

THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY

VOL. IV. No. 12.

OTTAWA, AUGUST 1917.

TWO CENTS

THE CAT OUT OF THE BAG.



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

PRICE 25c A YEAR

THE LOYALTY BUGABOO.

THE loyalty bugaboo reached its full growth when Borden first proposed conscription. Many Liberals at once were afraid to face the issue, because they felt that if they opposed it they would be accused of being disloyal.

It is high time now for all citizens to call a halt, to throw the bugaboo back into the faces of those who dragged it out. For conscription is the very thing that would prove to the world that Canada is not loyal. We went into the war shouting our loyalty and asserting our determination to send men until the Germans should be whipped. If we ourselves actually did not shout, Sir Robert Borden, Sir Sam Hughes and other knights shouted for us. The Prime Minister promised five hundred thousand men. Sir Sam Hughes declared that more men than were needed, were offering, and both he and Borden went about their own business, leaving recruiting to those who had to get men or quit. Under that system, recruiting failed, and now the very ones who shouted our loyalty, who failed to get men as they might have been got, impose conscription, and thereby brand us before the whole world as disloyal. For what would conscription in Canada mean? It would mean an absolute proof that we are a disloyal people.

Sir Robert Borden made promises that he did not attempt to keep except, as a last resort, by conscription. We believe that a government that would undertake to get men by means of a vigorous recruiting campaign would yet be successful.

There is no doubt that the mass of the Canadian people believe that all the men that Canada should send to the Front could be got without the necessity of conscription. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has expressed his determination to send men as long as they are willing to go, and he goes further by saying that the men could be got if properly solicited. Sir Robert Borden has done nothing towards recruiting the five hundred thousand men he promised, and now he is trying to correct his own blunder by forcing on a free, democratic people a measure that is unnecessary, unnatural and unfair. We say, give the young manhood of Canada a decent chance. We must not coerce Quebec. Laurier understands Quebec. He understands Canada. He can get the men of Quebec as well as the men of Ontario. If Laurier can do this without conscription—and the people of Canada should give him a chance to do it—he is the statesman of the moment. Borden has failed. Every Liberal charges that. Every Conservative admits it. Then why tie ourselves to a man who has failed, whose policy is unwholesome and undemocratic, whose constant attitude has been out of sympathy with the finest instincts of the people?

THE INCOME TAX JOKER.

The joker in the income tax measure brought down by the Minister of Finance in the House a few days ago reveals itself upon analysis of the actual figures of taxation to be imposed under the bill, as compared with the war profits tax now exacted from profiteering companies and others. The new tax in the public mind, at least, is supposed to supplement the existing tax, but the Minister of Finance in announcing his new measure made it plain that the present war tax on business profits would become inoperative after December 31st of the present year.

It will be seen, therefore, that the new tax is simply a sop to public clamour for conscription of wealth, and the big concerns are no doubt laughing in their sleeves at the gullibility of the public in acclaiming the new tax. Just how much the profiteers gain by the new legislation is impossible of computation, but the aggregate runs into the millions. Instead of the government continuing to take a graded percentage of profits running up to 75 per cent, as under the existing legislation, the country will take from the profiteers a paltry four per cent on all incomes above a low fixed amount. For example, a concern whose profits amounted to about a million and a half this year under the business war tax and whose contribution to the expenses of the war would amount to half a million, will, under the new tax, get off with a paltry payment of about \$60,000.

The Minister of Finance has stated that he expects the new tax to bring in approximately the same amount or a little less as did the business tax which he intends to discard on December 31st. If so, the man earning a small salary or enjoying a small income will be the victim. He will be asked, and forced, to make up the sum hitherto exacted from the big profiteering concerns. Instead of the companies which are waxing fat out of the war, and the increase of food prices and other necessities in this country, paying a large percentage of their profits to the upkeep of government and the expenses of the struggle, out of the existence of which these concerns are making millions, the amount will be collected from the vast number of small salaried men and women throughout the country, thousands of whom, instead of profiting by the war, are losing by its continuance. But the "Big Fellows" must be protected by the Rogers-Borden administration.

That the administration is determined to save the profiteers is clear from a study of the position taken by prominent speakers on the government side during the progress of the bill in committee. One of the startling features was the announcement of the Minister of Finance that individuals holding non-productive investments, such as land, which, owing to the war, is not in demand, would not be able to plead exemption on this score. The fact that such investments were increasing in value all the time was, in the opinion of the Minister, sufficient reason to tax the holder thereof. But who is the judge of unearned increment? What reason has the Minister for believing that such investments will become productive even during the next ten years? The fact that the holder of property of this

kind will not sell is not an infallible sign that the investment is a productive one. Perhaps he cannot get his price for it, a price to cover his original investment with interest on money which, in many cases, has been borrowed from the banks. But this is only one of the features of the bill, and is quoted merely to indicate the determination of the government to exact the pound of flesh from the small man while the big profiteers escape with a nominal tax.

A LESSON IN PATRIOTISM.

IT is to be feared that the hand of Sir Clifford Sifton in the Win-the-War Convention held at Toronto on August 2nd and 3rd, gives a pretty safe clue to the object of the scheme. On the face of it, accepted at what it pretends to be, the thing is presumptuous. If there is any value at all in it, then it must be regarded as a censure of the Government for not doing what the Convention contends should be done. It is doubtful, however, whether the ones who organized the convention, if they had no ulterior motive, would have had the audacity to arrogate to themselves that which at this moment should be the chief function of the government.

They started out with the avowedly patriotic motive contained in what they named the Bonne Entente. But Bonne Entente was a disguise. It was not so much its purpose to promote good feeling between Quebec and Ontario as it was to cajole Quebec into enlisting and to soothe Quebec into compliance with the big interests in Ontario, who are afraid that Quebec and the West will stand together against Ontario in favour of reducing the tariff.

The party that went down to Quebec some months ago with Bonne Entente was composed largely of Ontario manufacturers. The same interests are supporting the Win-the-War Convention. And then along comes Sir Clifford Sifton.

Sir Clifford played the biggest cards he could in 1911 against reciprocity. He is playing the same cards now in the hope of antagonizing the West against Quebec, in short against Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who is the leader of the only party that would be likely to give the West a fair chance as regards the tariff.

Bonne Entente! Win-the-War! What would Sir Douglas Haig and General Petain think of the Toronto Convention?

SLANDERING SIR WILFRID.

The campaign of slander, abuse and worse against Sir Wilfrid Laurier has reached its maximum. It will continue at this pitch until the voters go to the polls, and another election is decided on racial and sectional issues—that is, if the sober common sense, the instincts of fair play and justice which are popularly supposed to be inheritances of our British citizenship are completely swept away in the whirl of passion and prejudice directed against the Liberal leader by the sycophantic press and the paid agitators whose patriotism is synonymous with their jobs, and directed by their political bosses.

Sir Wilfrid's long record of even-handed justice to all nationalities, his tolerance of the traditions and

affiliations of all Canadians, irrespective of race or religious beliefs, and his efforts for the upbuilding of a true nationalism are forgotten by many who see in the present situation merely an opportunity to advance their political fortunes. The party press is denouncing our greatest Canadian as a traitor, and parish politicians are insulting our outstanding statesman because of his courage and his preference of principle to opportunism. Sir Wilfrid, standing on the foundation of his Liberal principles, faces the future calmly and serenely. The outcome for him cannot be other than a victory; it is a victory already because of his steadfast adherence to his convictions.

DR. CLARK REBUKED.

ON Friday evening, July 27th, Dr. Michael Clark, M.P., for Red Deer, addressed a large gathering at Hamilton, Ont.

The following are the remarks of Sir John Gibson at the conclusion of Dr. Michael Clark's speech:

"I am sorry that the last speaker introduced so much political discussion," when he arose immediately after the cheering had subsided. "I would have hesitated to take the chair if I had known the amount of political discussion to fall from the lips of the principal speaker of this evening. There was no criticism of any of the Government's mistakes, or its delays or remissness. Dr. Clark declared in his speech that everyone would know where he stood when they left. I think I know very well where he stands. I won't say anything further along this line. I would far rather see Quebec in the hands of Laurier than in the hands of Bourassa, Lavergne, and other Nationalists who have been pets of the government."

These were the words of the chairman of the meeting which Dr. Clark was asked to address, appearing in the Hamilton Spectator (Conservative) of Saturday, July 28th, 1917.

Canadian Enlistments to June 30th, 1917.

Sir Edward Kemp, replying to a question in the House of Commons on Monday, August 6th, 1917, said that the number of enlistments in the Canadian Expeditionary Force to June 30th last was 424,456.

Of this number 329,943 had gone overseas. Of them 142,779 were in France, 756 at other theatres of war, and 124,399 in England. Of the men in England, 23,265 were in hospitals and convalescent camps on May 31st.

There were 22,419 men under arms in the Dominion.

The total number of men killed, died, missing and prisoners of war was 31,955, discharged abroad or returned for discharge at once, about 26,000; discharged, etc., in Canada, 76,058.

The minister of militia told J. H. Sinclair, of Guysboro, N.S., that the number of recruits enlisted in July was 4,257, and the number of casualties in the Canadian Expeditionary Force in the same month was 3,637.

VOLUNTARY RECRUITING AND THE POSITION OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER.

The Conservative Party, the Conservative Press and some of the Liberal Press, particularly in large centres, are continually, and we believe maliciously, circulating the report that the policy of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in regard to the War is that Canada should not send another man or spend another dollar in the prosecution of the War. In fact certain politicians claiming to represent both political parties have apparently undertaken to inaugurate a campaign throughout Canada to make the people believe that the policy of Sir Wilfrid and the Liberal Party, is "NOT ANOTHER MAN OR ANOTHER DOLLAR FOR THE WAR."

That there are motives, other than winning the War, in circulating these false statements, cannot be denied. These motives may be for the purpose of FOISTING UPON CANADA A NEW POLITICAL LEADER, or it may be to REHABILITATE SIR CLIFFORD SIFTON into the political arena of this country, or it may be that the BIG INTERESTS are again MAKING A DETERMINED EFFORT TO SECURE CONTROL of the Government, or it may be an effort to COMBINE THE WESTERN FREE TRADE FARMERS WITH THE PROTECTIONIST ELEMENT OF CANADA under the guise of a "Win the War" platform. It matters not what the motives are, they are there as is proven by the statements being made by these politicians, namely that should Sir Wilfrid Laurier become Premier, Canada's participation in the War would end, also that Sir Robert is a bungler and has made such mistakes that he cannot expect to lead his party much longer. Then who are these politicians looking to for a leader?

Notwithstanding this condition of affairs the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier stands to-day where he stood at the beginning of the War, namely, THAT CANADA IS IN THE WAR TO THE END.

In proof of this we quote herewith extracts from speeches delivered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier within the past two months:

"I have only this to say: that Canada intends to remain in the War to the end until victory has been won."

"I pledge the word and judgment of those who sit beside me—is that we have no intention other than to remain in the War to the end, and we are determined that we shall do our duty to the best of our judgment and in such a way as to insure that the best methods are adopted to bring about that victory for which we are all longing and which we all hope will certainly come, whether it comes early or late."

(Extract from speech of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the House of Commons, May 18th, 1917, see Unrevised Hansard, pages 1618 and 1619).

"What I propose is that we should have a referendum and a consultation of the people upon this question. . . . When the consultation with the people has been had, when the verdict has been pronounced, I pledge my word, my reputation, that to the verdict, such as it is, every man will have to submit, and I claim to speak at least so far as is concerned the province from which I come."

"I am very firm in the belief, I am unshaken in it, that when the voice of every man has been heard, the aggregate will be the true voice, the right voice, and the right solution. At all events, it will have this effect, that it will be the final arbiter and it will put an end to the agitation which is now going on; it will bring about

harmony, now much disturbed, and it will be a vindication of that spirit of democracy which we hope and believe must be the future social inspiration of the world."

"Again, I repeat that when the verdict of the people has been given, there can be no further question, and everybody will have to submit to the law."

(Extract from speech of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House of Commons, June 18th, 1917, see pages 2505, and 2506, Daily Unrevised Hansard.)

"The issue of the conflict which is now going on in Europe is democracy, and it is the voice of democracy which has inspired my attitude towards the Government on this question, and when war broke out I stated, without hesitation, that Canada was in the war to the end, and I repeat, after almost three years of war, that Canada is in the war to the end."

(Extract from speech of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House of Commons, July 17th, 1917, see pages 3631, Daily Unrevised Hansard.)

"I have taken my pledge, and I repeat it again to-day with more fervour than before, that if the vote had gone for conscription the verdict would be accepted in every part of Canada, even in the Province of Quebec, where it has been said it would not be accepted."

(Extract from speech of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier House of Commons, July 24th, 1917, page 3878, Daily Unrevised Hansard.)

WHAT IS THE POLICY OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER ON THIS QUESTION?

It is:—That Canada will remain in the war to the end.

That Canada shall, by a systematic and thorough national war organization, make a supreme effort to secure by voluntary enlistment the necessary number of recruits.

If this national war organization fails to secure the required number of soldiers by voluntary enlistment that the electors of Canada will be asked to vote on a conscription referendum.

If the result of the referendum favours conscription, Sir Wilfrid Laurier pledges his word

that the verdict will be accepted in every part of Canada, even in the Province of Quebec, where it has been said it would not be accepted.

If the result of the referendum is against conscription, then the national war organization will be continued and vigorously prosecuted and every effort made to secure by voluntary enlistment the number of soldiers needed, the same as has been done in the Commonwealth of Australia.

Information will also be secured from the British authorities with a view to ascertaining which is most needed from Canada, men or food.

WHAT IS THE POLICY OF AUSTRALIA IN REGARD TO CONSCRIPTION?

We reproduce herewith the following statement issued by the Hon. W. M. Hughes, Premier of Australia on April 11th, 1917, at the time the general elections were being held in Australia:

"In order to kill that swarm of wilful lies and gross misrepresentations already being circulated throughout the electorates in regard to the attitude of the Government towards conscription of men for Overseas service, it is necessary that I should state clearly over my own signature precisely what the Government's policy is in clear, unambiguous language.

"CONSCRIPTION IS NOT AN ISSUE IN THIS ELECTION. The people of Australia have decided that they will not resort to compulsion to fill the ranks of the Australian divisions at the front. The Government accepts the verdict of the people as given on October 28th last. It will not enforce nor attempt to enforce conscription, either by regulation or statute, during the life of the forth-coming Parliament. If, however, national safety demands it, the question will again be referred to the people. That is the policy of the Government on this great question. It is clear and definite. In accepting the electors' verdict the Government appeals to the patriotism of the people to uphold the honour of Australia by maintaining the Australian divisions at their full fighting strength by voluntary enlistment.

(Sgd.) W. M. HUGHES,

Prime Minister."

Notwithstanding that the electors in Australia had six months previous to the issuing of this statement voted against conscription, we have the evidence that in the Commonwealth of Australia voluntary enlistment is proceeding satisfactorily, and that as the Premier states there was no necessity at that time to put compulsion into force. If Premier Hughes' words mean anything they mean that when the Australian people were put to the test their loyalty and patriotism responded nobly and the required number of soldiers were secured by voluntary enlistment. IS CANADA LESS LOYAL OR LESS PATRIOTIC THAN AUSTRALIA?

THE RIGHT HON. SIR WILFRID LAURIER IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS MAKES A DENIAL.

THE Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier rising to a question of privilege in the House of Commons, on Wednesday, August 1st, made the following statement:

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The House is aware that I very seldom notice any attack made upon me outside of this House, in the press or otherwise, but I find a report of a speech by Sir Clifford Sifton, delivered two days ago, which I cannot allow to pass unnoticed. Sir Clifford Sifton is reported in the Globe of yesterday as having addressed the Canadian Club at Winnipeg, and as saying, among other things:

"Sir Clifford did not think that the people of Canada had any call to find fault with Laurier on the war until the day that the conscription policy was announced in Parliament. Sir Wilfrid now said that he was unable to endorse fully the policy of conscription. His attitude was taken because he believed that it was his duty to the province of Quebec. In other words, Laurier abrogated his title to leadership. The plain, unavoidable and in-

evitable fact was that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier were to win this election Canada would go out of the war."

I have to say in reference to this, Sir, that from anything which I have ever said in this House or out of it, Sir Clifford Sifton could not draw the inference that any attitude which I have ever taken was in deference to the province of Quebec. Neither on this occasion, nor any occasion in my public life did I ever take an attitude in deference to one province alone. The policies which I have opposed were not opposed from the point of view of one province, but from the point of view of Liberal principles and with respect to all the provinces of Canada and irrespective of race or creed. This is my position to-day. I have stated before, and I repeat, that my attitude to-day, on the 1st of August, 1917, towards the war is the same as it was on the 19th August, 1914. I am in this war to the end, but I am in this war not upon compulsion, but upon the voluntary principle of enlistment.

THE "IDEAL" OF THE MONOPOLIES AND BIG INTERESTS.

WHAT HAD SIR CLIFTON IN HIS MIND,—
TARIFF OR WIN-THE-WAR?

THE morning papers of Saturday, August 4th, make the following significant announcement: "Calgary, Aug. 3.—In an interview here to-day, Sir Clifford Sifton, when asked as to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's chances of winning in the forthcoming election, said that if the Liberals of the West united with those in Quebec, Sir Wilfrid would likely win.

"Is it likely?" he was asked.

"I hope not," was the reply.

We can only add that we believe Sir Clifford Sifton spoke on this occasion from the fullness of his heart. Is it "Big Interests" Sir Clifford has in mind or is it "win-the-war"? Is Sir Clifford Sifton afraid of the free trade policy of Western Canada? Does he fear that if Quebec joins with Western Canada that nothing can prevent a reduction in the Tariff. We, therefore, repeat, is Sir Clifford sincere in his win-the-war propaganda or is it in reality "Protect Big Interests."

THE WHITEWASHING REPORT.

Hon. Robert Rogers, convicted in the Galt Court has been honourably acquitted by the Tellier and McLeod Court of Appeal. The case with others is expected soon to come before the People's Appeal Bench, (the electors of Canada) and while the decision of the review judges was unanimous it is not expected to establish any precedent for Their Lordships of the higher court.

