

THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY

VOL IV. No 6.

OTTAWA, FEBRUARY, 1917.

TWO CENTS

HANDICAPPED



ERT
y.
ERT
n in
RS.
own.
SIR
lect
ON.
ER
I.P.
erial
in
.C.,
real
to.
RT
.P.
SIR
RT
T.
RT
rs.
RT
N.
vn.
ed

THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY

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

PRICE 25c A YEAR

THE NON-DELIVERY OF THE LIBERAL MONTHLY.

For months past not a little evidence has come to the attention of the office of the Canadian Liberal Monthly that copies of the Liberal Monthly were not being regularly received by the subscribers.

Investigation shows that in practically every case a copy was mailed each month from this office. A publication the size of the Canadian Liberal Monthly can easily be lost in the mail but when month after month subscribers fail to receive their copy one concludes that "accidentally lost" is not the real reason why many copies addressed are not reaching their destination.

Information has reached this office that in some post-offices in Canada the names of the subscribers of the Liberal Monthly are being tabulated with a view of ascertaining who is subscribing for this publication. We have no objection to these names being thus tabulated but we trust that the Postmasters will promptly forward the copies to the subscribers.

Any subscriber failing to receive his copy each month should immediately notify this office when a complaint will be lodged in the Post Office Department.

EMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES.

In speaking before the Independent Order of the Daughters of the Empire concert in the Regent Theatre, Sunday afternoon, January 28th, Hon. Arthur Meighen, Solicitor-General of the Borden government made the following statement:—

"The fellow who gets out when his country is in danger, the fellow who will not stay and face the little embarrassments to which he is subjected by the War—that man has the word coward printed on his back in letters of yellow which will never fade."

The emigration of Canadian citizens to the United States is serious. In a subsequent issue of the Canadian Liberal Monthly figures were shown that for six months last summer and Autumn 33,340 male citizens of Canada had gone to the United States. It is now known that during the month of December, 1916 an additional 27,000 of our Canadian male citizens went to the United States. The question arises why are these citizens thus leaving Canada particularly when we require in this country every available man for munition and other work? The only correct answer seems to be that they are going to evade conscription.

It is the duty of the Government to at once declare themselves in regard to conscription. If conscription is to be adopted the people should know. If it is not to be adopted they should also know it and thereby stop this emigration to the United States.

LORD SHAUGHNESSY ON RECRUITING.

ECHOES of a statement made by Lord Shaughnessy, President of the Canadian Pacific Railway and one of the leading business men of Canada, are being constantly heard throughout Canada.

The speech of Lord Shaughnessy referred to, was delivered in the Board of Trade Rooms, Montreal, on March 9th, 1916. The meeting was called at the request of the military authorities and was addressed by General Sir Sam Hughes, Lord Shaughnessy and others.

What Lord Shaughnessy said on that occasion as reported in the Montreal Star, March 10th, 1916, is as follows:—

"I have read almost all of Sir Sam's speeches in Parliament, and basing my opinion on those I am quite sure he never made a mistake.

"I cannot, however, agree with Sir Sam as to his figures. I cannot understand how we could get 70,000 men in Montreal for enlistment without making a draft on the women. And I know some women who might be excellent in the firing line, but who would be impossible from the point of view of military discipline.

"Up to the present time, Canada has done marvellously, but I cannot believe that the suggestion to raise 500,000 men is a practical or practicable suggestion. We have a great many things to do, the manufacture of munitions, agricultural work, we must help feed the British nation, and we have the problems of finance. It is all important that the finances, not only of Great Britain herself but of the component parts of the British Empire should be maintained in all their solidarity.

Urges Less Speed.

"In sending 500,000 men from Canada we would make a draft on the working population of the country that might be severely felt. We must go slowly about our recruiting, and endeavor to carry out whatever may be the best plans for the country in a sane, methodical way.

"There are approximately 70,000 of our troops at the front at the present time, 60,000 in England, and 130,000 under arms in Canada. I know from the state of the ocean transportation situation that it would be impossible to move this army to England for a year or fourteen months at the earliest. Meantime we have this great army, representing a monthly expenditure of ten or twelve million dollars. It might have been better to go slowly and save, say, \$5,000,000 a month.

"I feel with the rest of you that if the time comes we must make any sacrifice whatever, resorting to conscription if necessary. But should we not proceed without enlistment in a somewhat different way, devoting our attention to the units already approaching completion before starting with new units?"

MACHINE GUNS.

Hon. Mr. Kemp, Minister of Militia and Defence informed the House of February 5th, 1917, that the people of Canada since the outbreak of War had subscribed \$1,271,257.04 for the purchase of machine guns.

That \$3, 527,894.86 had been expended by the Dominion Government on machine guns and spare parts since the outbreak of the War and that it was the intention of the Government to credit the amount subscribed by the people of Canada, namely, \$1,271,257.04 to this account.

WAR SAVINGS CERTIFICATES.

THE new War Savings Certificates which have been created by the Government to encourage thrift and economy and to give everyone an opportunity to assist in financing our War expenditure, are now on sale at every bank and money order post office in Canada. The \$25 certificate sells for \$21.50, the \$50 for \$43, and the \$100 for \$86.

As an investment these certificates offer many attractive features—chief of which are the absolute security and the excellent interest return. For every \$21.50 lent to the Government now, \$25 will be returned at the end of three years.

There are two other features which are especially interesting to small investors. First, the certificates may be surrendered at any time, if the buyer should need his money; and second, each certificate is registered at Ottawa in the buyer's name and, if lost or stolen, is therefore valueless to anyone else.

But while they are excellent from an investment standpoint, the certificates should appeal strongly to Canadians because they offer to those who must serve at home a splendid opportunity for a most important patriotic service. The person who honestly saves to the extent of his ability and places his savings at the disposal of the Government by purchasing these certificates, may feel that he is having a direct share in feeding, equipping, and munitioning our Canadian soldiers, who are so nobly doing their part.

A POLITICAL CHARLATAN.

The last act in the Sam Hughes farce comedy was played in Parliament recently when the leading actor successfully swallowed himself. The audience accepting his boastings and vaporings at their face value, had anticipated that the denouement would consist of a pyrotechnical verbal display, but instead they witnessed a discovered Political Charlatan going out into oblivion for all time, with drooping tail feathers and saffron visage. Poor old Sam! We scarcely know whether to pity or condemn him. Perhaps the most charitable construction that can be placed upon his kaleidoscopic political career is that his head became inflated with the greatness that was thrust upon him, and he could not think straight afterwards.

MOTTO OF THE LIBERAL PARTY.

Mr. J. H. Sinclair, M.P. for Guysborough, N.S., in speaking in the House of Commons on January 25th stated:—

“The motto of the Liberal party from the inception of the War has been: millions for the War, but not a dollar for graft. Patronage is bad enough, but there are certain things that are even worse in our circumstances than patronage.”

MUNITION SHOPS.

Mr. J. G. Turriff, M.P. drew attention to an item of extravagant expenditure when delivering a speech in the House of Commons on Friday night, January 26th, 1917. He stated:—

“I see by the press that three new large munition shops are being erected, one near Toronto—I forget at the moment where the other two are. One of them is to cost \$1,750,000, another, \$2,000,000 and the third \$2,250,000, the three shops together costing \$6,000,000. It does not make very much difference whether those shops are being built by the Government or by the Imperial Munitions Board or by the contractors.

