, 1918, giving the number of persons employed and salary paid to each, in the office of the Central Appeal Judge we feel sure the public cannot say that the staff looking after this work is not large enough to do the work promptly, or the salary so small that those engaged are not encouraged to rush the work.

The following is a copy of the Return:—

J. Lorne McDougall, Clerk to the Central Appeal Judge, \$250 per month.

P. M. Roy, Secretary to Central Appeal Judge, transferred from Supreme Court—No special remuneration.

Five barristers, engaged as counsel, \$70.00 per week, salary and expenses.

Eight barristers, engaged as counsel, \$84.00 per week, salary and expenses.

One agricultural examiner, \$105.00 per week, salary and expenses.

One barrister, office of Central Public Representative, \$85.00 per week salary and expenses.

One comptroller, \$180.00 per month.

One stenographer, \$150.00 per month.

Five stenographers, \$110.00 per month.

Eleven stenographers, \$100.00 per month.

One stenographer, \$95.00 per month.

One stenographer, \$90.00 per month.

Six stenographers, \$85.00 per month.

Eight stenographers, \$80.00 per month.

Three stenographers, \$75.00 per month.

One stenographer, \$70.00 per month.

One stenographer, \$65.00 per month.

Two clerks, Filing Department, \$125.00 per month.

One clerk, Filing Department, \$70.00 per month.

Three clerks, Filing Department, \$65.00 per month.

Ten clerks, Filing Department, \$60.00 per month.

One clerk, Filing Department, \$50.00 per month.

One index clerk, \$90.00 per month.

Two index clerks, \$60.00 per month.

One clerk, Record Branch, \$90.00 per month.

One clerk, Record Branch, \$85.00 per month.

One clerk, Record Branch, \$50.00 per month.

Three copyists, \$65.00 per month.

Six copyists, \$60.00 per month.

Two copyists, \$55.00 per month.

One messenger, \$75.00 per month.

One messenger, \$70.00 per month.

Two messengers, \$60.00 per month.

Three messengers, \$40.00 per month.

This amounts in salaries alone to over \$11,500 a month in this one branch of the work connected with the Military Service Act.

**PURCHASE OF THE LAND AT CAMP BORDEN.**

**How an \$80,000 Rake-off was Negotiated.**

Before the Public Accounts Committee on May 11th, 1917, the details in regard to the purchase of the land at Camp Borden were for the first time made public. The documents placed on record on this occasion proved conclusively that when the Government decided to purchase the land for Camp Borden they made an agreement with a Real Estate agent in Toronto, authorizing him to purchase the land at whatever price he could and gave him a hard and fast agreement, that regardless of what he purchased the land for, the Government would be willing to reimburse him at the rate of \$12.00 per acre.

We produce herewith extracts from this agreement. We also produce extracts from a letter written in the office of this real estate agent to one of the owners of the land at Camp Borden. It is a typical letter, in fact one of many which was sent out.

The Extracts from the agreement referred to are as follows:

"Hon. A. E. Kemp,  
Acting Minister of Militia,  
Ottawa.

"I, James Barr, of the City of Toronto, in the County of York in consideration of the sum of Twenty-Five (\$25.) already paid to me under a former offer, hereby offer to sell to you or to obtain for you the lands and premises, situate lying and being in the County of Simcoe and being known as Lots Numbers 18 to 32, (here a detailed description of the land is given), in all containing seventeen thousand, three hundred (17,300) acres and which said property is more particularly shown inclosed within the red lines on the sketch hereto attached; at and for the price or sum of TWO HUNDRED & SEVEN THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$207,600), it being understood that if said above mentioned property exceeds the acreage of 17,300 that you are to pay me in addition to the above amount a sum equivalent to TWELVE DOLLARS (\$12) per acre on such overplus and in case it does not amount to 17,300 acres there is to be deducted from the above sum, an amount equivalent to twelve dollars (\$12.) per acre on the deficiency.

"I hereby state that I am the owner or control some 8,000 acres of the above mentioned land.

"You are to be allowed until six p.m. April 15th, 1915, to accept this offer. Time is to be the essence of this agreement.

"If this offer is accepted, all former offers to you in respect to said lands are hereby cancelled. Acceptance hereof shall be sufficient if a letter accepting same addressed to me at 22 College Street, Toronto, is deposited in His Majesty's Post Office, any place in Canada on or before six p.m. 15th day of April, 1916.