It is the duty of every reader of the Canadian Liberal Monthly to see that twenty copies of this publication are going into his poll each month.

The subscription price is:

For one year.....	25c
Seven months.....	15c
Five months.....	10c

**SPEECH OF THE HON. CHARLES MURPHY
ON THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT OF 1917
DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF
COMMONS ON JUNE 21st.**

A Correction.

IN the July issue of the Canadian Liberal Monthly we reproduced the speech of the Hon. Charles Murphy, delivered in the House of Commons on June 21st on the Military Service Act. Unfortunately at that time a most important paragraph of Mr. Murphy's speech was inadvertently omitted, and we take this opportunity of apologizing to Mr. Murphy and at the same time including the paragraph herewith which was omitted.

How to Revive Voluntary Enlistment.

"More than once during this debate we have heard it stated that criticism that is not constructive is not helpful. Mindful of that, and responding to the Prime Minister's request for suggestions, I desire on my own account, and speaking for myself, to submit a constructive war-time policy to the Government. In the order in which its features occurred to me, and from the point of view of necessity and the public good, I suggest that, instead of enacting this Bill, the Government should adopt the motion of which notice was given by my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) on the 13th of the present month, and pass the necessary legislation to give it immediate effect, so that every moral and material force available in the Dominion and not yet reached would make its contribution as man power has done. STOP HORSE-RACING; STOP THE PUBLICATION AND SALE OF RACING FORMS; STOP ALL GAMES AND SPORTS CONDUCTED MERELY FOR RAISING GATE MONEY; CLOSE ALL BAR ROOMS, POOL ROOMS BILLIARD ROOMS AND MOVING PICTURE SHOWS; UNDER THE EXISTING LAW MAKE A NATIONAL SURVEY, SHOWING WHO ARE ENGAGED AT PRODUCTIVE OR OTHER NECESSARY WORK, AND THOSE WHO ARE NOT; GIVE THOSE WHO ARE NOT SO ENGAGED, WHO ARE OF MILITARY AGE, AND WHO CANNOT SATISFACTORILY ACCOUNT FOR NOT BEING AT SUCH WORK, THE OPTION OF ENLISTING VOLUNTARILY, OR OF DOING NECESSARY WORK FOR WHICH THEY ARE SUITED; AND IF ALL THE MEN AND MEANS REQUIRED ARE NOT PROCURED IN THIS WAY THEN TAKE COUNSEL WITH THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION, AND WITH THE PREMIERS OF ALL THE PROVINCES, AS TO WHAT FURTHER SHOULD BE DONE. This course will involve no delay or avoidable hardship. It will impress the whole country with the seriousness and the good faith of the Government, as well as the gravity of the work the Government has in hand. It will be a guarantee against unfair discrimination of any kind. It will appeal to the people's sense of fair play and equal sacrifice. It will evoke a spirit of nation-wide patriotism. It will stimulate generous rivalry instead of prejudice and passion. It will stop national waste of man power and resources. And, in my belief, the response will exceed that which even the most sanguine can expect. In any event, Sir, I make the suggestion in all sincerity, and in order to avoid the dangers to which I believe the Government's present course is leading."

WE reproduce herewith a letter which appeared in the Ottawa Morning Citizen of August 2nd, 1917, written by Mr. A. K. Maclean of Ottawa.

"Win the War, and Slam Quebec."

Editor, Citizen:—Big Business captured Canada in 1911.

Big Business is out to "consolidate its gains" in 1917. Big Business won in 1911 by the treachery of professed Liberals.

Big Business has opened its campaign of 1917 with the help of like treachery.

In 1911 in Ontario the slogan of Big Business was "No truck or trade with the Yankees" and in Quebec, "No help in Britain's wars."

In 1917 the slogan is "Win the War and Slam Quebec." The slogans of 1911 were appeals to passion and prejudice and against reason, but their objective lay outside Canada.

The slogan of 1917 is equally an appeal to passion and prejudice and against reason, but its purpose is to set race against race and province against province within Canada.

Big Business did not fight for control of Canada in 1911 to prevent Canada trading with the United States. The fight was solely for the profit and prestige of Big Business.

The fight of 1917 is not either to win the war or to slam Quebec, but to tighten the strangle hold that Big Business has had on Canada by control of its money and its food ever since 1911.

While the slogan of Big Business in 1917 is "Win the War and Slam Quebec" the secret despatch is: "If we control the factories, the flour mills, the packing plants and the banks, Quebec will look after itself, and other people must win the war."

The first, the biggest and the only kick against voluntary enlistment for overseas service came from Big Business in Hamilton, Toronto and Sidney. The demand for selective conscription came from the same centres and from the same interests—the interests that were strong enough to make the Premier say when introducing the conscription bill:

"Those who in their present occupations are rendering better service to the state than by enrollment in the Canadian Expeditionary force MUST NOT BE SELECTED FOR MILITARY SERVICE. There is need for men at the front; there is also need for men at home. The nation's activities essential for winning the war must be maintained."

While the Premier and the Solicitor-general shed crocodile tears over the wastage of men at the front, they don't propose to take men needed by Big Business to replace the wastage. If men are conscripted and the sections of the country under the protection of Big Business do not send their share, that share will either have to be made up from other sections of the country not under the protection of Big Business, or the wastage at the front will not be replaced. Its profits are to be protected, at the cost of the blood of the people not necessary to Big Business.

Big Business has strangled enterprise, has oppressed industry and has ground the faces of the poor in food prices. These were spoils of the victory of 1911, but not all the spoils. Now that men must be conscripted for the fighting line, it is the strangled enterprise, the oppressed industry and the hungered poor who must find the men while Big Business still fattens in comfort and security, and its hirelings shriek "Disloyalty!" at any and all who question its Divine Right.—A. K. MacLean, Ottawa, July 27, 1917.

SUBSCRIPTION RENEWALS

HAVE YOU RENEWED YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TO THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY?

If not, do so at once.

**THE LIBERAL MONTHLY CANNOT
BE PUBLISHED WITHOUT FUNDS**

Renew your subscription and get others to subscribe. Now is the time — 25 cents a year.

EXTENSION OF THE LIFE OF PARLIAMENT.

ON Tuesday, July 17th, the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden moved in the House of Commons the following motion, praying for an extension of the life of Parliament:

"That an humble address be presented to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, in the following words:—

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty:

Most Gracious Sovereign:
We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that you may graciously be pleased to give your consent to submit a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, to amend the British North America Act, 1867, in the manner following, or to the following effect:

"An Act to amend the British North America Act, 1867."
Be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

1. Notwithstanding anything in the British North America Act, 1867, or in any Act amending the same, or in any Order in Council, or terms or conditions of Union, made or approved under the said Act, or under any Act of the Canadian Parliament, the term of the Twelfth Parliament of Canada is hereby extended until the Seventh day of October, 1918.

2. This Act may be cited as the British North America Act, 1917, and the British North America Act, 1867 to 1916, and this Act may be cited together as the British North America Act, 1867 to 1917.

All of which we humbly pray Your Majesty to take into your favourable and gracious consideration."

In introducing this motion the Premier stated:

In my judgment, the reasons for proposing this motion ARE QUITE AS STRONG TO-DAY AS THEY WERE IN 1916, and perhaps stronger. They are fully set forth in the remarks which I addressed to the House at that time. I need only summarize them now. In the first place, there would be, consequent upon a general election, disunion and discord throughout this country. There has, up to the present time, been at least a seeming unity. Outside and inside of Parliament men have worked together without regard to party or race or creed. I believe that party political questions have not been very much in the minds of the people during the last three years, and I would hope that we might, on this occasion, arrive at some conclusion WHICH WOULD PREVENT THE CONTROVERSY AND DISTRACTION CONSEQUENT upon a general election. More than that, the minds, the thoughts, the energies of the people would be diverted and turned aside from the supreme purpose of aiding in this war, and would be concentrated on political issues of relative insignificance. In short, a general election would leave, at least might leave, a divided nation. Besides that, I desire to emphasize the fact that the time and the energies of the ministers of the Crown during a general election would necessarily be diverted from the conduct of our country's participation in the war to the activities of a political campaign. It goes without question that members of the Government could not remain silent under attack. They would be obliged to speak and to use their best efforts to justify themselves and the Administration for which they were responsible. In short, they would be obliged to take one course or the other; either to devote their energies largely to the purpose of a political campaign, or to let that campaign take care of itself, and continue, as they have been doing in the past, to devote their entire energies to the duties which are imposed upon them by the necessities of the war.

The Premier also referred to the great necessity of supplying reinforcements for our Canadian soldiers at the front. He went on to show how that in Great Britain and in New Zealand extensions of the Parliamentary term had been secured. Sir Robert stated further that he did not propose to press this motion, if this motion could not be carried in this Parliament by a unanimous or practically unanimous vote. He concluded his remarks by the following appeal:

It will be for my right hon. friend to see for himself

the path of his duty, and to decide the responsibility which appertains to him as he may think that duty demands. So, my final word of appeal to this House is that this motion may be passed with that practical unanimity which will enable us to present it to the Imperial Parliament for the necessary action and ratification by them, and I believe in doing so we will be taking a course which none of us, at any time in the future, can regret, a course absolutely in the interests of this Dominion, of this Empire, and of the great cause for which our troops at the front are fighting to-day.

Immediately following the speech of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, the Hon. George P. Graham moved the following amendment to the resolution asking for an extension of the Life of Parliament.

The amendment which Mr. Graham moved was as follows:

"That all the words after the word "that" in the said resolution be struck out and the following be substituted therefor.

"In the opinion of this House the consideration of the terms of said resolution should be deferred until the Government brings before Parliament measures providing that those best able to pay will be asked to contribute their full share to the cost of the war and by which all agricultural, industrial, transportation and natural resources of Canada will be organized so as to insure the greatest possible assistance to the Empire in the war, and to reduce the cost of living to the Canadian people."

In introducing this amendment Mr. Graham stated:

National War Organization.

The amendment has not been sprung upon this House. I gave notice of it several weeks ago, intending to move it on going into Committee of Supply, but not succeeding, as an opportunity was not afforded me to move that resolution, I take the opportunity of moving it to-day. I may say frankly that I did not care to move this on the third reading of the Military Service Bill to which I have referred. Had I done so, a great many hon. gentlemen would have said that the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) was retarding the Military Service Bill. Consequently, I am moving it to-day in the proper place and, I believe, at the proper hour, and I would ask serious consideration of the few observations I am going to make.

What is Necessary.

It is useless to send men to the front, either voluntarily or forcibly, unless we are prepared to back them up. We must feed, finance, equip and clothe them. We not only have to finance, feed, clothe and equip these men at the front, but we have to finance ourselves, and we have to feed the people of Canada. In addition to that, we have to produce all the food possible to assist our Allies. In all the discussions that have taken place in the United States, in Great Britain and in France, the questions of food supply and finance have been considered only secondary to the question of the supply of men. We in Canada appear to think that we have done our duty if we have passed a measure providing for the raising of a certain number of men. We are not helping the Allies one iota if we provide men and do not provide to fully feed and equip them. Instead of helping the Allies, we are placing a burden on them.

Finances.

Let me take up the question of finance for a moment. Hon. gentlemen will see, when I move the amendment,

that it is merely to defer the discussion of the question raised by the Prime Minister. There is plenty of time to discuss it before the term expires, while we deal with something that is more important to Canada and to the boys in the trenches. I am not going to say that the finances of Canada are in an unhealthy state. Canada has powers of financial recuperation, has resources, has virility in her people, has energy, courage and ability to carry her through any financial responsibility that may be placed upon her by reason of this war. Nevertheless, the fact remains that at the present moment we are incurring very heavy financial liabilities. And rightly so. But the question arises: Should we not, at this time of what may be called artificial prosperity, take advantage of the situation to more nearly pay our way as we go during this war? Why should we leave all the expense of this war to be borne by posterity, by the men who come back from the front, and by the sons and grandsons of these men? Why should we not, at the moment, look about us and see if there do exist sources on which the people of Canada can draw in order to meet the expenses of this war. There is not a man in this House who will not agree with me in his own circle of acquaintances there are men who are able to pay and who are not paying according to their ability.

Income Tax.

The hon. the Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) said the other evening that the time would come when an income tax would be imposed. The time has come now when something ought to be done along the line of securing from those best able to pay their full share of the financial burden of carrying on this war. That has not been done in its entirety. You ask me what I would do? I do not intend to keep the House more than a very few moments, because I discussed this question at great length some two weeks ago; but this I do say—that the men enjoying large incomes ought to be taxed on those incomes. It has been said that those receiving smaller incomes and those with small deposits in the banks have become alarmed. There is no need of alarm on account of any action that I would propose or on any action that this Parliament would take. No person understands better than I do the necessity and desirability of financial stability, and of doing nothing which will interfere with the financial progress and commerce of the country, because to do that would be to interfere with our financial status at home, and make us a burden instead of a help to the Allies. But, there are in this country many men who are not contributing their share. The poorer men and poorer women of the country are contributing their share. There is not a man in this House, there is not one man of ordinary means, who is contributing at all in comparison to what the washer-woman is contributing who pays fifty cents to the Patriotic Fund, and there are many of them. I do not minimize for a moment the splendid contributions that have been made to the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross and other worthy objects. Many Canadian men and women have risen nobly to the requirements and have contributed liberally. But there are still sources that ought to be tapped, and this Parliament will not be doing its duty if it ends this present session without devising means by which every man, and every woman, in Canada, who is able to contribute, is made to contribute his or her full share towards the cost of carrying on this great war. There are men who receive large incomes from mortgages and other securities, and on these incomes they are not paying one farthing towards this war.

Large Incomes should be heavily Taxed.

True, they are paying some small amount to the municipality, which is given authority to collect such a tax by provincial legislation. But I say again there are men in Canada with large incomes, drawn from sources which relieve them absolutely from contributing one farthing for the carrying on of this war—and you will find them in every community. They do contribute to the Patriotic Fund—all honour to them—but in most cases, if a well-graded income tax were imposed, we could afford to let

them keep all they give to the Patriotic Fund, and we would gain a thousand fold by adopting the other method of collecting. I would not impose a tax on the man of the ordinary income. Heaven knows he has all the troubles he can carry now, under the high cost of living, in keeping his family. But men who enjoy the larger incomes, I would compel to pay into the coffers of this country in order that we might borrow less and approximate more nearly our income to our expenditure as we go along. We are mobilizing men. That is proper, absolutely right. But if we quit with the mobilization of men, our duty is half performed and we are not doing what in us lies to make the issue of this war a success for the Allies.

Transportation.

I spoke the other evening of several things. Allow me, without wearying the House, to mention one or two. First, the transportation facilities of Canada. To win the war, as the Prime Minister has well said, is the transcendent issue in the Dominion of Canada. Nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of our transportation facilities being so efficient that our produce of the farm and from other sources can be carried with all speed to the place of embarkation. No matter who criticises or who does not, this Parliament will be responsible if we do not see that the railway companies of Canada are equipped with the rolling stock to carry the crop of 1917 to the seaboard. The fact that the heads of the companies or the Board of Railway Commissioners give as a reason why that was not done that they had not rolling stock, will not excuse this Parliament for not seeing to it that they have the rolling stock—and differences can be settled afterwards. Then, when we get the food to the seaboard, we only have it partially to the Allies and to our boys at the front. To-day the British Government, through the Imperial Munitions Board, is manufacturing ships all over Canada. This is proper and right; but I opine that, even if all the shipyards of Canada are busy, we in Parliament ought to sit down and devise a scheme whereby ships for the carrying of Canadian produce for our own boys will be built, and built without delay. That should have been done months or even years ago. It is useless for the farmer in the West or in the East to raise immense crops; it is useless to cry "production," unless we devise a scheme by which the products of Canada can be taken to the point of consumption across the sea. The discussions that have taken place in the press during the last few days of certain reports indicate to us that we have a work to perform along other lines in the matter of food production at home. I submit—and I want to give the Government full credit—that during the past few weeks they have started out along a line that the people of Canada have been discussing for a year or more. A food controller has been appointed; a fuel controller has been appointed. I am not going to criticise because this was not done before, but we seem to be working without concentration of effort, every man for himself. Some scheme should be devised by which all this would be co-ordinated and all would work, one with another, to attain the best possible with the minimum of expenditure.

Winning of the War Main Object.

I could discuss natural resources as I did the other evening, but I do not want to detain the House. But I do want to impress on the House that the winning of the war being the chief object, the great thing in view of all Canadians, of all lovers of the liberty which we enjoy, is that we should devote our energies to first things first; and I submit that the question which I have outlined in a very few words comes before the discussion of the extension of Parliament. If the winning of the war is the great object which we have in view, I ask the Government to accept this motion; to defer further discussion of the resolution for the extension of the parliamentary term and to bring in legislation along the lines which I have suggested. Let us get it on the statute books of Canada and proceed to operate under it. I may

say, in all friendliness, that I believe there is nothing that could be done by this Parliament which would bring as great credit among the people of Canada as would be given us if, after passing the other measure to which many objections have been raised we were to proceed to show that we were in earnest in this matter and pass a measure providing for the mobilization of all our forces in order that no effort may be lacking to carry on this war to a successful issue. Believing this, I have the honour to move this amendment, seconded by Mr. Pardee:

That all the words after the word "that" in the said resolution be struck out and the following be substituted therefor.

In the opinion of this House the consideration of the terms of said resolution should be deferred until the Government brings before Parliament measures providing that those best able to pay will be asked to contribute their full share to the cost of the war and by which all agricultural, industrial, transportation and natural resources of Canada

will be organized so as to insure the greatest possible assistance to the Empire in the war, and to reduce the cost of living to the Canadian people.

Sir George Foster followed the Hon. Mr. Graham and practically instructed his followers in the House to reject the amendment which Mr. Graham had presented. Others who spoke were Mr. Pugsley, E. M. Macdonald, and F. F. Pardee who seconded Mr. Graham's motion, and Mr. Richard Blain.

The vote was then taken and Mr. Graham's amendment was defeated by a majority of 17.

Sir Robert Borden's resolution for an extension was then taken up and we quote herewith in full the speech which was delivered on this occasion by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HON. SIR WILFRID LAURIER REFUSING EXTENSION OF THE LIFE OF PARLIAMENT.]