“What I charge against the Government is, that while they are permitting the construction of those three munitions shops at a cost of \$6,000,000, which will eventually come out of the pockets of the people of Canada and of Great Britain, they have had standing absolutely idle since the War began railway workshops that are already equipped with all kinds of machinery for making munitions, with the exception possibly of lathes for making the shells and drills for boring them. I venture to say, however, that an expenditure of a quarter of a million dollars would equip them with all the machinery required, and yet this Government have absolutely refused to allow those shops to be used for munition purposes, and they have absolutely refused to use them themselves to make munitions at cost price for Canada, for the Empire, and for our Allies.”

PAID FOR DOING NOTHING.

Notwithstanding the fact that the armouries at Omeme, Ontario (Victoria and Haliburton County) were destroyed by fire some three years ago, the caretaker, Mr. Robert Adams, continues to draw his salary and enjoy the comforts of a Government position. Surely the officers who certify Mr. Adams' pay sheet know that the armouries are no longer in existence.

THE PARTY TRUCE.

The Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in a public statement issued to the Press, on Aug. 4th 1914 stated:

“I have often declared that if the Mother Country were ever in danger, or if danger even threatened, Canada would render assistance to the full extent of her power. In view of the critical nature of the situation, I have cancelled all my meetings. Pending such great questions there should be a truce to party strife.”

To show how the Conservative party adhered to the truce and how little they thought of it, we also quote an extract from a speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. Kemp, now Minister of Militia and Defence, before the Albany Club in Toronto on March 6th, 1915. His reference to the truce is as follows:—

“I want to say that there is no truce between the Liberal-Conservative party and any other party, and never has been. There may have been a truce on some trivial matters, but on the big issues we are prepared for war. We are proud of our principles. Why shouldn't both parties get out and discuss their policies?”

SOME FACTS AS TO THE LIBERAL PROGRAMME.

THE memory of the public in regard to political details is very short. It is the fashion amongst a large portion of the people to talk about the political parties as though there was not much difference between them. The Tory press insists that the Liberals have no policy and that their campaign is merely one of getting into office. A large number of people who plume themselves on being too good to meddle with politics are fain to believe this and when asked to take part in any campaign or organization shield themselves behind the pretence that they don't care which party is in power as it makes no difference to them. It will be well to point out certain points on which the Liberal party have deliberately declared themselves during the present regime.

High Cost of Living.

One of the most absorbing questions to the public now is the high cost of living and the majority of people dwell upon especially the high cost of food in this connection. Let us see just what the difference between the two parties on this question is and let the above mentioned classes in the community digest the facts and see whether it makes no difference to them which party is in power. The Liberal party went out of office in 1911 on an effort to reduce the duties on food through reciprocity with the United States. By the reciprocity agreement Canada was to have free entry into the United States for many food products and these same and other products were to be brought into Canada free from the United States, thus giving the Canadian consumer an opportunity where convenient or better for him to buy imported foods without the additional cost of the duty.

The people of Canada did not see fit to adopt that policy but since that time constant and great increases in the price of food has brought home to them the fact that the cost of food is important to every householder in the country, indeed to everyone who eats, for the boarder and frequenter of restaurants is suffering fully as much as the householder.

The Liberal party have, on various occasions in the House of Commons and outside of it, announced itself in favour of the removal of the duties on food, on all foods and on various kinds of foods in particular.

On November 26th, 1913, Sir Wilfrid Laurier addressed the Liberal Club Federation of Ontario at Hamilton and announced a policy of free food, free from customs duties. These are the words Sir Wilfrid used at that time:—

"The policy I give you at this moment, the policy I believe every patriot in Canada ought to support, and the policy I believe it to be the duty of the Government to immediately inaugurate, is a policy of absolutely free food—free from customs duties."

This general statement has been followed by specific motions in the House of Commons demanding that certain foods should be placed on the free list.

Wheat and Wheat Products.

On January 28th, 1914 Dr. Neely, M.P. for Humbolt (Sask.) moved that:—

"The House regrets that, in the gracious speech with which your Royal Highness has met Parliament, the said speech gives no indication of any intention on the part of your advisers to take any steps to secure free access to the markets of the United States for the wheat and wheat products of Canada, by removing the duty on wheat and wheat products coming into Canada from the United States."

The Conservative members in the House of Commons voted against this motion, while the Liberal members voted for it.

Wheat—Wheat Products, Agricultural Implements and Steps to be taken to alleviate the High Cost of Living.

On April 23rd, 1914, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved:—

"That this House is of opinion that in view of the prevailing economic conditions of the country it is advisable to place wheat, wheat products, and agricultural implements on the free list; and that without doing injustice to any class, steps should be taken to alleviate the high cost of living by considerate removal of taxation."

The Conservative members in the House of Commons voted against this motion, the Liberals voted for it.

Potatoes.

On April 28th, 1914, Mr. Loggie moved:—

"That tariff item No. 83 be amended by adding thereto the following words:

"Provided, however, that potatoes dry, desicated or otherwise prepared, being the growth and production of the United States, shall be admitted free of duty when, and as soon as, the United States removes the embargo regulations now existing against like articles, the growth and production of Canada."

The Conservatives in the House of Commons refused to pass this motion and the Liberals voted for it.

Wheat Products and Potatoes.

On February 23rd, 1916, Mr. J. G. Turriff, M.P. for Assiniboia (Sask.) moved:—

"That in the opinion of this House, in order to secure to the farmers and people of Canada the advantages of the American market for wheat products and potatoes, steps should be taken at once to put these articles on the free list in the Canadian tariff."

The Conservative majority in the House of

Commons voted this motion down, the Liberals voting for it.

Other Resolutions.

These are all specific declarations on the part of the Liberal party tending to free food to the people and thus to lower the cost of living. In addition to these specific resolutions on foods we have two which are cognate and which tend in the same direction, one moved by Mr. W. E. Knowles, M.P. for Moose Jaw, Sask. on March 11th, 1914, to remove the duties on agricultural implements and the other, a motion of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier on April 23rd, 1914, to place wheat and wheat products and agricultural implements on the free list, both of which were rejected by the Conservative members of Parliament.

Blast Furnace Slag.

There is also a motion by the late Hon. H. R. Emmerson, moved on February 10th, 1914, stating:

"That under Article 372 of the Customs Tariff of Canada, 1907, blast furnace slag is on the free list, but that the Board of Customs, at a meeting held on the 9th day of September, A.D. 1913, improperly and illegally declared the same to be dutiable under tariff item 663 and in effect from the 9th of November, 1913, without such declaration being, as appears, approved by the Minister of Customs as required by Statute and that the Department of Customs is now subjecting the same to duty is violating the Statute to the great injustice and loss of the farming community."

Showing that here the Liberals objected to this high-handed proceeding on the part of the Customs Department and the removal of this impediment to the farmers which raises the cost of production on their food products. The price of agricultural implements being raised by the tariff also materially interferes with the cost of production of food products among the farmers of Canada and consequently tends to accentuate the high cost of living. We see thus that the Liberal party has deliberately and emphatically in general and in detail declared itself in favor of the removal of the impediments of duty on food products and thereby reducing the cost of production of food in Canada.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier's policy in his motion of April 23rd, 1914, also confirmed that steps should be taken to alleviate the high cost of living by a straight removal of taxation.