"Dated at Toronto this 10th day of April, 1916.  
(Sgd.) James Barr.

"Witness: (Sgd.) F. B. Poucher.  
I hereby accept the above offer, O.K.  
(Sgd.) A. E. K.

"Dated at Ottawa, this 14th day of April, 1916.  
(Sgd.) A. E. Kemp.  
Acting Minister of Militia and Defence."

We also quote extracts from the letter which was written from Mr. Barr's office to one of the owners of this property who resided in Montreal. It is as follows:

22 College St.,  
Toronto, Ont.,  
Sept. 18th, 1916.

Fred Smith, Esq.,  
1916 De la Roche St.,  
Montreal.

Dear Sir:  
No doubt you are aware that the Government has

expropriated certain lands situate in the Township of Tossorontio and Essa in the County of Simcoe, now known as Camp Borden.

The Government is willing to compensate you for your property. I am authorized to offer you the sum of eight dollars (\$8.00) per acre cash for same, or in lieu thereof an exchange of an equal quantity of land equally as good as yours with equal improvements, situate near the borders of the Camp.

I am fully aware that you property has cost you more than the cash price offered herein, but when you consider THAT THE BULK OF THE LAND HAS BEEN PURCHASED AT AN AVERAGE PRICE OF LESS THAN SEVEN DOLLARS PER ACRE FOR UNIMPROVED AND SOME IMPROVED LANDS, you will understand why the Government is not willing to pay more than the price offered for a cash settlement.

Signed by Mr. Barr's clerk.

The agreement shows that the Government agrees to give \$12.00 an acre for the land.

The letter from the Real Estate agent states that all the land at Camp Borden has been purchased for less than \$7.00 per acre. A little mathematical figuring will tell anyone just what the rake-off was in the deal by glancing at these two documents. In the first place the Government agreed to purchase 17,300 acres at \$12.00 per acre, or a total expenditure of \$207,600. The real estate agent in his letter shows he purchased the whole of this land for less than \$7.00 an acre which amounts to \$121,100. There is, therefore, \$86,500 difference in the price paid by the Government and in the price paid by this real estate agent.

**COST OF ADVERTISING VICTORY LOAN**

It takes money, and a lot of it too, when the Borden Government come to pay the expenses incurred in connection with the Victory Loan of November, 1917.

To be exact, the total cost for organization publicity and commissions up to April 5th, 1918, is \$3,620,395, according to the following statement given to the House on April 12th, 1918, by the Acting Minister of Finance, the Hon. A. K. McLean, in answer to a question of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

The Figures as given are:—

Organization expenses.....	\$ 376,000
For Publicity Campaign:	
(a) Through the Dominion Publicity Committee.....	163,000
(b) Through Canadian Press Association (disbursements to date).....	207,000
For remuneration to Brokers and Bond Dealers.....	750,000
Commissions to canvassers.....	1,140,000
Remuneration to Banks.....	984,395
	<b>\$3,620,395</b>

and this is not all. Mr. McLean added:—

"In addition to this, there are, of course, the departmental expenses for printing the interim receipts, for engraving the bonds, for the staff employed, numbering some 700 persons, in the Department of Finance, who have been specially engaged upon this work since last December. It is estimated that the total cost of the loan, when finally available, will approximate \$5,000,000 or about one and one-quarter per cent of the whole loan.

LEGAL, PROFESSIONAL AND BUSINESS CARDS.

JACOBS, COUTURE & FITCH
Advocates
Barristers and Solicitors
W. Jacobs, K.C. G. C. Papineau-Couture
L. Fitch
Power Building
38 Craig Street West. Montreal, Que.

RUSSELL T. STACKHOUSE
Advocate, Barrister and Solicitor
120 St. James Street Montreal, Que.

ROWELL, REID, WOOD & WRIGHT
Canada Life Bldg.
44 King St. W. Toronto, Ont
N. W. Rowell K.C. Thomas Reid
S. Casey Wood E. W. Wright
C. W. Thompson J. M. Langstaff
E. G. McMillan E. M. Rowand
D. B. Sinclair M. C. Purvis

McGIVERIN, HAYDON & EBBS
Barristers, Solicitors, Notaries, Etc.
19 Elgin St., Ottawa, Ont.
Parliamentary, Supreme Court and
Departmental Agents

COYNE, HAMILTON & MARTIN
Barristers, Solicitors, Notaries, Etc
600-603 Union Trust Bldg., Main Street
Winnipeg, Man.
J. B. Coyne, K.C. Wm. Martin
F. Kent Hamilton J. Galloway

FRANK PEDLEY, ESQ.
Barrister, etc.
Central Chambers Ottawa, Ont.