No Shirking of Responsibility.

Right Hon. SIR WILFRID LAURIER:

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister this afternoon, in introducing this resolution to extend the life of this Parliament for another year, made a strong appeal to me; in fact, he virtually laid upon my shoulders the responsibility for the resolution, as he hinted that if it were not to carry by a unanimous or practically unanimous vote, he should not feel warranted in giving it effect. My right hon. friend referred to the attitude which I took last year on a similar motion, and he recalled my words on that occasion when I stated—and in this he is quite agreed with me—that in the position which I occupy on the floor of this House, my responsibility before the people is almost equal, if not equal, to that of a Cabinet minister. I can say truly that upon this occasion I feel as strongly as I did then the responsibility that is upon me. I can assure my right hon. friend that I have no intention at all of shirking that responsibility indeed I am prepared to accept the responsibility to the full. I can say truly that since the war began, never did I rise with a firmer determination to be guided in the attitude which I am going to take by any other consideration than that of the welfare of the country and the supreme issue of doing our full share in this war.

A General Election or an Extension.

The problem before us, which is involved in this resolution, is whether the call of the country will be better served and the cause of the war will be better promoted by agreeing to this resolution and extending the life of this Parliament for another year, or whether the call of the country will be better served and the cause of the war better promoted by forcing on an election which, by the letter of the constitution, must come off within a few months.

Conditions have changed.

The situation to-day is not the same as it was last year. Since a similar motion was passed last year, many things have happened and many circumstances have arisen which had not arisen then, and those circumstances make it incumbent upon me to take a different attitude from the attitude I took then, having regard to the interest of the country and the prosecution of the war which we all have at heart. The question has long been debated in the press of the country—not of late, because the press has recently been devoting its attention to the question of conscription which is before the House—whether or not we should have an election during the war,

and the ministerial press has taken the ground that an election during the war time would be practically, if not absolutely, a national crime. Such a proposition, of course, is altogether too strong; it cannot be justified because, if accepted, it would mean that if the war were to last two, three or five years, the people would be powerless to pass judgment upon their own affairs. On the other hand, in another school of thought, many have been of the opinion that not to have an election at the proper time appointed by the Constitution would also be a national crime. The test, and the only test, to apply to a question of this kind is the old Roman maxim, *Salus populi suprema lex*—the welfare of the people and the good of the country alone is the supreme law. The cause which we all have at heart should be the only thought inspiring us in approaching this question.

Solution differently solved in each country.

The problem before us is not confined to the Dominion of Canada. It has presented itself in nearly all the dominions of the British Empire. It has presented itself in Great Britain, in Canada, in Australia, and in New Zealand, and in no two countries has the solution been exactly alike. In Canada we have had one year of extension, but we have had no by-elections for two years except such as were made necessary by a member of this House accepting a position of emolument under the Crown. There are to-day more than twenty vacancies in this House. On the other hand, in England, the Prime Minister has observed that there have been three extensions, all, by the way, for short periods, and all granted by Parliament with more or less misgiving. But in England there have been by-elections whenever a vacancy occurred; no seat was allowed to stand vacant without an appeal to the people.

The late William Redmond and Ireland.

The last of these appeals was held under very peculiar circumstances. It was held in the country of Clare to fill the vacancy caused by the death of William Redmond, who fell gloriously on the field of battle. William Redmond had been for 20 years, if not more, a member of the British Parliament and a strong advocate of Home Rule. When the war broke out he gave up his parliamentary duties and donned the King's uniform, and no soldier rendered better service. He never appeared in Parliament since, so far as my knowledge goes, except on one occasion recently when the question of Home Rule was before the British Parliament. Then he came back from the front and took his seat in the House to urge with all his might the cause of unity in Ireland. Having discharged his

duty he went back to the front, and only a few weeks afterwards was fatally wounded in battle. It so happened that he was found lying on the battlefield by men of the Ulster division, and he died in their arms as they carried him off the ground. Sir, if I recall this, may I be permitted to express my own wish that this incident between this ardent Home Ruler and the Unionist boys from Ulster may be an inspiration to that convention which is to sit in a few days in Ireland. May it help to bring together Home Ruler and Unionist, Catholic and Protestant, for the good of England and the good of Ireland. May it serve as an example to all parts of the British Empire.

New Zealand and Australia.

In New Zealand there was an election in the fall of 1914 in the first year of the war. That election came naturally by the efflux of time, according to the letter of the constitution. It was fought upon party lines, but after the election was over a reconciliation took place between the two parties and a coalition Government was formed. In Australia, everybody remembers that an election took place only a few weeks ago, and that it took place in consequence of the Government's attempt to force conscription upon the people of that country. The conscription issued was defeated, but the country is going on with participation in the war.

Circumstances of the Day must Decide.

What lessons are we to draw from these different examples? The lesson we are to draw is that in any country the question whether the term of Parliament should be extended or whether the constitution should be allowed to take its course should be decided by the circumstances of the day, and the best interests of the country. At the same time I am free to admit—everybody knows it—that in all the belligerent countries, not only in the British Empire, but in Italy and the other countries of the Allies, there has been a strong conviction that no election should be held unless conditions were such as to make it absolutely imperative in the interests of the country. That has been the rule everywhere except in Canada, in the minds of the gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches. It is well known, it cannot be gainsaid, that on three different occasions—in the fall of 1914, in the spring of 1915, and in the fall of 1915—the Government did everything they could to bring on an election, and an election on party lines for party advantage. We have not definite proof of the Government's intentions with regard to an election in the fall of 1914, but we have proof of their intentions on the spring of 1915.

Soldiers' Voting Bill.

In the spring of 1915 the Government brought in a Bill to give the soldiers the right to vote during the war. The title of the Bill was: "An act to Enable Canadians on Active Military service during the present war to exercise Their Electoral Franchise." Section 12 of this Bill says:

"This Act shall remain in force during the present war."

Minister of Public Works preparing for an Election.

What did this mean, if it did not mean that the Government was at that time determined to have an election? And what was the purport and the object of this election? I assert now the design was to have an immediate election, and if I wanted any proof of that it would be sufficient for me to recall the famous words of the Minister of Public Works, when he stated on the floor of this House on the last day of the session of 1915 that the people of this country demanded an election in tones louder than thunder, in order to protect their liberties which were in danger. In danger of what? In danger because the other branch of the legislature had ventured to amend a Bill presented and passed by this House. That was the reason for which we were to have an election. As soon as Par-

liament had been prorogued they set to work to prepare for the election.

Ballots were sent to England.

The special ballots which had been authorized by the Bill were printed, and were sent with the boxes to England and a gentleman appointed by the Government followed them. This gentleman was Mr. Daly, of Winnipeg, a disciple of the Minister of Public Works, and like the Minister of the Public Works well versed in the art of winning elections.

SIR SAM HUGHES: I know my right hon. friend does not wish to do any injustice to the young gentleman. He came from Vancouver.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend is wrong in his facts. The gentleman may have come from Vancouver at the time, but he had been brought up under the aegis of the Minister of Public Works, and from him he learned the lesson in the art of winning elections. There is an art in winning elections. We do not know what it is. Men of the age of my hon. friend and myself—if I may put him in the class in which I am, were taught in our day that elections meant simply the expression of the voice of the people, and nothing else. But the art of winning an election is to have not the voice of the people but the voice of the manipulator of the election.

SIR SAM HUGHES: If the leader of the Opposition will permit me, he is using language, quite unwittingly, which I am surprised to hear him use. I am very much surprised to hear him talk so of Major Daly, who is as straight and as honourable a young gentleman as is to be found in the Dominion of Canada.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: If I have offended the feelings of my hon. friend, it was unintentional. I can assure him I would not offend him or any one else under any circumstances. However, that is neither here nor there. I was saying that in 1915 the Government intended having an election, but the voice of the people spoke, and spoke in another way, and the expression of their feelings was so loud and unmistakable that the elections had to be put off.

Election postponed, Extension requested.

Then was a complete somersault, and the gentlemen who had been asking for an election came back to this parliament with a request for the extension of the life of Parliament. I had to pronounce upon it, and I pronounced myself in favor of the extension. The same request comes to us to-day, and again I have to pronounce myself upon it. I have already stated that the conditions are not such as they were last year. My right hon. friend, to-day made a special appeal to me, and stated his ultimate object would have been to have, if possible, a coalition government and an extension of the term of Parliament. As far as a coalition government is concerned if my right hon. friend wanted to have it, I can only repeat what I told him on a previous occasion, that I regretted he did not speak to me sooner than he did. My right hon. friend will permit me to tell him that the way he should have proceeded if he wanted to have a coalition government was not to frame a policy by a party government first and then present it to me to accept it. That was what was done. My right hon. friend announced on the floor of the House that it was his intention to introduce a measure of conscription, and when he had committed himself he called upon me to assist him in carrying it out. I do not want to take any party political advantage out of this, but I may say to my right hon. friend in all sincerity, if his intention had been to have a coalition government, and if he had asked me before he had committed himself to the policy of conscription, I would have told him with all the energy I possessed to abstain from conscription and to try and find some other basis upon which a coalition could take place. I would have told him it was possible—and I still believe it would have been possible—to get by voluntary enlistment all the as-

sistance we could have wanted in order to carry on our share of the war. I say to my right hon. friend that when he introduced the policy of conscription, in my humble judgment—and time will tell whether I am right or wrong—instead of helping the cause he did it the greatest possible injury he could.

The Unity of the Nation Paramount.

There is something more important even than the object which he has sought, that is to maintain the unity of the nation, and the unity of the nation is seriously compromised to-day. At this very moment my right hon. friend asks me to give my support to the resolution he introduced extending the life of the Government. My right hon. friend knows full well it is impossible for me to give my consent to such a proposal.

Moribund Parliament no right to pass Conscription Bill.

I told my right hon. friend, and I repeated it on the floor of this House, that it was an injury to the country to have this Conscription Bill passed by this moribund Parliament. I told him this moribund Parliament had the power to pass the Bill, but it had not the right. So long as a Parliament exists, so long as it is not exhausted either by efflux of time or the will of the Governor General it has the right to pass all the measures it can pass for the compulsion of the country or for any other nefarious design, but it has not the authority. Having taken that position I would be recreant to my own convictions if I were to consent to the extension of the life of a Parliament which has so abused its authority and its power.

Blood and Treasure Lost.

But, there is much more than this. The condition to-day is not the same as it was last year, because last year there were many things which were suspected, but of which we did not have the proof. To-day we have the proof in the dismissal of the ex-Minister of Militia. The correspondence between the ex-Minister of Militia and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has opened the gates, and a flood of light has shown us that the administration of the Government is responsible for the enormous losses in blood and in treasure which would have been avoided by proper administration. Is the indictment too strong? Is it not justified by the language which was used by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia on the floor of this House within the hearing of every one now listening to me, and by the letters he addressed to the Prime Minister? Did not the ex-Minister of Militia say, within the hearing of every member now within the sound of my voice, that from the time war was declared until the time he left office he had been interfered with by his colleagues; that this recommendation to Council as to contracts had been held up in Council in order to get increased prices? That all the purchases of equipment which he made, and all the equipment he sent over to England had been rejected and scrapped, although it was not only serviceable but better than the material by which it was replaced? Did he not state moreover that the financial loss caused to the country amounted to millions of dollars? Did not everybody hear this? Those things have been said. Some of them have not been denied, some have been denied mildly. They have not been probed, and I say until those matters are probed we should not grant the motion which is now before us for an extension of the life of this Parliament.

Losses in Blood Due to the Ross Rifle.

All these are things which we have to take in consideration when we are asked to vote upon the resolution now before us. But, there is still far worse than that. We would count our losses small if they were only losses in money, but there have been losses in blood for which this Government cannot escape responsibility—losses in blood which should not have taken place, and for which I charge the Government of the day, and I think I shall prove my

statement by what has occurred, and what is on the table of House already. When our troops crossed over they were equipped with the Ross rifle. Everybody knows that from the time the Ross rifle was first manufactured it was subject to very serious attacks. It was a matter for experts. Some experts condemned the rifle, others approved highly of it. Amongst those who approved of it highly was the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes) who was afterwards chosen to be the Minister of Militia in the Government by my right hon. friend. To his credit it must be said he was always loyal, and spoke with a seriousness which characterized him. He defended his opinion, and stated over and over again that the rifle was serviceable, and one of the best weapons and perhaps the best weapon of the kind. He was a member of the Militia Council which helped it from Mark I to Mark II and from Mark II to Mark III. When war was declared, our soldiers went to the front equipped with the Ross rifle.

The Ross Rifle Jammed.

It must be said, and everybody knows it, unfortunately that in most of the engagements in 1915 the Ross rifle did not give satisfaction, and that it jammed in the hands of those who held it. The truth was known to the Government; in fact, reports were made by experts and others, who said that, at the most critical time of the battle of St. Julien, when the Germans were coming and when they had to be repelled, the rifle jammed and our soldiers were unable to use it. They could not advance because their weapons were useless; they would not retire, but with tears of rage and grief in their eyes they threw down their rifles in the mud and took the Lee-Enfields that their comrades could dispose of.

SIR SAM HUGHES : Where did that occur?

SIR WILFRID LAURIER : I was told that it was at St. Julien.

SIR SAM HUGHES : Not a word of truth in it.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER : If it was not at St. Julien then it was at some other battle.

SIR SAM HUGHES : Is the right hon. gentleman not aware that it is known beyond peradventure that the ammunition was at fault and that the English rifle jammed worse than the Ross rifle?

SIR WILFRID LAURIER : I will come to that. Of course, my information is not official; it is such information as I can collect and such as comes to me through correspondence and otherwise. If I am wrong as to the battle, if it was not St. Julien, it was some other battle in which the soldiers in tears and rage threw down the Ross rifle and took up the Lee-Enfield. To quote from the poet, Walter Scott:—

But woe awaits a country when,
She sees the tears of bearded men.

The Government did Nothing.

The Government saw the tears of these bearded men, but they did nothing to correct the condition of things that existed. The commander in chief, Sir John French, had to take notice of that situation. He did not await to report to the War Office, but he instituted an inquiry, and on the 19th June, 1915, he made his report. After having stated that rumours with regard to the Ross rifle had come to him, and that he had appointed a committee to investigate, he proceeded:—

(1) To the unanimous opinion of my committee that the Ross rifle could not be relied upon to work smoothly and efficiently in rapid fire with any ammunition other than that of Canadian manufacture;

(2) to the fact that no ammunition of this nature was available in this country, and that sufficient supplies could

not be obtained from England, and,

(3) to the want of confidence in the rifle which a large number of the infantry evidently felt, as evidenced by the fact that over 3,000 had, without authority, exchanged their rifles for those used by their British comrades, and taken from casualties on the battlefield.

I did not feel justified in sending this Division into battle with the Ross rifle, and ordered the re-arming of the infantry of the Division with the Lee-Enfield rifle, which was carried out before they went in to action on the 15th instant.

Sir John French Acted.

Sir John French said that he armed one division with the Lee-Enfield rifle. Now, I come to the interruption made by my hon. friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). Sir John French goes on to say:—

6. I would, therefore, suggest that the Army Council should send to this country one or more of the most highly qualified experts obtainable to make the necessary tests under service conditions and report whether ammunition of British manufacture is or is not suitable for use with the Ross rifle. For this purpose a supply of ammunition of Canadian manufacture should be brought out for comparison.

I have expressed and acted on my opinion, that, so far as I can judge, the ammunition of British manufacture is not suitable for use with Ross rifles, and that there is a large and growing feeling of want of confidence in their rifle on the part of the men in the Canadian Division, which is amply justified by the report of the committee.

Ammunition Was Bad.

My hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) was right. It was not the rifle which was condemned, but the dissatisfaction arose from the fact that it was not supplied with the proper ammunition. The fact is that the Ross rifle jammed, and the men were left without any weapons to defend themselves. That is the charge I make against the Government. The General Commanding wanted a test made, and a commission was appointed to make that test, but to this day, in so far as my knowledge goes and in so far as the information brought before the House shows, there never was a test made of the Ross rifle with proper ammunition.

SIR SAM HUGHES: Is my right hon. friend not aware that there were three brands of British ammunition that failed when used with the Lee-Enfield rifle, and that not one division but fifty divisions of British troops were shot to pieces by the failure of the Lee-Enfield when using these three brands of British ammunition? These same brands were supplied for use in the Canadian rifle.

No Satisfactory Ammunition sent.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: That is not an answer to the charge I make. The charge I make is that the rifle did not give satisfaction, and there never was any ammunition sent over to make a proper investigation. Upon this point I should quote the testimony of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) himself. During the present session, in the month of January last, my right hon. friend, speaking upon this question, said:

The situation which confronted the Government in the summer of 1915 was this: We knew that Sir John French had concluded that the first Canadian Division ought to be re-armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle. He based that conclusion very largely upon the consideration that the men of the First Division, or a considerable number of them, had lost confidence in the Ross rifle. He took the view, in which I am sure we all concur, that no rifle, however effective, would be useful to the men if they had lost confidence in it. He said, in that same report, that he did not condemn the Ross rifle—that he had no data upon which he could condemn it; and he said further that the difficulty had arisen by reason of the fact that the ammunition supplied in this country,

which might have made the rifle useful, could not be supplied in sufficient quantities.

Sir John French asked that Canadian Ammunition be tried but Government did not act.

What a statement to make. In the first place, I must say that Sir John French had not condemned the ammunition made in this country. Quite the reverse. He asked that the rifle should be tested with ammunition made in this country, but my right hon. friend stated that ammunition could not be supplied in this country. So that there may be no ambiguity, let me repeat his words:

He said in the same report, that he did not condemn the Ross rifle—that he had no data upon which he could condemn it; and he said further that the difficulty had arisen by reason of the fact that the ammunition supplied in this country, which might have made the rifle useful, could not be supplied in sufficient quantities.

What a statement to make, Sir, that we could not supply cartridges in this country. We have established no less than two hundred plants for the manufacture of shells. Is it more difficult to manufacture cartridges than shells? If we can manufacture shells, why not cartridges also? We have a cartridge factory in Quebec; it has been there for years and yet we are told that ammunition could not be supplied for use with the Ross rifle. No test was made of the Ross rifle.

SIR SAM HUGHES: Is that General French's statement?