Again on the 16th of March, 1915, Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved as follows:—

"That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved:

"That this House is ready to provide for the exigencies of the present situation, and to vote all necessary ways and means to that end, but it regrets that in the measure under consideration duties are imposed which must be oppressive upon the people, whilst yielding little or no revenue; and that the said measure is particularly objectionable in the fact that instead of favouring, it is placing extra barriers against Great Britain's trade with Canada, at a moment when the Mother Country is under

a war strain unparalleled in history."

Protesting thereby against the increased 5% duty which had been placed on articles coming to Canada from Great Britain. By reason of this increased duty, the duties on certain food products that come from Great Britain are increased and therefore the cost of importation of these articles increased.

On all these occasions the Conservative party through the Government and its representatives in the House voted straight against this alleviation to the people of Canada in regard to the high cost of living. Here is a direct antagonism between two parties, the one in favour of relief to the whole people and the country; the other insisting upon the maintenance of obstacles in the way of commerce and supply of these essential articles. Is there no difference between the two parties? Is it of no concern to the average citizen who prides himself on not being a politician and plumes himself on taking no interest or part in public affairs which party should control the administration of the country? There are many other glaring and specific differences between the two parties, but we will content ourselves for the moment in emphasizing this.

SIR SAM HUGHES AND THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

SHORTLY after Sir Sam Hughes resigned as Minister of Militia and Defence his close personal friends and even Sir Sam himself made boasts of what he was going to do to the Conservative party and particularly those members of the Government who he said were intriguing against him. It was confidentially whispered that when Sir Sam made his statement in the House of Commons it would seriously implicate three or four Cabinet Ministers and several members of the Conservative party.

In due time Sir Sam announced that he would deliver his speech in the House on the following Tuesday, namely, January 30th. It was even whispered, after this announcement, that the political life of some of the members of the Borden government was short. There was an apparent unrest among the members of the Conservative party, in some instances. Some of the Conservative Ministers and members were looking decidedly panicky.

The day arrived; all the members were in their seats. The galleries were crowded. Sir Sam rose in his place and almost the first words he uttered were:

"I may be deserted; but to break with the dear good fellows of the great Liberal-Conservative party would wrench me almost as much as losing the War."

The thunderbolt had fallen. Sir Sam had spoken. The Conservative party was feeling better. Sir Sam proceeded and told how he won the South African war, how he had saved the Empire then and now, but not a word as to why he had saved his party. He was back in the fold willing to forgive if he only could be forgiven. The Conservative party forgave and they stand to-day for him as they have stood since the beginning of the War.

BONNE ENTENTE



In honor of the French-English Meeting held in Toronto, January 7th, 1916.

CAMP BORDEN HURT RECRUITING.

Speaking in the House of Commons on January 24th, 1917, Mr. E. W. Nesbitt, M.P. for North Oxford reminded the Government in the following terms that Camp Borden did more than anything else to stop recruiting in the Western part of the Province of Ontario.

These are his words:—

“No one thing that I know of did more harm to recruiting than Camp Borden, to which the men were sent absolutely against their wills. Let me remind the House that these men were citizen soldiers, who volunteered of their own free will to go and fight in the defence of the Empire, and they thought that they should be used as decently as they could be used while they were in this country. They were properly situated at the camps at London and Niagara, but they were sent to Camp Borden. The pinery and shrubbery there had been burned off not long before; the surface was full of ashes and black dust from the burnings, and if a sand if a sand storm came up while the soldiers were eating everything would be covered with dirt, so that the men could not possibly eat their food—the dust would grind in their teeth. Their beds were filled with this stuff; they could not sleep in them for dirt. They young men who volunteered to go to the front complained very bitterly about these things and their fathers, who are paying the taxes, complained even more bitterly, contending that the expenditure on that camp was not necessary.

NO TRUCK NOR TRADE WITH THE YANKEES

In 1911 the slogan of the Conservative party was, “No truck nor trade with the Yankee.” At that time Canada’s trade with the United States was \$378,000,000. In the past year Canada’s trade with the United States was over \$800,000,000.

SENTIMENTS OF THE LIBERAL PARTY.

Speaking in the House of Commons on January 23rd, 1917 no truer sentiments of the Liberal party could have been expressed than those expressed by Mr. E. M. Macdonald, M.P. for Pictou, N.S., when he stated:—

“Around me are twenty-six men whose boys to-day are either on the battle-line or on their way there. When I say to you, Sir, that, from the farm, the workshop, the office and the cottage throughout all the land the men we represent here, have given of their best for this cause, one does not need to apologize in this free Parliament for anything one may say as to the rights of these boys, or as to the conditions in which they live, or as to the administration of this Parliament in regard to them. We are here to ask that the greatest intelligence, the keenest attention, the strictest integrity and the highest ideals should characterize the administration of the affairs of this country at this time. Any departure from that high ideal deserves and must receive from us and from this free people the severest condemnation.”

THE DORCHESTER-QUEBEC-BYE-ELECTION

THE vacancy in the Dominion Cabinet caused by the death of the late the Hon. T. C. Casgrain, Postmaster-General which took place on December 26th, 1916, was filled by the appointment of the Hon. Albert Seigny—Speaker of the House of Commons. A re-arrangement of portfolios was effected. Hon. Mr. Blondin, Secretary of State being appointed Postmaster-General, Hon. Mr. Patenaude, Minister of Inland Revenue, Secretary of State, and Hon. Mr. Seigny, Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. Seigny's appointment to a position of emoluments under the Crown rendered necessary an appeal to the electorate. Nominations were held on the 20th of January and the election on the 27th, the result being the return of Mr. Seigny by a majority of 276 considerably less than the majority in 1911.

On the 16th of January, 1917, the Liberals of Dorchester met at Ste. Henedine and passed the following resolution:—

Declaration of Dorchester County Liberals.

"This convention of Liberal electors of the County of Dorchester approves the attitude of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the present circumstances and expresses in him entire confidence.

"They regret the disloyal fight that was fought against him in 1911 and deplore above all the anti-patriotic and anti-Canadian attitude of their former member, Hon. Mr. Seigny, during the course of that electoral campaign.

"The turn-over and volte face of Mr. Seigny since his election does not inspire them with any confidence.

"They declare in consequence that they cannot ratify his choice as adviser to His Majesty in the terrible crisis through which Canada and the Empire are passing to-day.

"They declare, moreover, that they have no more confidence in the Government of which he is a member.

"They have decided in consequence, to oppose the re-election of Mr. Seigny, as deputy for Dorchester County, and offer the candidature to Mr. Lucien Cannon."

In connection with this resolution it may be well to remind our readers that Mr. Seigny in the Election of 1911 ran as a devoted member of the Nationalist party and a zealous advocate of the policy of Bourassa, Blondin and other prominent members and supporters including, in Ontario, Hon. Frank Cochrane, Minister of Railways in the Borden government; W. R. Smyth, Conservative member for East Algoma, and George Gordon, Conservative member for Nipissing, afterwards appointed to the Senate to make way for Mr. Cochrane.

The bond of union between the Borden government and the Nationalists has been maintained from the formation of the Government to the present time without a sign of weakening. One Nationalist Minister after another has disappeared from the Cabinet through various causes, but with strange

consistency the Prime Minister has replaced invariably the departed Ministers by others of the same brand, if indeed they are not more pronounced in their Nationalistic views than their predecessors.

Mr. Seigny the last to be selected brings to the Cabinet the full development of the policy of "no assistance to England outside of Canada." "What has England ever done for us?"