NORMAN R. HOFFMAN
Barrister, Solicitor, Notary, Etc.
Solicitor for Merchants Bank of Canada
Gull Lake, Sask.

GEOFFRION, GEOFFRION
& CUSSON
Advocates
97 St. James St. Montreal, Que.

HORMISDAS PELLETIER K.C.
Lawyer
99 St. James St. Montreal, Que.

CHRYSLER & HIGGERTY
Barristers & Solicitors
Supreme Court, Parliamentary and
Departmental Agents
Central Chambers Ottawa, Canada
F. H. Chrysler, K.C. F. E. Higgerty

PATENT SOLICITORS

FETHERSTONHAUGH & CO.
Patents and Trade Marks
"The Old Established Firm"
Patent Solicitors and Barristers
Toronto Head Office, Royal Bank Bldg
Ottawa Office, 5 Elgin Street

PELLETIER, LETOURNEAU,
BEAULIEU & MERCIER
Advocates
100 St. James St. Montreal, Que.

J. H. DILLON
Advocate, Barrister and Solicitor
415 Merchants Bank Building
205 St. James Street Montreal, Que.

CHARLES W. KERR & CO.
Barristers, Solicitors, Notaries, Etc.
Lumsden Bldg., Toronto, Ont.
Charles W. Kerr Archibald Cochrane
Special attention to Investments,
Corporation Law and Litigation

BUSINESS CARDS

PROVOST & ALLARD
Wholesale Grocers
45 to 47 Clarence St., Ottawa
Agents for
"SALADA TEA" and "HEINTZ 57"

BERCOVITCH, LAFONTAINE
& GORDON
Advocates, Barristers, Solicitors
Peter Bercovitch, K.C., M.P.P. Ernest Lafontaine
Nathan Gordon
Bank of Toronto Building
260 St. James Street Montreal, Que.

JOHNSTON, McKAY, DODS
& GRANT
Barristers & Solicitors
Notaries Public, etc.
E. F. B. Johnston K.C. Robert McKay K.C.
Andrew Dods Gideon Grant
D. Inglis Grant Mervil Macdonald
C. W. Adams Bruce Williams P. E. F. Smith
Traders Bank Bldg. Toronto, Ont

MOYNEUR, LIMITED
Produce Merchants
12-14 York St Ottawa, Ont

J. S. BUCHAN, K.C.
Advocate, etc.
Eastern Townships Building
263 St James Street Montreal, Que

SIFTON WAGES WAR ON SASKATCHEWAN LIBERALISM.

(The Regina Leader, Dec. 24, 1917)

WHEN the Leader took the Winnipeg Free Press to task for its bigoted racial and religious campaign against those who did not see eye to eye with it in support of Union Government, that paper sought to nullify the force of our criticism by stigmatizing The Leader as a secret enemy of Union government and with striving to stab it in the back. Most people in Saskatchewan no doubt regarded the Free Press outburst against The Leader as merely an ebullition of anger on the part of an editor who they realized had lost his balance and sanity of judgment in the heat of the election campaign. The Leader, however, knew then that the real motive of the attack on this paper was much deeper, and the fact that last Wednesday's, Thursday's and Friday's issues of the Free Press contain additional false and sneering references to The Leader but confirms our belief in information which has reached us from several quarters and which the conduct and statements of Free Press representatives, and the innuendo of Free Press articles, further supports.