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: That is General French's statement commented upon by Sir Robert Borden.

SIR ROBERT BORDEN: What page of Hansard is that?

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: Page 148. This matter went on during the whole campaign of 1915. The report of Sir John French was not acted upon. Instead of having the Ross rifle tested with the proper ammunition, there was an order made to have the rifle fitted with new chambers.

The attempt was made; new chambers were manufactured, and the Ross rifle was tried again with the new chamber. The consequence was that, instead of being useless, it became dangerous, and some of the rifles exploded. That is my information. At all events, nothing was done during the campaign of 1915; and the Canadian troops, except one division, in the campaign of 1916 again took the field armed with Ross rifle. On the 28th of May Sir Douglas Haig sent the following letter to the War Office:

Sir Douglas Haig Reports on Ross Rifle.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that I have satisfied myself, after extensive inquiries carried out throughout the Canadian Corps, that, as a service rifle, the Ross is less trustworthy than the Lee-Enfield, and that the majority of the men armed with the Ross rifle have not confidence in it that it is so essential that they should possess. The inquiry on which these conclusions are based, was the outcome of an urgent application from a battalion of the 3rd Canadian Division for re-armament with the short Lee-Enfield rifle, in consequence of a high percentage of jams experienced with their Ross rifles during a hostile attack on May 1, 1916.

A Second Report by Sir Douglas Haig.

This report was such that it should have moved the Government to take some action; yet nothing was done, so that on the 28th of June Sir Douglas Haig again wrote as follows:

I have the honour to inform you that the efficiency of the

Ross rifle has been thoroughly tested by actual fighting in the field, and the application conveyed in my O.B.—74 of May 28, 1916, was made after very careful consideration of all the evidences available.

2. I have again consulted the General Officer Commanding Second Army in case any fresh points have come to light during the recent heavy fighting by the Canadians near Ypres. He tells me that his experience of the working of the Ross rifle during the last fight has only confirmed him in his opinion that the Canadians, in the 3rd Division at all events, have lost confidence in their rifles and he recommends that the rifles in this division be exchanged.

More Rifles to be Ordered.

This was on the 21st of June, 1916. That should have moved the Government to take some action, but again nothing was done. On the 24th of June the following telegram was sent by Sir Robert Borden to Sir George Perley:

"Most confidential, secret."

Mark the graduation—confidential, most confidential, secret. You can imagine that there was something very important when so much discretion was required—confidential, most confidential, secret. Well, it was perhaps not so much the importance of the despatch as the novelty of it which suggested this secrecy. Sir Robert Borden telegraphed to Sir George Perley:

We have had under consideration since January last an order for one hundred thousand additional Ross rifles, none of which can be delivered before April, 1917. If we decide to order the additional one hundred thousand company requires nearly a year's notice before commencement of delivery in order to secure necessary material of various kinds for which there is great demand at present. Several months ago the Master General of Ordnance strongly recommended immediate action, but we have delayed by reason of doubts raised as to efficiency of rifle. Time has now arrived when immediate decision should be made.

"Time has now arrived when an immediate decision should be made." On the 24th of June, 1916, nearly two years after the war broke out, the time has arrived for a decision as to whether the Ross rifle should be continued or some other substituted! The time has arrived for some action, and apparently some action was being considered, but there was immediate repentance, because the despatch continues:

To this end it is important that we should have a definite, reliable and thorough report upon the merits of the rifle.

After two years the Government asked for a report.

Here we had the communications of the two commanders in chief, General French and General Haig, asking that some action be taken. No action had been taken, and after two years the Government ask for another report. Sir Robert Borden goes on:

If it is so defective as to forbid its use at the front, or if confidence in its efficiency has been undermined in our troops it would be a waste of public money to give further orders. Please consult Aitken, with whom I have had much correspondence on this subject and advise me whether any such report as above mentioned exists. If not, it should be made immediately for our guidance.

Sir George Perley send adverse report.

That was on the 24th of June, 1916—a request for further reports. The answer came from Sir George Perley that all hesitation was at an end and that the change must be made:

Sir Douglas Haig remarks that although reports from Second Division not to same effect he is of opinion Lee-Enfield rifle should be issued to all three Divisions Canadian corps. Army Council agree with this opinion and have his

proposal to exchange rifles Second and Third Divisions for Lee-Enfield pattern and steps will be taken forthwith effect exchange.

So at last, after two years vacillation and hesitation, and nothing done, the exchange was made of the Ross for the Lee-Enfield. We may be thankful that at last a decision was reached, but I am far from sure it was a wise ending. The ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) stated in this House not long ago, that the Ross rifle was the best rifle in existence and should have been kept. I charge against the Government this, that the experiment which was asked by Sir John French never was made, so far as this correspondence shows, and I charge therefore that no justice was done to—

SIR SAM HUGHES: May I say a word?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Except with the consent of the right hon. gentlemen—

SIR SAM HUGHES: I asked his permission. If he does not choose to give it I will be silent, but if I have his permission I wish to speak.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, you can speak tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER: The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has given permission.

SIR SAM HUGHES: The right hon. gentleman will remember that a report was presented to this House of the official tests in England, rifle for rifle, in the hands of experts for both rifles, in the hands of possible point, accuracy, rapidity of fire, freedom from jamming and everything else, the Ross rifle out-distanced the Lee-Enfield three to one.

Ross Rifle made bad by Government refusing to supply proper ammunition.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: I said I believed the hon. gentleman was right. I believe the Ross rifle was the better of the two, but I have to say to my hon. friend that for some reason or other they came to a different conclusion; and I have to say further—and in this he will agree—that the test which was asked of the rifle with proper ammunition never was made, and therefore it is no wonder the rifle was condemned. But this is only reinforcing the point I make against the Government, that they did not discharge the duties they should have discharged. They should have ordered that test and applied it to the rifle and then we should have known which was the best weapon. There was no Canadian ammunition available and so the decision had to come that the rifle of the troops should be a Lee-Enfield. Be this as it may, this in no way discharges the responsibility of the Government, and I say to them that they are responsible for the blood which was lost on the battlefield when the troops were either not supplied with proper rifles or not supplied with proper ammunition. Is it conceivable that these troops were sent to the battlefield, that they were sent to meet the Germans, not properly equipped and not properly armed? They should have had not only the rifles but the ammunition as well. They had the one but not the other. And what was the consequence?

The Government record is bad.

The Government in the face of these things, come and ask for an extension of time. Have they any right to it? Can they say: We have done our duty to the country. Do they come to Parliament with clear consciences that they have done everything they could? The record is against them, and, Sir, against the record no defence has been made which can relieve them from the strong condemnation which they receive at the hands of the Canadian people. Sir, there are many other things which I

might urge against the Government, but I do not wish to press them.

Graft.

Charges of graft have been made, but I do not intend to deal with them, and I will simply pass them over. I shall deal with the main point that I placed before the House, and that is that the Government cannot escape the responsibility for blood lost on the battlefield, which might have been spared, nor for the suffering of brave men who went to the battlefield, and gave up their lives and who were not properly supported by the Government that sent them.

Further division of the profits stopped by an appeal to the people.

But there is another matter, to which my hon. friend referred to-day in his speech. He made a statement in which I agree with him: that the country is in a dangerous position. In consequence of what? In consequence of the policy which has produced to-day this conscription measure. There is division among the people, and an election may create a further division. I say to my hon. friend that, there is to-day a cleavage among the people in the country. The fact is there, and we cannot ignore it. It is too late to lament, and we must face it as resolute men. In a free country the only way to decide a question, and to cure all the evils that arise is in an appeal to the people. I know that if we are to have an election, it will be one based largely upon appeals to passions and prejudices. This is not the first time that such a thing has happened. It has happened in every election since I have been in public life, in my province and other provinces. We have been accused in one end of the country and in the other, but notwithstanding all this, it does not shake my faith in popular institutions, and I maintain that the only thing to do is to appeal to the people and ask them to pass judgment. We pretend to fight for democracy, and indeed we are fighting for democracy. The issue of the conflict which is now going on in Europe is democracy, and it is the voice of democracy which has inspired my attitude towards the Government on this question. My heart was very deep in this question, and when war broke out I stated, without hesitation, that Canada was in the war and I repeat after almost three years of war, that Canada is in the war to the end. But when I stated that I did not believe in conscription—nor do I yet—it was not under compulsion that we went into this war. We went into it from higher

and nobler motives, and I repeat after almost 3 years of war, that Canada is in the war to the end, to take our share of the sacrifice to promote a good cause. We did not go into it under compulsion, and I would have hoped that, to the end, we should have remained in that position, and acted upon those higher principles, never resorting to compulsion in order to do our share in this war. I still believe it would be possible to do our share by voluntary enlistment, by appealing to the great heart and soul of the Canadian people, all provinces included, I except none whatever.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: The Government have come to another conclusion. They said that they would resort to compulsion. When they made that statement, I said, that, for my part, I did not believe in that policy. I would rather stand by the policy of the Australian people, who rejected conscription, but are in the war, as we shall ourselves be, to the very end. I asked them to refer the question to the people, after the method of the most advanced democracy, and that request was rejected. Not content with rejecting the request which I made for a referendum, to-day we are asked to discard altogether the sacred right of the people which is guarded by the constitution. These are no longer British institutions; these are simple, not German, but Prussian institutions, and to agree to the resolution of my hon. friend under the circumstances would be an abdication of responsible government and a denial of democracy and of the rights of a free people.

Dr. Michael Clarke of Red Deer, Alta. followed Sir Wilfrid and in a most vitriolic speech blamed the Liberal members of the House of Commons for not granting the extension to the life of Parliament. Dr. Clarke paid a great compliment to the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden in the way he had presented this resolution and predicted that the opinion of the people would be recorded in favour of that consistent speech.

The Hon. Frank Oliver followed and we reproduce herewith in full the speech which the Hon. Mr. Oliver delivered on this occasion.

SPEECH OF HON. FRANK OLIVER ON EXTENSION OF THE LIFE OF PARLIAMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, it has certainly been a most interesting experience to find our most pronounced and thorough democrat in this House (Mr. M. Clark), or, I suppose he would claim, in the Dominion of Canada, appealing to the dead in France and Flanders as the justification for his opposing the most elementary principle of democracy. For all of my hon. friend's approval of the speeches and actions of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden)—and I am willing to agree with him as to the high motives and great ability of the Prime Minister—I want to say to him that it is not the Prime Minister, it is not this Government, it is not this Parliament that is fighting this war. It is not they who are paying for this war. It is the people—the common people—of Canada, the taxpayers, the men and women who have fought the war as far as it has been fought, who will have to fight it as far as it will yet have to be fought, and whom we will have to trust to fight it. Surely these are people whom we can trust to govern themselves.

Are the people of Canada to be guided by the precedent of England in all matters political? It has seemed good to the people of England to go through a portion of this war experience without a general election,

although a general election was due.

It has seemed good to us in Canada to do the same up to the present time. But there is this radical difference. In England every constituency that became vacant has been filled at a by-election. The opinion of the people has thus been taken from time to time. But there are twenty-three seats in Canada vacant to-day; some of them have been vacant for a year or two years, and there has been no by-election.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Whose fault?

Mr. OLIVER: I think it must be the fault of the Government, the fault of those who have the direction of our affairs. I cannot imagine whose fault it can be if not theirs. Certainly, I must say, on behalf of the members of the Opposition, with whom I am sorry to say my hon. friend is so disassociating himself, it is not our fault. Why is it?

The Government at fault if Voluntary Enlistment has ceased.

We have no responsibility in the matter if the people of Canada have not yet been consulted. The urgency of united action is greater to-day than it was a year ago

because of conditions at the battle line. Because the administration of the affairs of Canada, in military as well as in civil matters, has been such as to bring about a condition for which it is the right and the duty of the leader and members of the Opposition, and people of this country, to hold responsible those who have been given the responsibility. There is no escape from the conclusion that if our system of voluntary enlistment of men for military service has broken down, it is because of the lack of foresight, the lack of management, the lack of inspiration, the lack, Mr. Speaker, of common honesty and common decency on the part of the Government. Are the people of Canada to be blamed? Is their patriotism to be challenged? Is their willingness to sacrifice to be challenged? Are the people who, in the face of such mismanagement as has disgraced this country, military mismanagement as well as civil, have sent nearly 350,000 men across the seas, to be challenged, or is their patriotism to be called in question? I say, no. It is not against the people of a country which has sent so many men, which has sent such good men, which has stood the sacrifices that Canada has made, that such a challenge can be thrown. It is because the Government has failed to give that leadership, that inspiration, that direction to our affairs, both civil and military, that would enable that enthusiasm, that spirit of sacrifice to still go forward, that the condition has arisen with which we find ourselves confronted to-day.

Should the inefficiency of the Ross Rifle not be discussed?

My hon. friend has suggested that it is beneath the dignity of the people of Canada, that it would be a calamity to our country, if not to the Empire and the world, if the question of the efficiency of the weapon with which our soldiers were armed should be considered or discussed, or should be laid at the charge of the Government at the present time. Is that a light thing, is that a subject for the laughter with which my hon. friend's very witty sallies were greeted on the other side of the House? Is it a subject for laughter that we placed in the hands of our sons, our brothers and our fathers, a weapon that failed them in the hour of danger? Is it a light thing, I say, that having the authority of a General of the British army that that was the condition of affairs, we send division after division into the field to face the Germans armed with the same rifle and suffering the same losses, and keep that rifle until a second general made the same report a year after the first report was made, and when we had lost thousands of men in Flanders, beginning with the battle of Langemarck and ending with the battle of Zillebeke? My hon. friend has, may I say, peculiar ideas as to what is matter for light consideration. These are not light considerations, as far as I am concerned. And, charged as I have been in this House during past years with some measure or share of responsibility for the direction of the affairs of this country, the knowledge lies heavy on my soul that I did not take stronger measures to bring this state of affairs to the attention of the country, and to cure that terrible condition sooner than it was cured.

Is Canada to be deprived of self government?

We are not to have an election because if we have an election we shall not be able to collect for the Patriotic Fund, for the Belgian Relief Fund, for the Red Cross Fund. Is that a reason why the people of Canada should not enjoy the same right of self-government as the people of any other part of the British Empire? Surely the reason given is not sufficient. We need an election so that we shall not have to gather money for the Patriotic Fund, so that we shall not have to pass the hat and dispense charity, charity to the dependants of those who are giving their lives for that liberty that we profess to prize so highly. If there is one thing of which more than another Canada should be ashamed in connection with this war it is the fact that the dependants of its soldiers have to depend on benevolence, on charity, for a considerable portion of that which is necessary

to their actual existence. I do not know what is the case in England, I find no fault with the conditions in any other country; I care not what they may be. We owe the men who are fighting our battles a debt; we owe a debt to their dependants; and we have not been paying that debt as we should have paid it. We should not dole out charity to the dependants of the men who are giving their lives; we should not send busybodies around to the houses of these women to find out whether they spend a dollar here or a dollar there, and threaten that if they do not spend to suit us what we have given them, they will be deprived of it in the future. Supposing our men at the front were to take the same attitude as the gentlemen and ladies who dispense the Patriotic Fund and say: We will go over the top of we like, and we will not if we do not like. If they dealt by us as we have dealt by their dependants, the credit of Canada would not stand so high in the estimation of the world. We want a general election; put it up to the people of Canada whether or not they want to do the right thing by their own people. We cannot get an assurance of that from the Government of the day. When such a proposal was made to the Government we were told that it was a dilatory motion. We were told that we were delaying the sending of men to fill up the battle line in France because we wanted to get the assurance of the Government that the dependants of soldiers would be protected.

Would a General Election be a Calamity?

An election is spoken of as a calamity; something that will do permanent injury to the country. What has happened to the people of Canada since 1911? What has happened to the people of Canada, who have made such sacrifices as they have made in the years that have intervened, that they are not to be trusted to cast their ballots, to express their opinions? Surely, if any people in the world ever earned the right to govern themselves, the people of Canada have earned that right. Surely the people of Canada have earned the right to do as a nation what they have done by provinces in nearly every province since the war began. Why should not the same people in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec—in every province but one—why should not these same Canadians who are able to conduct their provincial elections during this time of war without any catastrophe occurring to the country—oh, I beg pardon, there was catastrophe, and that was it. I understand that that is where the calamity is to occur. What happened in Manitoba, what happened in New Brunswick, what happened in British Columbia, is liable to happen in the Dominion, and it would be a calamity that it should happen! It was not a calamity that the people turned the rascals out in British Columbia, it was not a calamity to turn them out in Manitoba, it was not a calamity to turn them out in New Brunswick—and it will not be a calamity to turn them out in the Dominion.

The Government at fault if Quebec has not responded.

My hon. friend made a suggestion as to what would happen in the prosecution of the war because of the character of a portion of the support upon which the right hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would depend if he were called to power. It seems to me that the allusion was somewhat unfortunate because, if there was anything wrong with that support, that is to say with the support of the French people from the province of Quebec, surely it has been wrong with our friends who are in office to-day. They had the support of twenty-eight out of sixty-five seats in the province of Quebec. And does my friend recall how they got that support and held it? They got it by proclaiming that Canada owed nothing to England. They persisted in that claim, and they are claiming it to-day, and the men who are most vociferous in claiming it to-day are the very men who by their claims in 1911 were able to place the friends of my hon. friend in power and to keep them there. There is a difference, however. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does

enjoy the support of the majority of the electors of the province of Quebec, has the support of a majority of the representatives of that province in this House; and my right hon. friend knows, and every reading man in this country knows, that the men who support him were elected on the policy of active assistance to the British Empire on land or sea in case of war, elected against every effort, every eloquence, every misrepresentation, that those from that province who support my hon. friends on the other side could bring to bear—financed in large part by those others supporting our friends on the other side who trade, year in and year out, on their loyalty to Great Britain.