The Liberal candidate Mr. Cannon, became, early in the campaign a victim of press reports placing an incorrect interpretation on his utterances regarding our participation in the War, and in justice to himself, sent to the Journal-Press, Ottawa, the following message:—

"Your report of my speech in Dorchester greatly misleading, I understand you are obeying the order of your bosses in vile attempt to divide Liberals and create ill-feeling between both races in this country, when a united effort is necessary. My programme as expounded to my electors is as follows:

"1. I am proud to be a British subject, and wish to remain so.

"2. I believe that Canada should give to the Mother Country all possible help in money and men, but most strenuously object to being robbed as we were at Valcartier and other places by Government friends. I do not think, moreover, with Lord Shaughnessy, that our country should be drained of all her manhood and resources.

"3. I am opposed to conscription, especially if it should commence in Quebec, as suggested by Sir Sam Hughes when Minister of Militia. Vancouver, Winnipeg and many other cities think as I do in this respect.

"4. I think the Government should ascertain the available resources of the country in men and wealth, but believe that the National Service cards were badly worded, and not the best means to attain the object in view.

"5. I believe the present Federal Administration corrupt and incompetent to deal with the problems we now face, and opportunity should be given to the electors to express their views.

"6. A change of Government here will be for the good of the country, as it has been in England, France, Russia and all other countries now fighting, because, in such a crisis, the Government should at all times possess the full confidence of the country.

"LUCIEN CANNON."

Mr. Cannon's views as above outlined regarding our relations with the Motherland will find acceptance by the majority of the Canadian people—while his expressions of opinion regarding the methods adopted for carrying on the War are such as any man may hold, and still be absolutely in harmony with true Canadian sentiment.

The Government, if reports be true, has won a dearly bought victory, and its selection of Mr. Seigny whose Nationalist declarations are too well known will bring small comfort to the Administration.

SPEECH BY RIGHT HON. MR. ASQUITH, EX-PREMIER OF GREAT BRITAIN ON HIS RETIREMENT AS LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.

A GENERAL meeting of the Liberal members of the two Houses of Parliament was held on December 8th at the Reform Club, London, England. There were present at this meeting 29 Peers and 182 Members of the House of Commons.

The Right Honourable Mr. Asquith who was in the Chair said:—

My Lords and Gentlemen,—I invited you to meet me here. I believe it is now very nearly nine years since we last had a Party meeting, and that was on the occasion of my succeeding my ever-lamented predecessor, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in the headship of the Government, and, subject to your ratification, in the leadership of the Liberal Party. I think it says something for our relations to one another that during the best part of nine years we have never had occasion for another party meeting. There has been, I believe, during the whole of that time a practically unbroken harmony between myself, as the leader, and you, my colleagues, and the rank and file of the party. We have been through very troublous times. We have been engaged in great political enterprises; sometimes we have succeeded and sometimes we have not achieved, at any rate, complete success. We have been animated by the same spirit, we have pursued the same purposes, we have been united one to the other, and all with a loyalty and a spirit of co-operation which I do not think has ever been exceeded in the political history of this country. I thank you most heartily. I can find no words adequately to express my gratitude.

Mr. Asquith's Resignation.

Then why are we here to-day? We are here to-day because I felt it my duty to resign, not the leadership of our party, though I am quite prepared to do that if I am asked, but I have been compelled to resign the headship of the Government. I should have been very glad if it had been possible, in a great national crisis like this, when all our hearts and all our hopes, as I believe, are steadily concentrated on the maintenance of national union and the effective prosecution of the War, to have said nothing at all about the causes or circumstances which have led to my taking this step. I am not, as you know, very sensitive to criticism; perhaps I am unduly insensitive to it; nor am I the least afraid of the judgment which history will pass, either upon what I have done or failed to do in connection with this War, and I should have kept unbroken silence if it had not been that (I am sure without authority—I am not making any imputation of that kind) misleading and inaccurate accounts have been circulated with regard to the part which I have taken in those recent events, which, I might almost say, if allowed to remain unchecked, might seem to involve an un rebutted reflection upon my personal honour, and that was a thing which I could not stand.

“A Well-Organized Conspiracy.”

It is impossible to isolate the events of the last week from what was going on before. There has been a well-organized, carefully-engineered conspiracy—not, I believe, let me say at once, countenanced in any quarter of the Liberal Party, but directed against members of the Cabinet, and directed, it is true, in part against some of my late Unionist colleagues, but in the main, I think, against my noble friend Lord Grey and myself. He and I are the two men who are mainly responsible for the part which this country took before the outbreak of the War, and since then up to the present time. I hope he will say a few words presently; but I know that both he and I from the first treated these attacks with indifference so long as we felt we could carry on our work, remain at our posts, and do what we could for the prosecution of the task which has occupied us day and night now for two and a half years in the interests of the

country. Those attacks were grounded upon some alleged slackness, want of energy, or sometimes even alleged want of heart, in the prosecution of the War. I am not aware of any foundation for those charges. We have during the last year—in fact more than a year—had a War Committee of the Cabinet composed of very able men, which has been charged with the main responsibility for the conduct of the War. I believe that Committee to have been a very efficient instrument, and I think it has done invaluable work; but experience showed (and I think there is no difference of opinion whatever between me and any of my late colleagues on this point) that, excellent as was the work done by the Committee, its efficiency might be increased if it were possible to reduce its numbers and to multiply the frequency of its sittings.

Mr. Lloyd George's War Committee Proposal.

I have discussed this with one or another of my colleagues a good many times during the past few weeks. It was, I think, a week ago to-day, last Friday, that my friend Mr. Lloyd George brought me a specific proposal—the matter had been generally considered—that the War Committee should consist of three members, one of the three being Chairman. The Prime Minister was not to be a member of the Committee. The Committee was to take full power, subject to the supreme control of the Prime Minister, to direct any questions connected with the War. I considered that proposal, and, having done so, I replied on the same day (I am not going to read the letter) that, having considered it—and I gave various reasons—in my opinion, whatever changes were made in the constitution or functions of the Committee, the Prime Minister must be its Chairman. I say at once, before going into what happened subsequently, that the more I reflect upon the matter the more I remain of that opinion. I shall be very surprised if any Prime Minister attempts to govern this country without sitting on the War Committee. That suggestion of mine did not commend itself to Mr. Lloyd George, as I gather—I did not see him—and on the Sunday, the first communication having taken place on the Friday, I came up from the country and was informed that a meeting of my Unionist colleagues had been held that morning under the presidency of Mr. Bonar Law, that they regarded the situation as a very serious one, that there was no doubt in their opinion—I am quoting from a written communication which they made subsequently—that a change must be made, and in their opinion the publicity given to the intentions of Mr. Lloyd George made reconstruction from within no longer possible. My Unionist colleagues therefore urged that I should at once tender my resignation, and intimated that, if I did not, they would feel themselves obliged to tender theirs. I asked them, through Mr. Bonar Law, to pause before taking so grave a step until I had had some further communication with Mr. Lloyd George, whom I saw later in the day.

Two Points of Difference.