The Leader has no desire to continue a quarrel with the Free Press or any other paper or person, but it is high time that the people of Saskatchewan, and particularly the Liberals of Saskatchewan, should have their eyes opened to the nature of the campaign which is being, and will continue to be, waged against them through the Winnipeg Free Press by order of Sir Clifford Sifton, the owner and

dictator of that paper. The attack on The Leader is merely a part of a much larger and more or less insidious attack being made on Saskatchewan Liberalism, its leaders and supporters and everything connected with it. . . . Sir Clifford Sifton fears and hates Saskatchewan Liberalism. It is the biggest stumbling block in the way of the Big Interests high tariff profiteers. It would be a master stroke if Sifton could succeed in creating discord in the ranks of Liberalism in this Province and thus divide its forces and weaken its power. The Free Press has been set the task. Hence its policy of belittling and casting doubt upon the sincerity and the efforts of every Saskatchewan Liberal who supported Union, while at the same time exaggerating and laying unwonted stress upon the words and actions of those Liberals who opposed Union and vilifying them in such a manner as to arouse the ire of all their fellow Liberals. The Free Press had high hopes of partly succeeding by such a discreditable and dishonest campaign in creating trouble in the Liberal ranks in Saskatchewan. It failed, and failed ignominiously. Saskatchewan Liberalism is of the true type. It is democratic, not autocratic. It recognizes the right of free British electors to think act and vote for themselves. Unlike the Free Press it does not place every man in the pillory who, conscious in his own uprightness and purity of motives, thinks for himself.

**PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.**

The important fact that the British House of Commons in February last passed an act empowering the election of representatives to the House from one hundred constituencies by the Proportional Representation method will be sufficient warrant for all close students of political matters to give their earnest attention to the series of articles at present running in the Monthly.

This reform in electoral method is receiving the consideration of leading statesmen of all shades of political opinion, and seems likely to become one of the vital influences to be utilized in the reconstructive period after the war.

Two more articles will follow in subsequent issues and any further information on Proportional Representation will be given on application to the Proportional Representation Society of Canada, Citizen Building, Ottawa, Ont.

**CANADA'S TRADE.**

The following table of export values illustrates the growth of Canadian trade:

	1917.	1916.	1914.
Munitions.....	\$ 240,302,414	\$ 73,904,586	\$ 13,353
Mfrs. grain.....	51,942,056	40,433,503	25,114,512
Explosives.....	40,917,856	7,080,926	228,312
Cond. Milk.....	1,371,610	770,566	666,941
Cheese.....	36,721,136	26,690,500	18,868,785
Butter.....	2,491,992	1,018,769	309,046
Bacon.....	43,011,439	25,710,767	3,763,195

**PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE.**

On March 25th, 1918, the Hon. Mr. Rowell, President of the Privy Council, informed the House that the Director of Public Information, Mr. M. E. Nichols, receives a salary of \$5,000 a year, that ten persons were employed in his office and that the total estimated cost of maintaining the office was \$4,000 a month.

A fairly good publicity ornament for any Government and supervised as it is by Mr. Rowell, should prove of great assistance.

**Special Offer**

Bound Copies of Liberal Monthly—

VOL. I.	August 1913 to August 1914
VOL. II.	" 1914 " " 1915
VOL. III.	" 1915 " " 1916
VOL. IV.	" 1916 " " 1917

**for 1.00**

Apply **Liberal Monthly, Ottawa.**

P. S.

Send for a beautiful colored Portrait of the Right Honorable Sir Wilfred Laurier. Price 50 cents.

THE FAME OF  
**"SALADA"**

B377

has spread throughout the continent. To-day it is used by millions for its unique, delicious flavour.

**TOTAL SOLDIER VOTE POLLED AND COUNTED AND THE NUMBER REJECTED.**

	Total Soldiers' Vote Polled	Total Ballots Counted	Total Votes Rejected
North America.....	54,500	37,386	17,114
England.....	104,377	85,126	19,251
France.....	128,073	113,048	15,025
	286,950	235,560	51,390

In other words approximately 18 per cent of the Soldier vote was rejected and why? That will remain a mystery until the details of all the manipulation is made public.

**WOMEN SHOULD VOTE.**

What are the arguments that can be, and have been brought forward against giving women the vote? There is the argument that woman is queen of the home. I often think she is more queen of the dishpan or of the washtub. The idea that a woman sits regally enthroned by the fireside is very pretty, but it is not according to facts, because as a rule, women have to work longer hours, go through greater drudgery, and enjoy fewer holidays than men do. The idea that women are going to be in any way lowered by mixing in politics does no credit to the political atmosphere of this country. If our political atmosphere is low we must endeavour to raise it to make it worthy of the women we are admitting to our ranks to-night. It has been suggested that women will have to go to political meetings. Of course they will. I will say that they go to political meetings already; they certainly do in the county which I have the honour to represent.

Mr. A. R. McMaster M. P. for Brome Que. in the House of Commons, Apl. 11th. 1918.