Mr. McKENZIE: And knighted for doing it.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, knighted for doing it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And raised to the peerage.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. There we have, in a nutshell, the difficulties with which this country is faced at the present time, in this present crisis—we have had a party in power who, before they came to power, but still more since then and since they have had control of patronage and control of means to gain support, have systematically in one part of the country cultivated a campaign of race and religious prejudice, and in another part of the country cultivated the same kind of a campaign in the opposite way. And after that Government has been in power for six years, they are still assiduously cultivating those two campaigns, one centering in Toronto and the other centering in Montreal. During the period of the anguish and agony of the world, they did not stop. They kept going a little harder on that account; and at last we come to the point that an election must be faced, or the people of Canada will be deprived of their rights and liberties. It is because of this condition, which our friends on the other side deliberately created, that the difficulties of to-day exist. That may be a reason why my hon. friend, as a loyal Britisher, as one who wants to win the war, thinks that this Government should be retained in office, that these people should be maintained in positions that will enable them to still further and longer carry on their campaign. I am sorry that I have to disagree with him.

Canada wants a Leader who can Lead.

I believe that the time has come when Canada needs, as it needed in 1896, a leader who can direct by union, and not by disunion. A Government that holds power because of its ability to create strife between section and section must give place to a Government whose business it is to bring about union between section and section in this country, because by disunion comes depression or destruction, just as by union, and by union only, can success come. We all have the light of past events to guide us in the present crisis. In 1896 the condition was almost parallel to the present condition. Our country was in a state of terrible economic depression, and our people were animated by race and religious prejudice in the same two sections of the country where those factions are governing to-day. Fortunately, when the issue was put to the people, they made a wise choice. They selected as the leader of the Government my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has devoted his life and his attainments to the great work of building up a united Canada. And when in the fullness of time the power was placed in his hands, from 1896 to 1911, under a policy of union there was progress, and Canada made her greatest development since Canada was Canada. She progressed from greater to greater, until in 1911, when my hon. friend was defeated at the polls, he was defeated on the cry "Let well enough alone." May I hope that this condition will be repeated when this election which my hon. friend refers to takes place, because surely, if we needed a change in 1896, we need a change ten times more in 1917. We did not have to face those world conditions of crises that we face to-day. But we must face those conditions to-day, and we can only do so with credit to ourselves by the establishment of union and efficiency, and we can only get that union and efficiency by retiring from office those whose business it is to create disunion, and those whose administration from the day they took office to the present time has been an example of inefficiency such

as this country never saw before. I will not discuss the inefficiency of this war time Administration, but I say that, when the election is held, no amount of flag-waving, and no amount of shouting patriotism, will prevent the people of Canada, who have made their sacrifices of money and blood, from demanding an accounting from those who are responsible for the conduct of our affairs during those years. We make no apology for demanding an accounting at their hands.

Which is the greater sin, disfranchise the soldiers, or disfranchise all the electors of Canada?

My hon. friend was worried about the impossibility of the soldiers at the front being able to cast their votes in any election that might be held. It is deplorable, and it is unfortunate if they cannot cast their votes, but I will submit this thought to him: if the man who has made up his mind—and all who have gone to the front should make up their mind—that his responsibility requires that he shall risk his life and everything he has or hopes to have, to be of service to his country, does the hon. gentleman think that the question of whether or not that man casts a vote is a serious matter? He is not casting a vote for any candidate, because he can only vote for the Government or Opposition. Does the hon. gentleman think that it is a material injury to that man, or that he is deprived of a serious portion of the right that belongs to him? If he thinks that it is a serious matter to disfranchise these men at the front, what does he think of the disfranchisement of the whole of the people of Canada, which is the condition in which we are to-day, which condition my hon. friend proposes by his vote to keep us in for eighteen months longer?

The Duty of the Opposition.

If it is a terrible thing for the soldier to be disfranchised, it is a very much more terrible thing for the people of this country to be disfranchised, because while the soldier is doing his work at the front, we have our work to do here. The soldier depends upon us for the support that he receives, and unless we conduct our business here as it should be conducted, we cannot give him that support; and just as we have a right to look to him that that sacrifice to which he has pledged himself shall be made when the occasion demands, surely he has the same right to look to us to see that the affairs of this country are conducted, in principle and in detail, in the large and in the small, in such a manner as shall be to his benefit and to his credit.

For what is the soldier fighting? For the good of the country, for its safety, for its honour, for its welfare now and in the future. And yet we are to sit here and are not to criticise the Government; we are not to question anything the Government does; we are to permit the food of the people to be stolen by the profiteers to the amount of millions upon millions of dollars, and we are to say nothing. We are not to criticise—we are to take no action. If we do our duty here we shall ensure to our men at the front that there is good and efficient government in this country, and when those who are fortunate enough to come back, do return, there will be a country for them to come back to. Heaven knows whether they will really have a country to come back to when the war is over, if matters continue on the same course as at present. For the policy of this Government since they took office—and no man knows it better than my hon. friend (Mr. Michael Clark)—has been to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, and at no time and on no occasion was that more true than it is at this moment, and it is becoming increasingly true every day. When this Government itself brings down a report to say that the men who handle a large part of the food of the people have made profits of untold millions, and when the reports of the milling companies, which handle another large part of the food of the people show the profits that they show, are we justified in sitting here and failing to take such action as will protect those for whom our

men are fighting and protect the rights and interests for which they are fighting? We have a duty to perform as well as they.

Honesty and Efficiency Paramount.

It is our business to see that this country is governed honestly and efficiently. It is the business of us who are in Opposition to hold a check upon the operations of the Government. No condition could be more dangerous to the welfare of the State than a combination between both sides of the House that would prevent effective criticism of the actions of the Government. I am not given to much over-praise; I am not one who goes heavily on laudation; but I want to say this, that when the leader of the Opposition refused the proposals of the leader of the Government—and I am not criticising the motives of the leader of the Government in any degree—and preferred to stay in Opposition and to do his duty to taking office, if I never was proud of my leader before, as one of his humble followers, I was proud of him then. I knew that there rested the true principles of Liberalism that could be depended upon in time of stress, in time of temptation, if such a proposal might be a temptation, as well as in times of prosperity I am sorry to say I have not been able to follow all the remarks made by my hon. friend. He made very many, and they were very clever. The first remark he made—I regret that it has almost slipped my memory.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: It has slipped mine too.

Mr. OLIVER: It had relation to—I am afraid after all that my hon. friend made so many turns in his argument—

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Do not blame me for your bad memory.

Mr. OLIVER: I am afraid my hon. friend made so many turns in his argument that some of the corners have escaped my memory. I was so interested in following my hon. friend, whom I had known as the most pronounced pacifist, the most pronounced free-trader and the most pronounced advocate of sound and honest Government and British precedent, in his reversal of all those positions, that I am sure he will pardon me if I have not been able to recall all of the many turns in his argument.

Following Mr. Oliver's speech the vote was taken which resulted in a Government majority of 20. Six of the Government supporters voting against the extension to the life of Parliament and six of the Opposition members voting for an extension to the life of Parliament.

When a Government majority dwindles from 48 to 17 on a Government motion there is strong evidence that something is wrong.

MORE THAN SUSPECTED.



A COMPLETE JOB.

One of the most remarkable and thorough jobs to the order of the Public Works Department, constituting an extensive whitewashing contract, was recently successfully carried out by the contractors, Messrs McLeod and Tellier, whose efficient manipulation of the kalsomine has been enthusiastically welcomed by the administration—in spots. It is rumoured that some of the cabinet were anxious that the contractors fail in their undertaking but as the job was awarded them at the instance of the Premier himself there was no open attempt to jeopardize the work. The Conservative members of parliament (where were the others?)—congratulated the Hon. Robert Rogers whose character was disinfected and embellished anew, but owing to some strange oversight failed to take into account the splendid services of the cleaners on this occasion. We feel that an injustice has been done the firm and would suggest that the title of Whitewashers Extraordinaires to the Public Works Department be forthwith conferred upon them.

We want persons in every Poll to canvass for the Canadian Liberal Monthly. Send us a name.

THE WINNIPEG CONVENTION.

The following are the resolutions passed at the Winnipeg Convention held on August 7th, 8th and 9th, 1917.

After an address of welcome delivered by Hon. T. C. Norris, Premier of Manitoba, the Convention proceeded to elect its officers which resulted as follows: C. M. Hamilton of McTaggart, Sask., Chairman; Capt. Clifford B. Reilly of Calgary, Vice-Chairman; W. R. Wood of Beautiful Plains, Sask., Secretary; and J. Douglas of Redvers, Sask., and Mrs. Kneil of Edmonton, as Assistant Secretaries.

Objects of the Convention.

As the existing political situation in Canada is likely to necessitate a general election in the near future resulting in the creation of a new parliament in which Western Canada, after a protracted delay will have its full quota of members under its present constitution this convention of Liberals representing as it does the four western provinces of the Dominion deems it advisable that it should make a declaration respecting the many problems in which in its opinion, the people of Western Canada are deeply interested. With this object in view, we declare:—

The resolutions do not appear here in the order in which they were passed at the Convention.

Win-the-War.

Moved by Dr. D. B. Neely, M.P. for Humboldt, Sask., and seconded by Lieut. C. B. Reilly, (both returned soldiers) of Calgary, that:

"In this war for the defence of democratic civilization against a military despotism, the conditions call for the putting forth by each allied belligerent of its full power as the only assurance of victory. In times of peril the entire resources of the country, moral and material man-power and wealth, are justly disposable by the state for the preservation of its national liberty. The imperative duty of the Canadian people in regard to the war is its continued vigorous prosecution."

(1) "By conferring with the British Government for the purpose of definitely ascertaining

the scope and character of all the services that can best be rendered by Canada in the conduct of the war."

(2) "By the maintenance, in unimpaired strength at the front, of our fighting forces, and the taking of all steps necessary to secure the required reinforcements for this purpose.

(3) "By organizing the productions of our other contributions to the war, such as food, munitions, and other war necessities, upon lines of the greatest efficiency.

(4) "By the complete extinction of profiteering in all business having to do with munitions and the necessities of life, if neces-

sary, by the nationalization of these industries, or by an adaptation of the British system of controlled establishments."

(5) "By the recovery for the public treasury of undue profits obtained since the beginning of the war by the exploitation of the necessities of the people or the urgent requirements of the State."

(6) "By the application of a combined system of sharply graduated taxation upon incomes and excess profits which shall insure that every citizen shall bear his or her full share of the war burden, according to his or her means."

(7) "By thoroughly organizing the nation and carrying out this program by whatever means may be necessary for its accomplishment."

Condemnation of Borden Government.

Moved by Premier Sifton, Alberta, seconded by Mr. Laidlaw of British Columbia, that:

This convention of the Liberals of the four western provinces of the Dominion assembled for the purpose of assisting in the solution of the many serious problems facing Canada at the present crisis feels compelled to place on record its most severe disapproval of the war administration of the Borden Government.

War is essentially the business and concern of the entire nation and not of any section, class, or political party. It can be waged to the greatest advantage only when behind its prosecution all classes of its people are enlisted in the same passionate determination

The Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Moved by Hon. A. G. Mackay of Edmonton, and seconded by Mr. W. E. Knowles, M.P. for Moose Jaw, Sask:

"That this convention place on record its admiration of the life and work of the greatest of all Canadians, the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and of his earnest endeavor to carry out his duty as he sees it in the interest of all Canada, respecting our part in the great world struggle."

"We express the hope that his undoubted ability, his long experience and matchless statesmanship may be utilized in reuniting the people of Canada in this great crisis; in the successful prosecution of the war; and in carrying out the platform laid down by this convention."

to defend the right, and triumph over the forces of despotism and unrighteousness.

Any attempt to arrogate to one section of the people or one political party a monopoly of its prosecution and the prestige of the conduct of a national struggle for freedom and existence can be characterized only as base and unworthy in the highest degree.

Because the Borden Government has sought from the outset to make our national life and death struggle a prerogative of one political party, to the exclusion of one half of the Canadian people, and an instrument for selfish political advantage rather than the triumph of national ideals; because it has exhibited gross incompetence and inefficiency in the face of national peril; because it has substituted partisan selfishness for honor and fair dealing; because dissension has overcome leadership in its councils and weakness and vacillation have taken the place of firmness of resolution, courage and efficiency in execution, we condemn it as no longer entitled to the confidence of the Canadian people.

Woman Suffrage.

Mrs. Luther Hollings of Winnipeg moved and Mrs. S. W. Brown of Vancouver seconded a resolution:

"That the Dominion franchise should be extended to women on the same basis as men."

Election Laws.

Moved by Hon. T. H. Johnson of Winnipeg, seconded by Alex. Stewart of Edmonton, that:

"The election laws of Canada should be so amended as to prohibit contributions for election purposes by corporations or officers thereof; so as to limit the total amount of money spent by or in behalf of any candidate in any election contest, to provide for full publicity of the source of all campaign contributions and the mode of expenditure of money for election purposes, and for a more speedy and simple procedure for the trial of election petitions."

Homesteads for Women.

Miss Fleet of Winnipeg moved and Miss Wilson of Harris, Sask., seconded a resolution that:

"The Homestead act at the present time gives to male British subjects of 21 years and widows with minor children, 160 acres of free land, providing they fulfill certain specified conditions. Be it resolved that this convention go on record that the Homestead act be extended to permit women to file a claim, and upon fulfilling similar conditions to receive their patent."

School Lands and Endowment.

Moved by Hon. Edward Brown, of Winnipeg,

and seconded by Hon. J. R. Boyle, of Alberta that:

"The interests of education in the West demand the transfer to provincial control of all school lands and of the school land endowment fund, which under federal management, have produced scarcely more than one half the revenue which could be secured by placing the control in the hands of those most interested in the revenue."

Hereditary Titles.

Moved by G. St. Clair Stubbs of Birtle, Man., and seconded by Alex. Stewart, K.C., of Edmonton, Alta., Resolve.

"That this convention is opposed to the granting of all hereditary titles in Canada, and to all other titles for other than military or naval services."

Natural Resources of West.

Hon. A. L. Sifton, Premier of Alberta moved and was seconded by S. J. Latta, M.P.P., of Govan, Sask.

Resolved that :

1. "In the interests of the proper carrying out of the spirit of Confederation and as a fitting memorial of the fiftieth anniversary thereof, the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta should be placed as nearly as possible on a basis of equality with the other provinces of the Dominion."

2. "The lands within said provinces, which have already been disposed of by the Dominion government for the general benefit of Canada should be considered a fair recompense for the financial terms granted said provinces."

3. "All the lands, water, minerals and timber heretofore ungranted in said provinces, now held by the crown for the benefit of the Dominion, should as from and after the first day of July, 1917, be held for the benefit of the respective provinces within which they are situate."

4. "Such legislation as may be necessary for the proper transfer of such lands, water, minerals and timber and all rights thereto appertaining, subject to agreements heretofore made and with such exceptions of land now in use by the Dominion as may be proper should immediately be passed."

Agricultural Credits.

Moved by Hon. C. R. Mitchell of Alberta, seconded by J. H. Haslam of Regina, that:

"Resolved that in view of the fact that several of the provinces of Canada have inaugurated governmental systems of long-terms agricultural credits which being under provincial control permit each province to deal adequately with the conditions which are

peculiar to itself and as it is desirable that in the development of these systems the money be obtained at the lowest cost; we believe that the federal government should make provision to assist the provinces in securing the cheapest possible long term credits for agriculturists by lending money to the provinces at cost; for this purpose on security of provincial bonds whenever an economy in the cost of money to the farmer can be effected by so doing."

Prohibition.

A resolution moved by Mrs. Charles Robson of Winnipeg, and seconded by Mrs. Tedford of Yorkton, Sask.

"Resolved, that as a war measure, and with the object of utilising to the fullest extent the food values within the Dominion, the federal government should take possession of all stocks of alcohol, and the federal Parliament should absolutely prohibit the manufacture, importation, exportation, storage or sale of intoxicating liquors within the Dominion of Canada."

Prince Rupert Dry Dock.

Moved by Fred. Stork of Prince Rupert, B. C., and seconded by Hon. M. Pattullo of Victoria:

"Whereas, it is necessary to bring to bear every possible national energy in the present war condition, and whereas, an elaborate and modern dry-dock and shipbuilding plant costing two and a half million dollars has been in existence in Prince Rupert for the last three years, and whereas the interest on the bonds of which is guaranteed by the government, and, whereas, no steps have been taken by the government to make use of the same and it remains neglected and out of use and this neglect has become a public scandal;

"Be it resolved, that the Dominion government should at once cause to be installed a permanent and efficient staff and materials assembled for the operation of said dry-dock so that building and repairing of ships may be carried on in the national interest and this convention pledges itself to the enforcement of this resolution."

Farm Machinery.

Moved by T. H. McConica of Luseland, Sask., seconded by J. G. Turgeon, M.L.A., Alta.

"Resolved, that as the present high cost of farm machinery is one of the greatest factors in the increasing cost of producing foodstuffs, the Canadian farmer is paying more for such machinery than does the farmer of most other countries—we believe that the Dominion government should immediately provide for an enquiry into the different factors which constitute the price to the farmer; such an enquiry

to embrace the cost of manufacture, cost of transportation, distribution, collection and any other factors, with a view to such action as may be possible to bring about reduction when the facts are ascertained."

Settling Vacant Land.

Moved by J. G. Turriff, M.P., for Assiniboia, Sask., and seconded by T. A. Crerar of the Grain Growers' Grain Company of Winnipeg:—

"Resolved, that as the general progress and prosperity of our people depends in a very large measure upon our agricultural development, and as the obligations assumed by Canada by reason of the war and of our existing railway situation can best be taken care of by increased population and consequent increased production, it is imperative there should be inaugurated without delay a comprehensive scheme of immigration and land settlement; such scheme to be evolved and carried into effect by the co-operation of federal and provincial authorities, and to embrace the principle of state assistance in the direction of making available for suitable settlers the vacant lands now owned by speculators, railway and land companies, and located in existing well-organized communities within easy distance of railway and marketing facilities."

British Columbia Lands and Resources.

Moved by Premier Brewster of British Columbia and seconded by Premier Sifton of Alberta that:

"Whereas the retention by the Dominion of the title to the lands in the Peace River district and the railway belt leads to an unnecessary expensive and embarrassing duplication of offices, agencies and administration and is particularly embarrassing in the administration of the minerals, as well as the lands in the railway belt;

"Resolved that in conforming with the request put forward with regard to land and natural resources in the three prairie provinces, we strongly urge that the same policy be pursued with regard to British Columbia, and that all lands, timber, water and minerals in the Peace River district and railway belt be transferred to the province of British Columbia."