I was most anxious, and I am not at all ashamed to confess it to you, though some people seem to think it is a sign of weakness, to avoid a break-up of the Government. I regard it as a national calamity, though I hope all will be for the best. I was naturally anxious, having for two and a-half years done everything in my power to preserve the substantial unity of the nation, that the Government should continue, if it were possible, in an honourable alliance. I say at once, I feel sure that Mr. Lloyd George shares my opinion. We had a conversation, in which we tried to see if it were possible to accommodate our views. We were at issue on two points; the first was the relation of the Prime Minister to the War Committee, and the second was the personnel of the War Committee—hardly a less important point. I do not want to go into the names, A, B, C, or D, but I was of opinion (and I speak purposely in most general terms) that there were some—whether in the singular or in the

plural—some persons whom he wished to exclude who had better be included, and some persons whom he wished to include who had better be excluded. I leave it at that. There was a strong and sharp difference of opinion between us. I threw out various suggestions, or perhaps I should say he and I together threw out various suggestions, to see if we could not solve the first question, and the second we did not attempt to solve; and in the end they amounted to this, on which I am sure there is no difference of opinion. I will read them.

The Suggested Arrangement.

This arrangement was suggested:—

“The Prime Minister to have supreme and effective control of War policy. The agenda of the War Committee will be submitted to him; its Chairman will report to him daily; he can direct it to consider particular topics or proposals; and all its conclusions will be subject to his approval or veto. He can, of course, at his own discretion attend meetings of the Committee.”

It is not correct, in my understanding, to say that anything in the nature of an agreement was come to on those lines. On the contrary, the matter was left for further consideration, and I undertook to make a written communication to him the next day. I say that because I see it has been suggested that I drew back under outside pressure from an agreement in those terms. That is not the fact, and, as you know, it is not a thing that I am at all likely to do. That is what happened. I thought over the matter most carefully, and the next morning, when I took up my newspaper, I saw this proposal that I should be excluded. It was the view of the newspaper that the suggestion that the Prime Minister should be excluded from this Committee was perfectly well known, and it was being commented upon. Now, how was it being commented upon? I will just read. Might I say again that Mr. Lloyd George assured me that he had no responsibility of any kind in connection with this production, and, of course, I entirely accept his assurance, but the fact remains that the thing was known.

An Article in “The Times.”

This is how it was commented upon:—

“The gist of his proposal (Mr. Lloyd George’s) is understood to be the establishment forthwith of a small War Council, fully charged with the supreme direction of the War. Of this Council, Mr. Asquith himself is not to be a member—the assumption being that the Prime Minister has sufficient cares of a more general character without devoting himself wholly, as the new Council must be devoted if it is to be effective, to the daily task of organizing victory. Certain of Mr. Asquith’s colleagues are also excluded on the ground of temperament from a body which can only succeed if it is harmonious and decisive. . . . On the top of all this comes the official announcement that the Prime Minister had decided upon reconstruction. . . . It means, we assume, that he consents in principle to Mr. Lloyd George’s proposal. The conversion has been swift, but Mr. Asquith has never been slow to note political tendencies when they become inevitable. The testimony of Mr. Asquith’s closest supporters . . . must have convinced him by this time that matters cannot possibly go on as at present. They must have convinced him, too, that his own qualities are fitted better . . . to ‘preserve the unity of the nation’ (though we have never doubted its unity) than to force the pace of a War Council.”

That is the construction. As I say, I have not the least idea who was responsible for a breach of confidence which undoubtedly must have occurred somewhere. I make no imputation and cast no reflection. When I read that, which was one of a number of similar comments, I saw at once the construction which must be put, not only by critics but by friends, upon a proposal of the kind, even though it were safeguarded in the manner which I have suggested. I wrote at once, and this is

the letter, and I only read it because of the charges which have been made against me which I cannot otherwise deal with:—

“Such productions as the first leading article in The Times of to-day, showing the infinite possibilities of misunderstanding and misrepresentation of such an arrangement as we considered yesterday, make me at least doubtful as to its feasibility. Unless the impression is at once corrected that I am being relegated to the position of an irresponsible spectator of the War, I cannot possibly go on.”

Then I added this:—

“The suggested arrangement was to the following effect”—I used the word ‘was,’ and then I put in the various items which I read to you a moment ago: ‘The Prime Minister to have supreme and effective control of War policy. The agenda of the War Committee will be submitted to him; the Chairman will report to him daily; he can direct it to consider particular topics or proposals; and all its conclusions will be subject to his approval or veto. He can, of course, at his own discretion, attend meetings of the Committee.’”

That, I said, was what was suggested. That letter is treated as being a written confirmation of the arrangement already verbally entered into—the letter in which I start by saying that the infinite possibilities of misunderstanding and misrepresentation in this article made me at least doubtful as to its feasibility, and that I could not possibly go on as an irresponsible spectator of the War, as it was proposed I should. To that Mr. Lloyd George at once replied, saying that he had not seen The Times article. I will not read his letter because it is private; it was written very confidentially; but he concluded by saying that he accepted the suggested arrangement, subject, of course, to personnel.

Consultation with Colleagues and Final Decision.

When I had received that letter I thought it right, the situation being so grave, to consider the whole matter very carefully and to take into counsel in its consideration some of my oldest and most valued colleagues and friends. That I acted under their pressure or under the pressure of any of them in my final decision is absolutely untrue. It was taken on my own authority and on my own authority alone; but I cannot conceive that I was doing anything wrong in taking them into counsel. In the end I wrote to Mr. Lloyd George that, after full consideration of the matter, I had come to the conclusion that it was not possible for such a Committee to be made workable and effective without the Prime Minister as its Chairman. With regard to that he and I were obviously not of one mind, and I could not possibly assent to those proposals, and, if the Committee were to be reconstituted, as I thought it should be, upon a smaller basis, I must choose the men to sit upon it with the single regard to their special capacity for the conduct of the War. That is what happened, and the more I reflect upon the matter the more I am convinced that my final conclusion was the right conclusion, having regard to the construction put, as I think not without plausibility, on the suggestion with regard to the Prime Minister, that, so long as he remained Prime Minister, he must have supreme authority as well as supreme responsibility. It is very disagreeable to me to have to go into these matters, because I am as anxious as any man in this room, or this country, that we should be united, as I hope we are united, in our desire to prosecute the War by every possible effective means to a successful end.

Help for the New Government.

I have been asked, and it is a perfectly fair question for you to put to me, why I did not agree to act in a subordinate capacity. My own inclination was strongly

against any such course, and again I consulted my friends and colleagues, and they were unanimous in advising me not to do so. I need not tell you that they did not put it on any ground of amour propre at all, or wounded pride, or anything of the sort. No such consideration operated or could operate. I thought myself, and they pointed out, and I am certain it is true, that if I were to come into the new Government (which I wish from the bottom of my heart, without any kind of affectation or reserve, the most complete success) in whatever capacity you like but not as the head of the Government, these attacks would continue. If anything went wrong it would be said, "Oh, there is the old paralysing touch there. You have not made a clean job of the matter. Why do you not remove the taint and the cancer which has been so fatal to the effective prosecution of the War in the past?" And my unfortunate new colleagues would in a very short time have found themselves confronted with the necessity either of getting rid of me altogether or being themselves tarred with the same terrible brush. I really do not think, and my colleagues did not think, that I could as effectually serve the new Government, and, what is still more important, the real interests of the State, as a member of it as I could outside, and outside I am remaining with the sole object—I do not know that I need assure you of this—of lending such help as I can with all my heart and with all such strength as remains to me in order to assist them in the great task which lies before us.

Free Hand for Ex-Ministers.

It is suggested that I put some kind of pressure—it is a false and infamous suggestion—upon my late colleagues who are sitting here not to join the Government. I have done nothing of the kind—absolutely nothing of the kind. I have said to them collectively, and I have said to them individually, "Exercise your own judgment; consider how you can best serve them. If you think you can serve them by going in, for God's sake go in; if you can best serve them by remaining with me outside, stay outside. I do not quarrel with your judgment or attempt to exercise any pressure upon you one way or the other. Such a suggestion shows to what a terrible depth the standards of public decency have fallen. Whatever have been my faults and shortcomings—and no one is more conscious of them than I—at any rate I have been Prime Minister of this country for the best part of nine years, and have now for two and a half years been engaged day by day under a strain and stress of labor and anxiety, and lately under the burden of heavy domestic sorrow, which no one who has not borne it can even conceive. I am speaking to friends here, and I say it is almost unbelievable that anyone should venture to suggest that I am trying, or ever have been trying to exercise pressure to restrain my patriotic and public-spirited colleagues from doing their fair share in the work of the State and the conduct of the War.

No Recriminations.

I cannot describe to you in adequate terms how strongly I feel that it is the duty of all of us at this time to avoid anything in the nature of recrimination. If there have been misunderstandings, let us bury them. Whatever differences of opinion we may have either as to the past or as to the future, let us give each and all the credit, as I do without any reservation, for the best motives and the most single-minded desire to serve the country and carry on the War, and let us, above all, each of us do whatever he can, whether by speech or by action, by hearty co-operation to facilitate the task which is before the country now. That is my hope, that is my desire, that is my intention, and I trust it is yours.

Viscount Grey of Follodon, also addressed the Liberal Lords and Members, after which the following resolution was unanimously carried.

Moved by Mr. Eugene Wason, seconded by

Lord D'Abernon:—

"That this meeting records its thanks to Mr. Asquith for his long and magnificent services to the nation, its unabated confidence in him as leader of the Liberal Party, and its determination to give support to the King's Government engaged in the effective prosecution of the War."

Book of Cartoons

Something New 32 Pages 40 Cartoons

All phases of political questions dealt with.

PRICE TEN CENTS PER COPY

Special rates for large quantities.

Apply Secretary,
Central Liberal Information Office,
Hope Chambers, Ottawa, Ont.

Study Politics

by reading Bound Volumes
of the
Canadian Liberal Monthly

Volumes I, II, III (covering period
Aug. 1913 to Sept. 1916) are avail-
able. Price for Three Volumes \$1.50

Apply Central Liberal Information Office
Ottawa, Ont.

"SCUTTling IT"



HON. ROBERT ROGERS AND THE REPORT OF JUSTICE GALT.

We reproduce here an editorial which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* on February 1st, 1916.

Hon. Robert Rogers Found Guilty.

"HON. ROBERT ROGERS must not be allowed longer to degrade the Crown by holding a position as Minister in Canada, with the verdict of guilt attached to him by Justice Galt of the Supreme Court of Manitoba. Justice Galt, as Commissioner investigating the building of the Manitoba Agricultural College, has made a report casting doubt upon the veracity of the Dominion Minister. In six several paragraphs Justice Galt has expressed himself as being unable to accept the word of Mr. Rogers, and in each instance he has pointed out where the evidence is contrary to the statements put forward by Mr. Rogers."

"Furthermore, Justice Galt's report is an unqualified pronouncement of guilt upon Mr. Rogers regarding the increasing of a government contractor's bid from \$60,229 to \$68,929, and the unlawful passing of an order-in-council falsely stating the amount of the contractor's original tender to be \$68,929 when Mr. Rogers knew it to have been \$60,229."

"According to Justice Galt's report, the evidence would seem to show that Mr. Rogers' irregular transactions, as Minister of Public Works in the Roblin government of Manitoba, were directly connected with the collecting of political campaign funds from the government contractor. Regarding this dishonest practice, the report says":—

"The circumstances attending these transactions led to an irresistible inference that the increased tender allowed by Mr. Rogers and the unusual contributions to the campaign fund amounting to \$7,500 made by the Carter Company, was directly connected, whereby the fund was augmented and the Carter Company received the benefit of \$1,200, while the province lost the entire sum of \$8,700.

I find that the Carter Company contributed in all the sum of \$22,500 to the Conservative campaign fund during the currency of his contracts.

"Mr. Rogers has admitted that he telephoned to the contractor, suggesting to him that he had tendered to do the government building work at a price too low; and that the contractor replied to Mr. Rogers by arranging to have an interview with the provincial architect about it: the interview ostensibly resulting in the contractor's price being increased from \$60,229 to \$68,929."

"But Justice Galt finds that the evidence does not bear out Mr. Rogers' statements, indefinite as they are, regarding the date of the telephone conversation, and the Minister's efforts to defend himself by saying he acted on the advice of the provincial architect. By accounting for the whereabouts of the Minister and the provincial architect on the dates in question, according to Justice Galt's report, the evidence is contrary to Mr. Rogers' statement that the telephone conversation took place in the presence of Samuel Hooper, the provincial architect."

Justice Galt says:—

"I cannot accept Mr. Rogers' statement that his telephone communication with Carter must have occurred after August 16th, upon the advice of Mr. Hooper."

"The evidence is also given to show why Justice

Galt further says:—"

"I cannot accept Mr. Rogers' third statement that the telephone communication may have occurred on July 27th, the day after the original tender was accepted."

"After Mr. Rogers had stated, again and again, that the provincial architect, Mr. Hooper, was present with him when he telephoned to the contractor, and that he acted wholly upon Mr. Hooper's advice when he granted the increase, a later statement by Mr. Rogers is rejected by Justice Galt as follows:—

"I can give no credence whatever to Mr. Rogers' fourth and final statement that "if by any chance I used words that Mr. Hooper was present at the time the telephone rang, that might be incorrect, because I am not clear on that. I could not be expected to be clear on that. If I used these words I want to say I would want to correct it. I am not sure that I did."

This later statement of the Minister's is characterized as "merely a desperate attempt to escape from an awkward dilemma."

Justice Galt has recorded the following verdict of guilt against Mr. Rogers:—

"I find upon the evidence that the telephone conversation between Mr. Rogers and Mr. Carter occurred between the 16th and 24th days of August, 1911, at a time when Mr. Rogers had the other tenders before him, and that he gratuitously offered Mr. Carter the privilege of increasing his tender and Carter acted accordingly. As a result, Carter's tender was increased by \$8,700.

"I also find that Mr. Rogers instructed his deputy, Mr. Danier, to draw up a recommendation to council, dated August 24th, 1911, and to insert therein as the amount of Carter's original tender in answer to the advertisement for tenders the sum of \$68,929, contrary to the Act as known by Mr. Rogers, and that an order-in-council was passed accordingly."

This finding is part of the report of the Manitoba Agricultural College Commission. Sir Robert Borden, as Prime Minister of this Dominion, appointed Mr. Rogers as Minister of the Interior in the present Dominion Cabinet, and at a later date deliberately promoted him from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Public Works. The Prime Minister's sense of personal honor must compel him to protect the Crown, by retiring Mr. Rogers until he has cleared himself of the verdict of guilt brought in by Justice Galt."

From the *Ottawa Citizen* (Independent) of Feb. 1st, 1917.

Comment on the above quotations from Mr. Justice Galt's report is unnecessary. Mr. Justice Galt, has pronounced the verdict and it is to the effect that he does not accept all the statements made under oath by a Cabinet Minister. This is a serious situation and one which our Canadian people can well reflect over.

And now the announcement is made that this same gentleman, Hon. Robert Rogers is to accompany the Prime Minister of Canada, to England to assist and give advice on behalf of Canada in the deliberations of an Imperial War Council.

THE OUTCROPPINGS OF THE DORCHESTER BY-ELECTION.