Cold Storage.

Moved by J. H. Lamb, Alberta, seconded by J. R. Jones, Sask.

"Resolved, that as the private ownership of cold-storage facilities for foodstuffs lends itself to an extortionate manipulation of food prices, thereby greatly increasing the cost of living in Canada, and as producers of foodstuffs by reason of such private ownership are usually absolutely at the mercy of the food manipulator we believe that the State should own and

operate cold-storage plants throughout the Dominion."

Tax on War Profits.

Moved by S. J. Latta, M.P.P., Saskatchewan, seconded by T. H. McConica, Luseland, Saskatchewan:

"Resolved that so long as the war lasts there should be a tax on war profits over and above every other form of taxation."

Combines.

Moved by Hon. G. W. Brown, Regina, seconded by Hon. Duncan Marshall, Edmonton:

"Resolved, that it is the duty of the Government of Canada in the interests of the people to stamp out all combinations in restraint of trade, or which have the effect of unduly affecting prices. Our laws pertaining to the creation and operation of any and all combines and trusts should be revised, extended and strengthened, and there should be established a Federal court with a public prosecutor attached thereto entrusted with the responsibility of rigidly enforcing such laws in the general public interest."

Banking

Moved by Hon. W. R. Motherwell, Sask, seconded by J. H. Haslam, Regina:

Resolved that the Bank Act should be so amended as to permit the creation of local agricultural banks under proper government supervision with provision for rediscount facilities under federal control; all such banks to have a minimum paid up capital of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) with power to lend on chattel securities, but without power to establish branches.

Resolution re Banking and Currency.

Moved by G. E. McCrossan, Vancouver, seconded by E. S. Knowlton, Vancouver:

That in the opinion of this Convention, the time has arrived for the reorganization of the banking system of Canada, so as to bring it more nearly within the democratic spirit of proper regulation and control by the people, and with this object in view: Be it resolved that:

1. The Banking System of Canada should be placed under the control and regulation of a banking commission invested with plenary powers in all matters pertaining to banking, currency, coinage, and credits: and in particular power to regulate and control:

- (A) The issue of public currency
- (B) The coinage of gold and silver
- (C) The purchase of bullion produced in Canada
- (D) The amount of call money loaned outside of Canada

- (E) Interlocking directorates
- (F) The supervision of credits
- (G) The capitalization of banks
- (H) The payments of dividends
- (I) The relations of subsidiary trust and money lending concerns to banks
- (J) And generally, all such matters as are necessarily incident to the proper regulation and control of banking and currency.

2. Be it further resolved that: In connection therewith, there should be organized a national bank of Canada, as a central reserve institution upon whose board of governors should also sit amongst others, the members

of said banking commission; the object of said national bank, to include amongst other objects, the primary responsibility of marshalling and mobilizing the gold and silver reserves of the nation and the ownership and control of the issuance of public and national currency.

Tariff.

Moved by Roderick McKenzie, Manitoba Grain Growers, seconded by D. W. Warner, Saskatchewan.

Resolved—

1. That the British Preference be increased to fifty percent of the general tariff, with the view to ultimate free trade.

2. That wheat, wheat flour and all other products of wheat be placed upon the free list.

3. That the following articles be placed on the free list:—

- (1) Farm implements and machinery with repairs for same.
- (2) Farm tractors and internal combustion engines with repairs for same.
- (3) Mining, flour, sawmill, and logging machinery with repairs for same.
- (4) Rough and partly dressed lumber.
- (5) Illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils.
- (6) Cement.
- (7) Fertilizers.
- (8) Fishing lines, cordage, swivels, and metals for fishing spoons.

4. That fruit, staple foods and food products (other than wheat flour) domestic animals and food therefore, and flax, be admitted into Canada free of duty when coming from and being the product of any country admitting like Canadian articles into such country free of duty.

5. That substantial reductions be made in the general tariff on all articles imported into Canada, excepting luxuries.

National Highway.

Moved by Joshua Kingham, Victoria, B. C., seconded by J. Stuart Jamieson, Vancouver.

Resolved—

That this Convention go on record as being in favor of the immediate commencement and completion with all reasonable despatch of the necessary links of a national highway across Canada in accordance with the terms of the entry of British Columbia into confederation. The money voted to be divided equitably between and expended under the direction and management of the governments of the provinces through which the highway will necessarily pass.

Conservation and Production of Foodstuffs.

Moved by Hon. Duncan Marshall, Alberta, seconded by D. W. Warner, Alberta.

Resolved—

That in the opinion of this Convention, the Government of Canada should, as an emergency war measure for the immediate conservation and production of foodstuffs:

1. Prohibit the manufacture of all high grade white flour in Canada, establishing a maximum grade that will add materially to the bread produced in Canada yearly.

2. That an immediate organized effort should be made under the direction and management of the Dominion Department of Agriculture to prepare for next year's crop every available acre of land in Canada not being tilled by private enterprise, and to make arrangements for breaking virgin prairie in the spring of 1918 sufficient to ensure a substantial increase in the possible grain production of Canada.

Our Soldiers.

Moved by Hon. Dr. Kingham, British Columbia, seconded by Mrs. Charles Robson, Winnipeg.

Our soldiers who have so freely offered themselves as a sacrifice on the altar of freedom have demonstrated

the fighting quality of our race and have upheld the glorious traditions that have been handed down to us. To the relatives of those men who have shed their precious blood on foreign battlefields we offer the tribute of our grateful sympathy. They and those who have survived have given a new meaning to valor and have covered the name of Canada with undying glory. We are under a debt to them that we can never pay. But in partial compensation for the sacrifice:—

1. We advocate pensions to widows that will enable them to live in comfort and educate their children.

2. The increase of the pay of our soldiers so that they will be to some extent on an equality with those who have remained at home.

3. The increase of the separation allowance in lieu of patriotic fund and to eliminate all contributions that have the semblance of charity.

4. The recognition of the democratic character of our army by placing all ranks on an equal and adequate basis in the matter of pensions.

5. The securing of the re-entry of the returned soldier to civil life so that he shall not suffer because of his devotion to his country in its hour of great peril and in the case of the disabled to provide them with vocational training by properly fitting them for subsequent employment and to fairly recompense them for partial disability.

Pacific Coast Iron and Steel Industry.

Moved by Hon. Wm. Sloan, British Columbia, seconded by Mr. Walters, M.P.P., Yale, B.C.

Whereas there is at the present time a great imperial necessity for tonnage on the high seas, and whereas in British Columbia there are extensive deposits of high grade iron ores, from which the necessary steel for ships could readily be secured.

Resolved that as a war measure this Convention approve of the principle of the development of the iron and steel industry on the Pacific coast of Canada as a national enterprise.

Bankruptcy Act.

Moved by Hon. C. W. Cross, Alberta.

Whereas, the lack of a bankruptcy law in Canada leaves those who fail in business the choice of adopting subterfuge to continue in business or of leaving the country, be it resolved that, in the opinion of this Convention, there should be passed a Dominion bankruptcy law by which a debtor could secure a discharge through a bankruptcy court from all claims against him after a fixed date and after all his assets have been handed over and administered for the benefit of his creditors.

National Government and Election Appeals.

Moved by T. A. Crerar, Manitoba Grain Growers, seconded by Mrs. Charles Robson, Winnipeg.

Resolved that this Convention expresses the hope and hereby declares the desire of its members, that in the impending election the discussion of issues should be kept on a plane free from all appeals to passion or prejudice in matters of race and creed, and further whichever party is returned to power the business of the government of Canada should be carried on by a truly national government composed of representatives drawn from the different elements and industries of Canada.

Canadian Northern Railway Company.

Moved by Roderick McKenzie, Manitoba Grain Growers, seconded by J. S. Jamieson, Vancouver.

Resolved that in view of the fact that the Drayton-Ackworth Commission showed that the equity of Mackenzie and Mann was of no actual value, the arrangement recently submitted to Parliament whereby it is proposed to pay an arbitrated price for sixty millions of common stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company is indefensible from any point of view.

Newspaper Ownership.

Moved by M. McLean, Saskatchewan, seconded by G. B.

O'Connor, Alberta.

Resolved that all newspapers, magazines, trade journals and other periodicals publishing articles designed to influence public opinion shall be compelled from time to time to publish sworn statements setting forth the names of the owners, managers, editors, stockholders, bondholders and of any other person having an interest in such newspaper, magazine, trade journal or other periodical.

Railway, Telegraph and Express Systems.

Resolved that this Convention declares its approval of the principle of public ownership of railway, telegraph, and express systems and believes that this principle should be applied to all such Canadian systems as soon as the financial and economic conditions of the country permit.

PROVISION FOR SOLDIERS' DEPENDENTS.

JUST before the Military Service Bill received its Second Reading in the House of Commons on the evening of July 5th, 1917, Mr. A. B. Copp, M. P. for Westmorland, N.B., moved the following motion:

"That all the words of the motion after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

That the further consideration of this Bill be deferred until such adequate provision has been made for the dependents of soldiers enlisted for overseas as will remove the necessity of raising money by public subscription for their support."

Mr. Copp's suggestion was that the Government should make more permanent provision for soldiers' dependents, and advocated a large government grant for Patriotic Fund purposes. Instead of going around the country from pillar to post asking for money for the Patriotic Fund Mr. Copp asked the Government to assume this responsibility and not leave the soldiers' dependents to look to charity for support. "If," Mr. Copp stated, "men are to be sent to the fighting line by the Military Service Act the support of their dependents should not be left to charity or in the hands of any committee," the government should protect them and provide for them as well or even better than before the Head of the House had gone to fight.

Sir Robert Borden replied, and he charged Mr. Copp with introducing this motion for a dilatory purpose and to delay the passing of the Military Service Act. Sir Robert concluded his remarks by saying:

"I have no sympathy either with his motion or his motive, and without any hesitation whatever I declare to this House that the Government cannot accept it."

Sir Robert might well have added that no member on his side of the House was sympathetic to the motion or the motive, as while Mr. Copp was making his appeal, the Conservative members in the House sneered and jeered in consequence of which the Speaker of the House was repeatedly obliged to call them to order. That a Liberal member of Parliament should present to the House a motion asking for the permanent protection for the mothers and wives and children or dependents of any class of the soldiers now fighting at the front seemed to be beyond the comprehension of Sir Robert Borden and his followers defeated Mr. Copp's motion.

SIR CLIFFORD SIFTON.

SIR Clifford Sifton as Leader of a Union Government Whew! What strange things take place in the dog days!

The Ex-Minister of the Interior in the role of a modern Warwick reminds one of a wax figure in a suit of mail at Madame Tussaud's—and about as effective as he has proved to be in the past few weeks as wet nurse to Canada. Taking up his headquarters at the Chateau Laurier Hotel, Ottawa, Sir Clifford has discovered to his chagrin that money doesn't talk so eloquently as it did in 1911. People now look askance at millionaires who write open letters telling the Senate and the electors of Canada how they should vote. Of Sir Clifford in particular they are naturally suspicious, having regard to the role he played in 1911 as the spokesman of all the get-rich-quick politicians and big interests, on whom this war has pronounced judgment.

What are his claims to leadership that Sir Clifford should take himself so seriously as the leader of the war lords of Canada? It is true he is a living example of great success in public life—as success was judged before this war came to reassert the moral values by which national progress may alone be tested.

What more could a grateful country do for him? Has it not enabled him to play a big part as leader of the Toronto profiteers and monopolists in defeating the reciprocity agreement and in maintaining high tariffs and high cost living? He was the chief apostle of the "No Truck, or Trade with the Yankee," disappointed the hopes of the Free Trader of the West, and returned Borden to Power as the Government of the Big Interests. But he won't be happy till he gets there himself—Borden and Tom White and Rogers having made such a mess of things at Ottawa. For several years past Sir Clifford has been the power behind the Round Table movement in Canada. Imperialism—a Central Parliament in which Sir Clifford would figure as the brain-carrier of Canada—has been one of his dreams. But even this did not survive the blundering intrusion of Sir Robert Borden. Foiled in the attempt to destroy Confederation by the Round Table scheme of centralized Imperialism, Sir Clifford saw in a Union Government at Ottawa an opportunity to deal Canadian autonomy a blow.

Once the principle was admitted that a conscription law could be enforced without consulting the Canadian people, it might yet be possible to recover lost ground for ultra-Imperialism of which he was Chief sponsor in the Dominion. Of Sir Clifford's qualifications for leadership he, himself, was never in doubt. Indeed it has been said that he now aspires to be the Northcliffe of Canadian politics. If rumour does not lie, he is in close touch with Lord Northcliffe, who is now a British agent in the United States and who is not a disinterested spectator of the political crisis which is disrupting this country.

His open letter to Senator Bostock shows that Sir Clifford Sifton feels that he alone is capable of leading the country. Will he, therefore, tell the people of Canada what has become of the men who have enlisted for service overseas? He says there are 80,000 men in the fighting line.

We have enlisted over 420,000 men and sent 320,000 overseas. The casualty list—including men who recovered and are sent back to the front—is less than 100,000. Canada, therefore, should have 140,000 men still available for the fighting line. Where are these missing 140,000 men? What calamity has deprived Canada of their services at a time when the cry is raised that there is a shortage of men for enlistment at the front? Sir Clifford is not a novice at figures as his vast wealth proves. As a self-elected war leader and adviser to the Canadian Senate why does he hide from Canada the whereabouts of her missing divisions? It must be a big hole that hides 140,000 men from view!

An Associated Press cablegram from Bramshott dated April 20th last, throws some light on the mission of Canada's lost divisions. The report stated:

**Bramshott Camp, England,
April 20th 1917.**

The biggest "show" staged in England during the war was put on here the other day in honor of the Canadian Premier, Sir Robert Borden, by thousands of his fellow-countrymen in khaki. It included an exhibition of all phases of training by infantry and artillery, gas-helmet drills, bayonet practice, trench fighting, bombing, signaling, and ended with a review of about 50,000 troops. The bad weather kept the airplanes away, but there were plenty of good sized bombs to represent the noise of howitzers.

The "show" was the nearest thing to a good-sized battle that can be staged without a real enemy. It was daily practice on a larger scale in honor of the Canadian statesman. The men never call it a battle! they always refer to this business of modern warfare as a "show." Sir Robert remarked at the end that it was the best "show" of its kind he had ever witnessed.

The exhibition closed on a great plain where the Premier reviewed the troops and pinned medals on five privates for bravery during the battle of the Somme.

Borden's "biggest show on earth" is only equalled by Sir Clifford Sifton's biggest game of bluff at Ottawa. If men are so badly needed at the front why are they held in England to provide the Borden and Perleys with guards of honour and sham fights and reviews? Kaiser William can't be beaten by sham battles fought at Bramshott!

By the delicate process of eliminating Borden and Laurier, Conservatism and Liberalism, Sir Clifford, in his letter to Senator Bostock, said as modestly as it was possible for him to say it—"Here am I, the heaven sent Saviour of Canada in her hour of peril!" But somehow that modest offer of his services as leader of a non-partisan Government fell upon deaf and ungrateful ears!

Leaders are men who lead. Sir Clifford was a blind leader of the blind when in 1911 he endeavoured to destroy the agricultural interests of Canada on which the Allies now so largely depend for food supplies. Even now he talks of the necessity of new guns and munitions, at a time when Lord Rhondda the British Food Controller on July 23rd, 1917, in a message to Canada's Food Controller, urges the pressing primary importance of food. This is Lord Rhondda's message:

"We look to the resources of Canada, and to the indomitable energy of Canadians, for an answer that will shatter Germany's threat of starvation. In normal times the Mother Country is dependent on your Domi-

nion for a large part of its food supplies. War has increased that dependence to such an extent that it is now vital for the United Kingdom and the Allies in Europe to obtain from Canada foodstuffs in far larger quantities than under peace conditions. That must necessarily entail effort and far-reaching economy, with their attendant sacrifices on the part of Canadians.

"I know that, like ourselves at home, the pick of your manhood have gone, and are going, to take their splendid share in the front line of battle, and that, therefore, you are faced with the difficulty of a supply of labor. I also realize that an increased export of food supplies must entail diversion of effort from other enterprise, yet I am convinced that the people of Canada will surmount all obstacles, and that the harvest, as far as human labor can achieve, will be a striking demonstration of Canada's efficiency and determination. The willingness of the Canadian people to permit control of their products for purposes of winning the war is naturally welcomed by all the Allies, as tending to increase the supply and to regulate prices. The certainty that we can rely on your whole-hearted co-operation, not only in utilizing every ounce of national energy to increase production, but in equitable adjustment of prices, gives me the greatest encouragement. I most heartily wish you every success in your all-important work."—Lord Rhondda's statement.

Who is the best judge of the requirements of the Allies—Sir Clifford Sifton or Lord Rhondda, who is the trusted Food Controller of Great Britain? Canada cannot follow the lead of Sir Clifford and at the same time aid the Allies as Lord Rhondda asks Canada to aid them. "Food—more Food!" is the call of the Allies who recognize that this country has already sent "the pick of her manhood" to fight side by side with the Allied troops. Could any stronger argument be waged against the Borden-Conscriptionist folly than this call from Lord Rhondda for more food?

There is only one way in which Sir Clifford Sifton may assert his leadership, and that is by convincing the public that black is white. When Sir Clifford Sifton sets out to misrepresent Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he forgets that the people of Canada are not fools and cannot be fooled all the time. They now know that Sir Clifford's 1911 campaign against Laurier and Reciprocity had its aftermath in the long record of graft and corruption at Ottawa. The adoption of the principle of reciprocity by the Borden Government and the borrowing of loans from the despised Yankee. Sir Clifford's election slogans of 1911 are remembered now when he brazenly misrepresents Laurier's Win-the-War policy as, "No more men, no more money."

But the Pharisee in the temple of Patriotism wears his broadest phylacteries when he descants upon the attitude of Quebec. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has stated repeatedly that he is in this War to the end. The greatest of all Canadians, he is also the distinguished son of Quebec who has spent a lifetime in building up the foundations of national unity in a land which is destined to be ruled by two dominant races. Sir Clifford professes to fear for the Allied cause should Sir Wilfrid be returned to power at the next election. "There will be no conscription in Quebec; there will be no recruiting in Quebec," he declares should Laurier be Premier. Even were this true, it could not be worse and might be a good deal better, than it has proved under the Borden administration. "Imagine," says Sir Clifford, "a Laurier Government trying to raise troops in the other provinces while Quebec scornfully

From the glorious hill-top gardens of sunny Ceylon comes

'SALADA'

with all the fragrance and freshness of the Eastern breezes clearly apparent in every cup. Always the same—delicious.

refuses either to submit to conscription or to recruit." Why does Sir Clifford so deliberately cloud the issues? Who is responsible for conditions in Quebec? Laurier has not been in power since the war broke out. How then can he be held responsible for the alleged failure of Quebec? Did not Sir Clifford join hands with Bourassa in 1911 when the cry of the Nationalists of Quebec was "No aid for Britain in her Wars!" At the very time that Sir Herbert Ames was spending Conservative campaign funds for the dissemination of Bourassa's anti-British doctrines he was in daily consultation with Sir Clifford. If Quebec has failed in this War, the fault lies with Sir Clifford as much as with Borden and Bourassa. Sir Clifford will not be allowed to cover up his 1911 campaign tracks by unfounded insinuations against Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The people of Canada do not trust the man who does not play the game.

Sir Clifford is seen in his true light as the apologist of the Borden Government. When he talks of the only alternative to the Borden War policy as the abandonment of the men at the front he insults the intelligence of the electors of Canada.

The Clifford Sifton creed is not the one to inspire a Win-the-War movement. He, like the Borden conscriptionists, preach a strange doctrine in the fiftieth year of Confederation. In 1911 he resisted the demand of the Western farmers for freedom of trade, while conserving to the Allisons and other profiteers freedom to extort millions from the people of Canada as well as from the Allies. He denies the right of the people of Canada to be consulted but reserves to himself and to the conscriptionists the right to dictate to the House, the Senate and the Government as to how the war is to be conducted. It is only thus a Clifford Sifton could come to the top in Canada—where the people are not allowed a say in the most momentous decisions that can affect the destiny of a people, and where the men who have grown rich in time of war claim to be the only true patriots.

SPEECH OF THE RIGHT HONORABLE SIR WILFRED LAURIER, ON THE THIRD READING OF THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

Delivered in the House of Commons on Tuesday, July 24th, 1917.

Principle should be referred to the People.

Right Hon. SIR WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the speeches to which the House has just listened, especially the speech of the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), with whom I have been associated for so many years, I crave no indulgence, though I may rise to fruitless effort, for placing once more before the House the dangers which in my judgment must follow if the Bill now before us is enacted and put into operation.

On the second reading of this Bill, as the House recollects, I moved that the principle of it should be referred to the people. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who spoke immediately afterward on behalf of the Government, characterized this amendment as a miserable, dilatory motion. That it was a dilatory motion I do not dispute; I asked that the House should pause before imposing such a measure upon the people. Whether or not it was a miserable expedient, time alone can tell—nay, time has already told. It required but a few weeks to get the answer. That answer is already written, not upon the walls of this hall, in flaming and mysterious letters, to be explained only by a seer, but in very plain language in the records of this House, in the division upon the second reading, and even in the spectacle which is offered every day in the division of opinion that exists among both parties upon this question. The reason which I urged against this Bill was that, presented as it was, after the numerous statements which had been made by the Prime Minister and the Government that compulsion would not be resorted to; that to the very last we would win the war on the voluntary principle, if this Bill were forced upon the people by a moribund Parliament, division, irritation, friction, and disunion would follow.

Government introduced Conscription measure without making preparation.

Already we have the verification of my statement, even before this Bill has left this House. The statement which I made was combatted by many hon. members on both sides of the House, and by none more vigorously than by the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), who spoke after the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The Solicitor General took the ground that no such disunion would follow from the intentions of the Government, which were to be found within the four corners of the Bill, and which were to get more soldiers to fill the ranks of our army. As to the intention of the Government, I do not purpose entering in to any discussion here and now. If there be those who have affirmed—and there are some—that the intention of the Government was more to win the elections rather than to win the war, on such a statement I do not offer any reflection at all. and I do not purpose entering into any discussion at the present time in regard to it. If there be those who contend that this measure was forced upon the Government by the jingoes and the ultra-Imperialists, who, not only in this country, but in all British countries, have tried to force upon those countries the continental military system of Europe, I have no intention of entering into any discussion in regard to that. To those who, like the Solicitor General, affirm that the intentions of the Government are to be found within the four corners of the Bill, I have only this observation to offer: That I accept the statement as it was made, but the attitude and the conduct of the Government showed a singular lack of foresight and forethought. I charge against the Government, in introducing this measure as they did, without any more preparation than they made, and upon their declaration, maintained since the first day of the war that there would be no compulsion, and that they would continue the voluntary system; that to precipitate this Bill as it has been precipitated upon the people certainly showed that no calculation had been

made as to what would be its effect, and although its intentions were not sinister, the results were sinister, and in this House and in this country, more violent speeches have been made than were ever before heard. The Solicitor General spoke very confidently as to the results of the Bill—more confidently, perhaps, than he felt. He stated that he had no doubt that the Bill, when it was studied by the people, would produce no bad effects. Perhaps I had better read this language. He said:

I am as confident as I have ever been of anything in my life that if the members of this House, reading and studying this Bill, and hearing this debate, will go to their constituents and tell them the meaning, purpose and spirit of this Bill there will be no possibility whatever of discord or resistance.

Explanations were lacking.

This was very easily said. Whence comes this assurance of my hon. friend? Would he speak to-day with the same assurance? I have no doubt that he did what he said should be done, namely, that he studied the Bill; that he explained it to his followers; that he showed them there was nothing in it to which they could take exception. How do I know that he did that? He would have been recreant to his office, to his duty and to his self respect, if he had not attempted to explain this Bill to his followers and to show that there was nothing in it to which exception could be taken. But he failed, as anybody must fail who had to give the same explanation. I followed the speech of the Solicitor General with more than usual attention. It was, as customary with him, a closely knit argument. Still, I thought the tone of his speech was not free from anxiety and doubt. There was a passage in particular which struck me very forcibly. I do not know what effect it had on the other members of the House who listened to it. He said:

We are told this action will result in disunion. I see no reason why it should produce disunion. It should not produce it. It is framed to avoid disunion. Let no man deceive himself. We do not avoid disunion by dropping back to where we were, any more than we avoid disunion by going ahead with this measure. I see no more peril in the one course than in the other.

The Apple of Discord.

This is a singular confession of impotence. Mark the words. There is peril behind and in front whether this measure is proceeded with or not. That confirms what I said a moment ago, namely, that the Government was singularly deficient in foresight and forethought when it introduced such a measure without calculating the effects as they were calculated by the Solicitor General.

But the Bill is before us at the present time, and we have to deal with it. The apple of discord has been thrown into this assembly and already the assembly is divided on it. It is nothing new in Parliamentary history for a Government when it introduces a new measure, to find itself deserted by its followers or its friends. That has happened in this country; it has happened in all countries where there are parliaments. It is, however, something which is very unusual when a measure is introduced which creates division, not only in the one party, but in the two parties at the same time. Why should I be blind to what has happened? I have already heard three of my friends take exception to the course which I have taken as the leader of the party. I find myself on the present occasion estranged from friends who were just as near and dear to me as any of my own brothers. I need not tell the House—every one will believe me—that such an estrangement, even if it be only temporary and upon this question alone, is a wrench

at one's very heart strings; but every one of my hon. friends knows that I have not tried to impose my views upon any of my followers. I respect their consciences; I would not attempt to bring any one of them around to my way of thinking. I have my conscience and they have theirs; but this situation shows that we are face to face with a cleavage which, unless it is checked, may rend and tear this Canada of ours down to the very roots.

A Coercion Measure.

Such is the situation and no one can be blind to it. If there are in this House men who affect to be impervious to the situation, to be careless about it, I am not one of them. If I may give a personal allusion, this is a matter which has caused me a great deal of anxiety within the past two weeks. But what is the use of lamenting over a situation? We must face the situation like men. What is the attitude of the Government with regard to the situation? How are they purposing to settle it? We have had the answer from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), when he rose after me to answer my speech on that occasion. The answer is simply these words of my right hon. friend:

What we propose is to do, in the light of the experience and knowledge that we have, our plain duty, and let the people pass their verdict as they choose later, or by history. At least we will stand as not having been afraid.

Conciliation better than Coercion.

That is the only position which is to be taken by the Government. They will carry this measure by coercion, let the consequences be what they may. This attitude of coercion and this disregard of the consequences which may follow, coming from friends of mine on the other side, grounded in Toryism, do not surprise me, but I am more surprised when friends of mine, Liberals brought up in the old days of the Liberal school in which I myself have been brought up, take no more concern upon this question than is taken on the other side. May I call attention to the attitude of my good friend the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who, speaking upon this very subject said:

He, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, has referred to another question which I will discuss very, very briefly; that is that this Parliament is in the nature of a moribund parliament, or, as he described it, a rump parliament, his contention being that on that ground this House should not deal with it.

I do not take that view of the matter. My view is that this Parliament is in every respect legally constituted.

There is no doubt at all that this Parliament is legally constituted, and so long as it is not dissolved, either by the effluxion of time or by the decree of the Governor General, it can pass this law and many other laws equally nefarious and equally dangerous to the Canadian people. But that is not the point I wish to bring before the House.

It is not a question of legality or illegality, but a question of policy. Is it wise, is it prudent, is it good statesmanship to force on the Canadian people at the present time such a measure as is now before the House? Upon this point I have simply to say to my hon. friend, who was brought up in the same school as I was, that again and again, not only in England but in every other country under British institutions, and particularly in Canada, Parliament has been dissolved for the purpose of consulting the people on a measure which it had the power to pass. The last instance I recall is the reciprocity question, on which we went to the country six years ago. We could have passed that law, for we had a majority behind us, but we preferred to submit it to the people and for my part I am prouder to be standing here defeated by the will of the people than I should be if I had denied to the people the right to have their way upon this question.

Government went blindly into the War.

All through my long parliamentary career my object has been to try and convince. But where I could not convince I would not coerce. The attitude of the Govern-

ment upon this question is simply that we must have more soldiers at the front. A letter has been read from General Currie, commanding our forces in France, asking for more soldiers. There is nothing new in that. I do not know of the general who, now or at any other time in history, did not ask for more soldiers. I say to my hon. friend from Assiniboia, I say from the bottom of my heart, that I stand on the same platform to-day that I have stood on from the very first day of this war; my conviction is still the same. I wish that we could send more soldiers to General Currie. I wish that our population and our resources would allow of our sending not only half a million but a million men. But the question is how many men can we take from the life of the nation at the present time without imperilling the public services which are essential to this country, and essential to carrying on our share of the war. This is a subject which, in my humble opinion, has not been sufficiently considered by the Government. They went into this war without any previous calculation whatever, without taking any census of our resources in men and in other respects. They asked for 100,000 men, 200,000 men, 300,000 men, 400,000 men, and, at last, for 500,000 men. When they reached the 500,000 figure they were told by several people that they could not get the men. One of the most important captains of industry in this country, Lord Shaughnessy, expressed his opinion in no uncertain terms, that the men could not be got without injury to the public services. But the Government paid no heed to that. They paid no heed to the other consideration, that it is not only men the Allies require at the present time, but food. They paid no heed to the question whether the men could not be better employed in producing food in Canada than in fighting at the front.

The Weak Point.

It is manifest that the campaign of 1917 will not materialize as we had hoped. We had expected that the offensive of this year would be effective. We had supposed that an offensive would take place on all the fronts, especially on the Western front, where we expected the Allies would pierce the German line, and roll it back to the Rhine. I have no doubt these plans were laid, and if they could have been carried out the effect would have been as I have stated. Unfortunately, events in Russia materially interfered with the plans, and enabled Germany to transfer thousands of men from the Russian front to the western front, with the result that the Allied offensive was checked. But there is some comfort to be found in the situation. There is one good omen, it seems to me. The strategy of the German staff in this war has been to strike wherever they thought there was a weak spot in the Allied line. They would throw an overwhelming force upon that point, with the object of breaking down resistance, and pushing into the Allied territory as far as possible, and then they would entrench. Such has been their strategy since the beginning of the war. At the very opening of the war Germany attacked Belgium, in the face of the treaty which she had herself signed, because she knew that by attacking France through Belgium she could break through the French frontier at its weakest point. The same thing happened in Roumania. Instead of protecting their own frontier, the Germans invaded Transylvania and at once penetrated Roumania, and Germans have remained in possession of it ever since. As I said, there is some comfort to be found in the war situation. When the Russian revolution took place everybody expected that the Germans would begin their much-talked-of offensive to Petrograd. The fact that it has not taken place is simply an evidence that the Germans did not have the men. Their resources in men are beginning to fail. It is an evidence that the policy of attrition which was inaugurated by the Allies in 1914, after the battle of the Marne, is commencing to tell. And if the German forces are being depleted it is due almost altogether to the British navy, which day in and day out, at all times and at all seasons, has brought pressure to bear upon the German Empire by its blockade in the North Sea. The Germans have countered by submarine warfare and have brought about a very serious position, perhaps

the most serious of the war, but there is this comfort in it: It seems to me that already the effort of Germany in this respect has failed. They expected to achieve their object by submarine warfare within four or five months, but we all know that that object has not been achieved. But there is, however, a heavy toll to pay, and the duty has been imposed upon the Canadian people to produce more than we have ever done, because we have not only to send food to feed the people of England but also to make up for the food that week by week is being sent to the bottom of the sea. But all these considerations seem to have been of no consequence to the Government. The Government seem to have paid no attention to them. Their energy has been employed in the last few weeks upon this new policy of compulsion. The genesis of this new policy still remains obscure.

Why from Voluntary to Compulsory Service?

It never was sufficiently explained, it never was explained at all, how, from one day to the other, the Government changed their attitude from voluntary to compulsory service. But, upon this point, at all events, if we do not know what the genesis was unfortunately, we know what have been the results and the results have been to impress many classes in the community with a sense of deception; that is with a realization that they have been deceived by the Government.

I contrast the action of the Government with the action of President Wilson. When President Wilson had made up his mind that war with Germany was inevitable, what did he do? He did not launch his policy upon the people but he consulted almost every class of the community. He consulted his opponents of the Republican party, he consulted the great Democratic party, he consulted the churches, he had their assistance, he consulted the American citizens of German origin, and the consequence was that the day that he put his policy before the people every American citizen was behind him. Has that been the policy of the present Government? How did they manage this matter? They have consulted no one outside of their own Cabinet. One of the first bodies that they should have consulted was the labour party. They did not consult the labour party—far from it. The labour party came to the Government and we have it on the statement of one of the most prominent members of that organization that it has been deceived by the Government. On the 15th June Mr. J. C. Watters, President of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, made this statement:

Up till the time the Prime Minister left for London we had repeated assurances that conscription was not contemplated by the Government. On the 27th of December last while discussing with him the registration scheme of the National Service Board, he stated, in connection with the adoption of conscription, in the hearing of Vice-Presidents Simpson and Rigg, Secretary Draper and myself that he would consider it his duty to consult organized labour before undertaking to act on a matter of such grave importance.

The first intimation I had was in the daily press and no official of our Congress was consulted.

We were not consulted, but the Congress executive sought an interview with the Prime Minister after his pronouncement on May 18 last to learn his reasons for his changed attitude. There was not the shadow of a reason revealed at the interview to warrant a change from voluntary to compulsory service. On the contrary, the statements made by the Prime Minister, taken in conjunction with the information I gleaned while in Washington the week previous, all went to demonstrate that the need of the hour was not men at the front so much as food for the people in our Motherland, France and Italy, the means of transportation of the same by overcoming the submarine menace, and the manufacturing of all war supplies and building of ships.

Here is a direct statement that the labour people were deceived as a result of the announcement of their policy by the Government.

The National Service Cards.

But, that is not all. When the Government intro-

duced the system of national service, for which they issued their cards, it was thought that these cards might be considered as being perhaps the first move towards conscription. In this connection they sought the assistance of the church. I do not know whether they consulted other high dignitaries of the church but I do know that they consulted a high dignitary of the church in Montreal. I do not know what passed between him and the ministers who interviewed him, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin), but the impression was conveyed to this high dignitary that there would be no conscription. The Minister of Justice stated the other day that he had made no promise. Of course, I accept his statement. He made no promise but whether he made any promise or not to the high dignitary when seeking to obtain his assistance, the impression that he left on the mind of this high dignitary was that there would be no conscription. I grant that my hon. friend may have made no promise but that was the impression left on the mind of the gentleman whose assistance it was important for him to secure. But, my hon. friend said, in addition, that even if he had made a promise, and even if at that time conscription were not intended under the changed conditions of things it now had to be resorted to. I ask my hon. friend in what way has the condition changed at all? The condition was the same last fall as it is to-day. Last fall we had men at the front just as we have to-day. My hon. friend knows that when we send men to war it is to face death and that there must be a depletion in the ranks. My hon. friend knew that as well last fall as he knows it to-day, but it never came to his mind to have the ranks replenished in any other way than by the voluntary system. So, here is a high dignitary of the church who has been deceived in this matter.

Conscription Not Contemplated.

But, is it not a fact that when last year we, in this House, granted an extension of Parliament for one year, we had in our ears the solemn statement made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, that under no circumstances would there be any deviation from the voluntary system? But, we are told, and it is the whole basis of this Bill, that voluntary enlistment has failed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I must take exception to my right hon. friend's quotation. I do not think that I put it in the way he suggests.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend stated, if he stated anything, that conscription was not contemplated.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, exactly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I asked him at the time what was the meaning of this 500,000 promise, I wanted to have a plain answer, and my hon. friend answered that conscription was not contemplated. We had his statement in our ears, when we granted this extension, that conscription was not contemplated, and yet within twelve months it was executed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I must take exception again. My right hon. friend's chronology is very defective.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In what respect?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The statement was made in January, 1916, if I remember correctly. My right hon. friend states that conscription was announced within twelve months.