FROM reports received it is very evident that the Nationalists have not recanted and are still adhering to the policy that they have advocated since the foundation of the party.

Forced, to some extent, by the exigencies of office to refrain from boldly proclaiming the Bourassa propaganda in its well understood particulars, it is clear that the spirit of Bourassaism, if not the letter pervaded the Government side of the recent campaign in Dorchester.

From the Ottawa Morning Citizen of January 26th, 1917, reproduced in Hansard of the same date, page 186, we copy the following:—

"Ste. Germaine, Que., Jan. 25.—The Liberal organization here sprung a mine tonight when they announced that Hon. P. E. Blondin, who is working at Ste. Rose in the interests of Hon. Albert Sevigny, Minister of Inland Revenue, had been uttering disloyal sentiments in meetings at Ste. Rose.

"The following affidavit was given out tonight by the Liberal Chiefs:

"We, the undersigned, declare that we heard last night at Ste. Rose, January 24th, 1917, the Hon. P. E. Blondin make the following declarations:

"As for the Allison scandal and others of the same nature, let us suppose that if these thefts have taken place it has no importance for the people of Ste. Rose, because it was English money that was stolen."

"Speaking of the danger of conscription, Mr. Blondin declared: 'Even if conscription was put in force that would mean little to the people of Ste. Rose, because they had only to cross the frontier to get away.'

"(Signed) Dorille Prevost, Valere Lamontagne."

"Sworn before me, Justice of the Peace, J. B. Cote, at Ste. Germaine, Dorchester, this 25th day of January, 1917.

"(Signed) J. B. Cote, Justice of the Peace."

Mr. Blondin's reported version of the story is as follows:—(We quote from the Ottawa Evening Journal, January 26th, 1917, reproduced in Hansard of the same date, page 187.)

"Hon. P. E. Blondin, through his lieutenant, Felix Durocher, has issued a reply to an affidavit, which purported to give a report of his remarks at Ste. Rose, during a Dorchester County By-Election speech on Wednesday night. The affidavit credited Mr. Blondin with contending that the Allison scandal was of no importance to Ste. Rose because it is English money that was stolen, while those who desired to escape conscription could do so by crossing the United States border. Mr. Blondin's explanation follows:—

"The statement which has been sworn to by certain Liberals with regard to my utterances are a distortion of my words. I never by any means intended to convey the meaning which they have attached to my speech. Mr. Cannon had been stating in his speeches that the Conservative party had been grafting from the Canadian Treasury in connection with munition contracts."

"In my speech at Ste. Rose I explained that, it was not true that the Allison scandal had to do with Canadian money pointing out that the money paid for the shells was the money of the British Government. I did not imply that Allison had done a worthy act, but simply corrected Mr. Cannon's mis-statement. In regard to the conscription matter I told the people of Ste. Rose that I did not believe conscription would be necessary because so many Canadians were eager to go and fight for the cause of liberty and humanity. I added that if any of them were afraid of conscription, if conscription should be passed and they did not want to go to the War, they had a remedy left. They could go across the United States line which is near Ste. Rose and escape military service."

This is a very ingenious way out of the difficulty. In other words as long as Canadian pockets were not touched, let the stealing go on. If, indeed, conscription were adopted the boundary line was not far away and the non-conscriptionists could avail themselves of the land to the South.

From the Montreal Star of January 27th, 1917, we quote the following telegram from Mr. Blondin to Sir Robert Borden:—

"Ste. Rose, Que., Jan. 26th, 1917.
Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden,
"House of Commons, Ottawa, Ont.

"I am informed that the press is publishing affidavits from Liberal canvassers to the effect that I have advised people to run away if conscription would come, and that I have stated that if money was obtained improperly through war contracts, those who got it did well because it was English money."

"This news comes to me just a few minutes after my declaration in a speech delivered at St. Prosper, in the presence of Dr. Masson, Liberal M.P.P., for Montmagny, and Alderman Dussault of Quebec, my two Liberal opponents at the meeting, that it would be an act of cowardice on the part of the Government to promise that there would never be conscription in this county and more especially so in this war time."

"As to the war contracts I simply have drawn the attention of the people to the fact that the Munitions Board is an Imperial institution under the direct control of the War Office and completely outside of Canadian politics."

(Signed) P. E. Blondin.

The public will draw its own conclusions from these communications. There is no doubt that contracts and conscription were discussed, as admitted by Mr. Blondin himself, and the statements alleged to have been made by him are quite in keeping with the Nationalist policy and Mr. Blondin's record.

Hon. Mr. Blondin's Denial.

On February 1st, 1917, after his return from the County of Dorchester, Mr. Blondin made the following statement in the House of Commons, see Hansard, pp. 358-359:—

"Hon. P. E. Blondin (Postmaster General):—Mr. Speaker, I saw yesterday for the first time, in the Ottawa Evening Journal of Friday last, January 26th, a report

of the Canadian Press, which I will read:

Mr. Blondin then proceeded to read the report herein before quoted in that article and which can be found in Hansard on page 187 and, then added:—
military service.

"First of all, as for Mr. Desrochers, I beg to state that he did not act as my secretary or lieutenant, and that during the whole election I had no connection with him whatever. I never spoke to him concerning the matter referred to in the report which I have just read. I never authorized him to make any statement for me, and I never was informed by him or anybody else of the statement reported to have been made by him on my behalf. I have inquired from Mr. Derochers about the correctness of the statement, and he denies, and authorizes me to deny in this House, the last part of that report, namely, that part which relates to conscription.

"As to the statement itself, to wit, that I advised people to cross the boundary, which I am informed was freely commented on by the hon. member for Assinibois (Mr. Turriff), the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Copp), I must say that there is not a single particle of truth in that report. The facts concerning the matter are very plain. I was replying to a speech in which my opponent had strongly endeavoured to show that conscription was coming by means of the National Service cards, which, he said, meant nothing but conscription, and that very soon coercion would be used by the Borden English-Protestant government against the Catholic French-Canadians, and that very soon armed soldiers would come and force their husbands and sons to go to war.

"Those are the very notes that are still fresh on the paper on which I wrote them when preparing my answer.

"My answer to these arguments was that the National Service cards did not mean anything of the kind and were only an appeal to the patriotism and good-will of every citizen whose duty it was to sign them; that if conscription had to come it would come openly; that this Government could not promise or declare that conscription would never come, as it would be cowardice on the part of the Government to make such a declaration or promise; that it might have to come; but that for the present there was no question of conscription, and the Government did not by the National Service cards intend any coercion of the people, and that the best proof of this was that the stretch of 4,000 miles of frontier had been left unguarded and open. And this I said in order to show the stupidity of the contentions of my opponent. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that any other construction of my words is purely and simply gross misrepresentation."

It will be noted that the denial authorized by Mr. Derochers is confined to Mr. Blondin's alleged remarks about conscription. He authorizes no denial of the statement regarding the Allison deals being of no moment to Canadians, because it was British money, not Canadian that was paying for them.

Furthermore Mr. Blondin's own explanation of his remarks about conscription, will hardly hold particularly when he referred in the same breath to the stretch of 4,000 miles of frontier had been left unguarded and open." Was it left open so that advice from high authorities could be utilized in a practical manner?

It is further stated that two gentlemen acting as campaigners for the Conservative candidate availed themselves of the stretch and crossed the border with \$11,000 in their pockets.

Mr. Cannon's Platform.