Voluntary Recruiting has not Failed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Well, that would be only four months longer. The fact remains that the Prime Minister asked this Parliament to grant an extension which was a twelve months' extension, and during these twelve months he brought in a Bill which he said would not be introduced. The statement made to-day in justification of this measure is that recruiting has failed. Recruiting has not failed, but recruiting has decreased, I admit. If recruiting has decreased the fault and blame lie at the door of the gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches. I make that statement and I make it advisedly. We have had in this House, during this present session, recriminations and recriminations and differen-

ces between the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) as to what has taken place in regard to recruiting. The ex-Minister of Militia complained that he had been interfered with in his recruiting. He stated in one speech, and he repeated it here, that if recruiting had decreased, it was because his work had been interfered with by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance. There is no doubt about that. That is a statement that everybody has heard. Explanations or excuses have been from time to time offered. It may be true that the minister was never actually stopped in his recruiting, but he was told how not to recruit. He was told: Do not go to this part of the country, do not go to that part of the country, do not go amongst manufacturers, do not do this, do not do that, and the result was that, being interfered with, the work stopped, and, of course, recruiting failed.

You will remember, Sir, the famous chapter in one of Charles Dickens' works as to the effect of the circumlocution office. It is an exact description of what is taking place with this Government. Charles Dickens somewhere says, speaking of what he called the circumlocution office:

The circumlocution office was (as everybody knows without being told) the most important department under Government. No public business of any kind could possibly be done at any time without the acquiescence of this circumlocution office. Its finger was in the largest public pie and in the smallest public tart. Whatever was required to be done, the circumlocution office was beforehand with all the public departments, in the art of perceiving how not to do it.

The Fault of the Government.

That is the case with my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes); he was told how not to do it; he was balked at every step, and here we have the consequence. When the Government places as the basis of this Bill the fact that there has been no recruiting for some time past, they do not impugn anybody but themselves, and they show up their own delinquencies. But, Sir, after all here is the Bill, as I said a moment ago, and we have it before us. The strongest indictment which was made against this Bill, in my humble judgment, was made by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in a speech which he delivered a few weeks ago. He said that this Bill, if it became law, could not be carried out unless it were by the joint effort of a union government. What does this mean? If it means anything it means that the sentiment against this Bill is so strong, is so rooted in all parts of the community, that the Bill is such a departure from the traditions of the past, that it requires the efforts of the two political parties to put it into operation. If that be true, and if this measure was unavoidable, it should have come in, not as the measure of a party government, but as the measure of a coalition government.

Coalition.

I may be told that I was asked, and my friend from South Wellington may have had it in his mind that I was asked, to be a party to a coalition government. Sir, I was asked to form part of a coalition government when the policy had been framed, when the Bill had been prepared as a party measure, by a party government; and when it had been framed, deliberated on in council, determined upon, and launched before the public. When the Government could not retrace their steps, my poor assistance, such as it might have been, was sought. If, Sir, the Government had been in earnest, they would have consulted me before they determined on their measure. But they did not consult me, they did not ask my opinion upon conscription; they did not ask me what would be my opinion upon its possibilities, its results, and its dangers; they did not ask me to discuss with them the situation, against which they were determined to close their eyes; but when they had concocted

a measure, then they were kind enough to ask me to carry on what they had devised in their wisdom. As in the play of children, they asked me: close your eyes and open your mouth and swallow. I refused.

Sir, some of my friends have reminded me, some of my Liberal friends have reminded me, that George Brown once entered into a coalition Government. He did, and under such circumstances nobody would blame him. In those days, party government in Canada had come to a deadlock. The powerful agitation of George Brown, asking for representation by population, had depleted the majority of the Conservative party until there was a deadlock between the two parties. Then mutual friends asked that George Brown should enter into a coalition. He asked the basis of it, and when representation by population was granted, which had been refused up to that time by John A. Macdonald, when the principle of union of the provinces had also been granted, which also had been refused by Macdonald, he then entered into a coalition. But, Sir, I was not approached in the same way. I have my views upon conscription. They have not changed. It is not a pleasure for me to find myself at variance with so many of the friends I have around me; but I thought and still believe that a measure of conscription, under the circumstances, was an apple of discord, and I could not accept it. That is all I have to say upon that point.

The Referendum Policy.

But I may be asked: what is your policy; it is not sufficient for the Opposition to say "nay" to any proposition, what is your policy? Sir, I laid my policy before Parliament upon the second reading of the Bill. I asked that a referendum should be had and the judgment of the people taken upon this question. I have not the merit of this policy; it did not originate with me; it was not my own device. Sir, it was asked by the whole organized body of labour in the Dominion of Canada. We are familiar with the strong resolutions which have been placed upon the table of this House, passed by the central labour organizations. Every member of this House, I would venture to say, at all events, the large majority of the members of this House, I am sure, have received from labour organizations within their ridings, petitions, resolutions and communications to that effect. I have received them by the bushel. They are there, before the House, and, Sir, under such circumstances I say I have no merit in having proposed that policy. That policy would have given us peace, harmony, and concord, which to-day are in much danger. Objections were made to it, and what were the objections? The objections were that this policy of a referendum should not be granted because, forsooth, the soldiers could not vote. Well, Sir, we passed a law two years ago to give the franchise to the soldiers, and by the same measure we established machinery to give facilities to the soldiers to express their views. Are we to be told that this law is a mere scrap of paper, that it is a mere dead letter, that it cannot be put into execution? Why, Sir, are we to be told that those who two years ago were so insistent upon passing this law intended it only as clap trap. If, Sir, when this measure was proposed, we on this side of the House had opposed it, and if we had defeated it, the welkin would have rung and would be still ringing with denunciation against those who had deprived the soldiers of the sacred right to vote. We did not oppose it; the law is there, and when we are told that the law cannot be put into force upon a referendum or an election, when we have given the right of voting to the soldiers, hon. members are simply playing with the common sense of the country when they advance such an argument.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL: Is the right hon. member aware that the Act to which he is referring provides only that soldiers shall have votes in elections and not on a referendum?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes, I am aware of that. I am aware also that the Parliament which gave them power to vote in elections could give them power to vote on a referendum. The difficulty is not serious.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL: Parliament has not done so;

the Act is confined to elections.

The Soldier Vote.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If there is to be a referendum, the law would have to be passed by this Parliament and this Parliament could as easily give a vote to the soldiers on a referendum as on an election, and I would be the first to vote for it, and, I suppose, so would my hon. friend. The objection that a soldier could not vote on a referendum has no weight. It would imply that this Parliament refused him the right to vote, and nobody would suppose that. Moreover, as I said a moment ago, in Australia there have been both an election and a referendum upon this very question of conscription, and the soldiers voted upon both issues. That I do not know personally, but I am told it, and I have reason to believe it is true. More than that; in British Columbia there has been an election and there has been a referendum on the question of prohibition, and the soldiers voted on the referendum and in the election also. Are we to be told that what can be done in British Columbia, Australia and New Zealand cannot be done in Canada? To state such a proposition is simply to refute it. Furthermore, to-day I heard my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) tell us that he was against referendum because he was sure it would not carry. In other words, he said that a referendum would be defeated. Well, Sir, I ask, is that a reason why a referendum should not be taken? Again I ask: Where are we living now? Is it Canada, or is it Prussia?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

A Government of the People, for the People, and by the People.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We want no more hypocrisy. If that is the position, no more can it be said that we are fighting to maintain the government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Sir, we have a vast country composed of different nationalities, brought here by the force of circumstances. We have opened our doors to all the working people of Europe to come here and help us build up this country, to develop it and bring it up to the standard we hope it will attain some day, and are we to be told that in this year 1917 we are going to deny a vote to the men whom we have made British subjects under the law? That is not British policy. It is the policy of Paul Kruger, the very policy which started the war in South Africa. When Kruger, after inviting British subjects to come and live in that country, denied them the privileges he promised them, and after giving them the privileges of citizenship, took away their right by an Act of Parliament, the war ensued. For my part, I do not believe in such doctrine as that. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said a few minutes ago that, if there was to be a referendum, the whole of the French province would vote against it; the foreign voter would be against it, and the slacker would be against it. I do not want, in this country, to hear of any such division. I stand upon the broad line of Canadian citizenship.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I know very well that the same feeling does not appeal to all Canadians. I know that the majority of French-Canadians have a certain way of looking at these things. I know that English-Canadians look at them in another way, but when you tell me that all French-Canadians are on one side, and all English-Canadians are on the other side, I do not believe one statement or the other. It has been said that all the French-Canadians are on one side and all the English-Canadians are on the other side, and if that be so the English-Canadians are more numerous, and they would carry the vote. It is not by such appeals as this that we can hope to settle this vexed question. It is simply by appealing to the better instincts of the people, and for my part I hope that the day will never come

and I am sure it will never come—that I shall appeal either to the prejudices of one man or to the prejudices of another.

One Policy only for Ontario and Quebec.

Referring to the position which I have taken upon the floor of this House on this question, if I cannot defend it in Ontario as well as in Quebec, I want to lose my name as a French-Canadian citizen, as an English-Canadian citizen, and as a Canadian. I am prepared to defend my policy. I may be right or I may be wrong, but at all events I am sincere in my belief, and when a man speaks the voice of his conscience, there is no part of Canada where he should fear to state his views. I have been told that there is no constructive feature in the policy of a referendum. On the contrary, I say it is the most constructive policy which has yet been presented in this debate. I do not know how the vote will go. I have taken my pledge, and I repeat it again to-day with more fervour than before, that if the vote had gone for conscription the verdict would be accepted in every part of Canada, even in the province of Quebec, where it has been said it would not be accepted. When the people had spoken my way of a referendum, I believe that those who voted against it would, had it been carried, come forward to do their duty and uphold the law. If it were defeated, a duty would be imposed on all, and there would be a new basis, and new appeal to the whole people of Canada to lend their best endeavours in the defence of a noble cause. But my hon. friend said that the minority must govern sometimes. I do not admit that proposition at all. If you admitted the policy that the minority could govern, you could say goodbye to representative institutions. My hon. friend was very badly advised when he referred to the referendum on prohibition in 1898. Let the hon. gentleman look at Hansard. I have not looked at it for twenty years, but he will find that the Government stated they they would not be satisfied with a bare majority, even if prohibition were endorsed, unless there was behind it such a body of public opinion as would insure its success. But when we found that prohibition had been carried by a vote of only 10,000 out of more than half a million, we thought we were not justified in putting it in force. I have been asked as to what my policy is. I may say that it is the same as it has been from the first. I am in this war to the finish.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am in this war under the voluntary system to the last. I am in this war as Australia is in it to-day. Australia voted against conscription but still she is in the war. I am sorry that on an occasion of this kind I cannot see eye to eye with my hon. friends on the other side. I do not want to speak severely of anybody. I do not want to introduce any bitterness that it is possible to avoid. I respect the convictions of all men, and I hope my own convictions will be respected.

In the position that I occupy on this side of the House, I am part and parcel of the machinery of the Government, and up to the 18th May no man occupying a position similar to that which I occupied, in any country, whether in England, France, New Zealand, or South Africa, gave to the Government a more consistent support than I gave them. But when the conscription measure was proposed I had to oppose it, and why? Because, presented as it had been presented, before the country, it had been made an instrument of coercion.

It is a denial of those principles of democracy which we hold dear and sacred. I oppose this Bill because it has in it the seeds of discord and disunion; because it is an obstacle and a bar to that union of heart and soul without which it is impossible to hope that this Confederation will attain the aims and ends that were had in view when Confederation was effected. Sir, all my life I have fought coercion; all my life I have promoted union; and the inspiration which led me to that course shall be my guide at all times, so long as there is a breath left in my body.

LEGAL, PROFESSIONAL AND BUSINESS CARDS.

The rate for these cards for one-half inch space is as follows:

For one insertion \$ 1.25
 For 3 consecutive insertions..... 3.50
 For 12 consecutive insertions.... 12.00
 A corresponding rate for double or triple space.

All cards appearing in the English edition automatically appear in the French, without extra charge.

MONTREAL

JACOBS, COUTURE & FITCH

Advocates

Barristers & Solicitors

W. Jacobs, K.C. G. C. Papineau-Couture
 L. Fitch

Power Building

83 Craig Street West. Montreal, Que.

GAUTHIER & BEAUREGARD

Advocates

Rooms 412 and 413 Power Bldg.

Montreal, Que.

L. J. Gauthier K.C., M.P., L. E. Beauregard K.C.

GEOFFRION, GEOFFRION & CUSSON

Advocates

97 St. James St. Montreal, Que.

HORMISDAS PELLETIER K.C.

Lawyer

99 St. James St. Montreal, Que.

PELLETIER, LETOURNEAU, BEAULIEU & MERCIER

Advocates

30 St. James St. Montreal, Que.

LIGHTHALL & HARWOOD

Barristers & Solicitors

W. D. Lighthall, K.C. C. A. Harwood, K.C.

304-307 Montreal Trust Bldg.

Montreal, Que.

RENE CHENEVERT

Attorney at Law

Bank of Ottawa Building

222 St. James St. Montreal, Que.

J. H. DILLON

Advocate, Barrister and Solicitor

415 Merchants Bank Building

205 St. James Street Montreal, Que.

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.

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

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

OTTAWA

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

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

AUGUSTE LEMIEUX, K.C.
 Barrister & Solicitor. (Ontario & Quebec)
 "Plaza" Building, Ottawa, Ont.
 Supreme and Eschequer Court and
 Departmental Agent

PERKINS, FRASER & McCORMICK
 Barristers, Solicitors, etc.
 Parliamentary Agents Ottawa, Ont.

McLAURIN, MILLAR & KENNEDY
 Barristers, Solicitors, Notaries, Etc.
 19 Elgin St. Ottawa, Ont.
 Ges. McLaurin LL.B. Haldane Millar
 D. Ray Kennedy

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

TORONTO

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

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. Smily
 Traders Bank Bldg. Toronto, Ont.

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

MANITOBA

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

SASKATCHEWAN

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

ALBERTA.

J. W. WYATT
 Ranching and Farm Lands,
 Jarrow, Alberta.

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

BUSINESS CARDS

PROVOST & ALLARD
 Wholesale Grocers
 45 to 47 Clarence St., Ottawa
 Agents for
 "SALADA TEA" and "HEINTZ 57"
MOYNEUR, LIMITED
 Produce Merchants
 12-14 York St. Ottawa, Ont.

WOMENS' LIBERAL CLUBS.

ON June 15th, 1917, a Womens' Liberal Club was organized in the city of London, Ont. The meeting was most enthusiastic.

Immediately after the election of officers Mrs. C. A. Whitman of Toronto delivered an address and particularly dwelt upon the broad welfare program of the Ontario Women's Liberal Association which included: education of women for citizenship, establishment of juvenile and womens' courts, betterment of laws affecting women and children, moral reform, public health and Mothers' pensions.

Others who spoke were the newly elected President, Mrs. J. M. McEvoy and Mrs. Adam Ballantyne and Mrs. Percival Foster of Toronto.

Womens' Liberal Clubs have also been organized

at Owen Sound and St. Mary's, Ont. and other clubs will be formed in the near future.

CANADA MAY FACE ACTUAL WANT IN FOOD PRODUCTS WITHIN NEXT TWELVE MONTHS.

"Are you sure we shall not be faced by actual want in another twelve months? Do you realize that the next twelve months will see the greatest strain on food in relation to human needs that the world has ever seen?"

(Extract of Speech of Sir George Foster, in Russell Theatre, Ottawa, July 31st, 1917)

SOMETHING NEW THE LIBERAL WEEKLY

A weekly publication issued by the Central Liberal Information Office under the direction of the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier will we hope be an accomplished fact in a few days.

WILL YOU SUBSCRIBE ?

How many subscribers will you secure before September 1st? **Price \$1.00 a year, 25 Cents for 3 months.**

Consider this carefully and let us hear from you by return of mail. Write

Secretary,
Central Liberal Information Office,
Ottawa, Ont.

This "Liberal Weekly" will not interfere in any way with "The Canadian Liberal Monthly" which will continue to be published as usual. The Liberal Weekly, as the name implies, will be circulated weekly.

LABOUR SCARCE.

"All the way from the Rocky Mountains to the St. Lawrence River the need for harvest help is acute. The Government of Ontario has opened up Labour Bureaus in various centres in that Province. Help there is needed at once. Through the press the requirements of Western Canada will be made known as soon as the Provincial authorities of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta are able to estimate the volume of labour needed."

(Extract from letter of July 19th, 1917, sent out by the National Service Board, Ottawa, Ont).

MORE LABOUR WANTED, SAYS FOOD CONTROLLER, MR. HANNA.

Speaking in Toronto at a meeting of manufacturers, Mr. Hanna, on Thursday, August 2nd, made the following statement:

"We don't want to say 'must' if you will get the men to the farms. It is imperative that every ounce of the crops shall be saved. In order to accomplish this I am appealing to every employer of labour to release all the men possible without detracting from the immediate work of war. The Government desires to avoid compulsion, if it is possible to obtain the services of 10,000 men voluntarily."

PREMIER HEARST OF ONTARIO ASKS FOR 10,000 MEN FOR THE HARVEST FIELDS.

In a half page advertisement signed by Premier Hearst and appearing on Tuesday, August 7th, in nearly every newspaper in Ontario, the following

are extracts from an appeal made to the men of Ontario:

"Three months ago, in order to avert Famine and World Hunger, the farmers of Ontario were urged to save every possible acre."

"We have applications on hand for over two thousand men, and thousands more are needed if the harvest is to be fully saved."

"The actual need for men exists to-day, and will continue to exist until the last sheaf of wheat and barley and oats is under cover."

"As Prime Minister of Ontario, I call upon Employers to make it easy for their Employees to assist, and upon employees to face the obligation of the hour in a Spirit of Service and Loyalty."

"I confidently call upon every Industrial Centre of Ontario to organize at once to secure the ten thousand men who are needed."

JUST OUT.

Vol. IV of the Canadian Liberal Monthly.

The Fourth Bound Volume of the Canadian Liberal Monthly, (September, 1916, to September, 1917), is completed and will be ready for distribution on August 20th. Price, 50c.

Sets of Volumes I, II, III (Sept. 1913 to 1916) are available which with Volume IV, make a most attractive addition to a library.

Price 50c. a volume or the four volumes for \$2.00. The political history of Canada for the last four years is contained in these four volumes.

Apply Canadian Liberal Monthly,
Ottawa, Ont.