On the other hand Mr. Cannon's attitude in the campaign was of a vastly different character. We quote from the Montreal Gazette of January 30th, 1917:—

"I ran against Mr. Sevigny on account of his Nationalist opinions, I though he was not fit to sit in the Dominion Cabinet during war time."

"In my campaign I adhered strictly to the Liberal policy of my leader as regards war questions. I declared myself decidedly in favor of Canada participating in the war. As to the National Service, I told the electors that I had signed my card and advised them to do the same, and added that if it did not mean eventual conscription I had no objection to the scheme. I do not believe we shall need conscription here.

"To show how little I appealed to prejudice or pass on, I may say I did not mention the bi-lingual question in a single speech. My speeches were directed solely against the Nationalist principles of my opponent and the bad administration at Ottawa.

"Although defeated, I still hold that my fight was in the best interests of the country. My opponent had recourse to every known method of election corruption; and unfortunately for the dignity of Canadian politics, this corruption was carried on under the direct supervision of the Hon. Messrs. Blondin and Sevigny.

"In the last days of the campaign, my adversaries reverted to the Nationalist tactics by stating in public meetings and in private canvassing, that Laurier was worse than Borden on the War question; that he was in favor of conscription, and that he was sold to England. In short, the Nationalist-Tory party made use of every unpatriotic argument and every dishonest method to defeat me. I am sorry that some electors were carried by these means."

(Signed) Lucien Cannon.

WHY AN EXTENSION TO THE LIFE OF PARLIAMENT IF THE WAR IS TO BE FINISHED IN 1917?

Speaking in the House of Commons January 22nd, the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden stated:—

"In the first year the Allies held the enemy, and could do no more. Opportunity for victory passed from the Germans in the first six months of the War.

"The second year was for the Allies almost wholly a year of preparation.

"The third year, upon which we have now entered will be the year of action, of victory and of peace."

Notwithstanding this statement Sir Robert Borden has informed the House and the country that it is the intention of his Government to apply for a further extension of the life of Parliament.

At the last session of Parliament a unanimous resolution was passed by the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada which was acted upon by the Imperial Parliament and accordingly the life of the Canadian Parliament was extended from October 7th, 1916 until October 7th, 1917. Therefore the present Canadian Parliament need not be dissolved until October 7th, 1917 and the general elections need not take place until December 1917. In 1896 the elections were held over two months after the House had been dissolved by time. The Governor-General in that year dissolved the House a few days before the Parliament had lived its full period.

If according to Sir Robert Borden's statement above referred to the War is to end in 1917 why is it necessary to have an extension of the life of Parliament?

THE CHARGES OF SIR SAM HUGHES AGAINST THE BORDEN GOVERNMENT.

WHEN Sir Sam Hughes resigned his portfolio as Minister of Militia and Defence in the Borden government several letters which had passed between himself as Minister of Militia and Sir Robert Borden were published. These letters contained grave accusations, not only against Sir Robert Borden, the Prime Minister of Canada, but against his colleagues, members of the Borden administration, all with reference to the conduct of the War. All of these charges are most serious, in fact if half of what Sir Sam Hughes states is true the members of the Borden government, Sir Robert Borden himself included, are guilty of interfering with the successful prosecution of the War.

The Hon. Charles Murphy, Ex-Secretary of State in the Laurier administration, has taken the trouble to make a summary of these charges and when speaking in the House of Commons on January 29th, 1917, he placed this summary on Hansard.

We quote herewith the summary of the accusations made by the Ex-Minister of Militia and Defence.

1. That from the outset the management of our forces, supplies, equipment, transport, etc., were taken completely out of our hands and controlled by the British authorities.
2. That for the first ten months of the War our equipment, stores, supplies, armament, everything provided by us was set aside.
3. That the Ex-Minister of Militia spoke to the Prime Minister about the rejection of our stores and supplies of every description and submitted to him a written memorandum proving the utter falsity of the reasons given by the British officers for their rejection of everything that came from Canada. But nothing was done.
4. That the Pay Department was found to be absolutely chaotic, and that the Medical Service lacked system, efficiency, and comprehensiveness.
5. That a force was raised and managed in spite of all sorts of intrigue.
6. That appointments in the force were based on two avenues of supply, of which one was British officers connected with society people, and the other Canadian Permanent Corps officers, with their usual pull.
7. That few, if any commissions, are of any practical value, and that everybody connected with the Hospitals Commission, the Pensions Board, and the National Service Commission knows of the absurdities they contain.
8. That had the forces been conducted on the basis of formal Orders-in-Council the First Division would not have left Valcartier yet.
9. That the Second Division was held in Canada for four months by the Cabinet's petty haggling over the question of paying commissions to agents on the sale of motor trucks, instead of purchasing at the lowest wholesale prices.
10. That no one knew better than the Prime Minister that the statements made by him in his letter of October 31st, 1916, regarding the control of the forces during the first year in Great Britain, were not correct.
11. That the Prime Minister's reason for appointing an Overseas Minister of Militia was not, as alleged by him, due to the failure of the ex-Minister of Militia to secure authority by Orders-in-Council for his acts, but was the result of several months planning between Sir George Perley and the Prime Minister.
12. That for a long time there were petty intrigues going on in the Cabinet, to which the ex-Minister of Militia had shut his eyes as he wanted to win the War.
13. That the Prime Minister had not supported the ex-Minister of Militia in the administration of his department.

14. That from the opening of Valcartier Camp the Prime Minister had agreed that matters of urgency need not be brought before the Privy-Council, and that ratifying Orders-in-Council could be passed after action had been taken.

15. That the Minister of Finance never brought before Council any proposed loan for the Dominion of Canada, or any single important act concerning the administration of his department.

16. That the same observation applies to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

17. That two members of the Cabinet were usually antagonistic to anything proposed by the ex-Minister of Militia, and when they opposed him the Prime Minister did not support him.

18. That the Prime Minister asked the ex-Minister of Militia to submit Orders-in-Council before incurring large expenditures, so as to set an example and assist the Prime Minister to control the Post Office Department, Railway Department and Public Works Department, for projects had been undertaken without the authority of Orders-in-Council.

19. That the Prime Minister also stated that some boats had been purchased and other large expenditures incurred without his knowledge and without Orders-in-Council.

20. That for more than a year the ex-Minister of Militia had known of the meddling and intriguing that had been going on to place Sir George Perley in control in England, and that the position taken by the Prime Minister in the correspondence in regard to the matter was untenable.

21. That the Prime Minister was actuated by favoritism rather than by the best interests of the force.

22. That the Prime Minister mis-represented the attitude of the ex-Minister of Militia with regard to the sub-Militia Council.

23. That except when in trouble himself the Prime Minister had never been frank or loyal with the ex-Minister of Militia, and that he rewarded loyalty by preferring those who had been untrue to him.

This indictment of the Prime Minister and his colleagues by a member of his own Cabinet is absolutely without parallel in any country enjoying responsible government. The Prime Minister although replying to several letters which contained these accusations did not deny them, in fact a significant fact which these letters proved, is that Sir Sam Hughes was not dismissed for mismanagement or maladministration. The letters prove conclusively that he was dismissed for accusing the Prime Minister Sir Robert Borden for not telling the truth.

But this was not all. As stated these synopsis accusations were all contained in the letters made public at the time of Sir Sam Hughes' resignation. Sir Sam however, wrote another letter to the Prime Minister which was not made public at the time of his resignation, but which was made public when Sir Sam spoke in the House of Commons on January 27th, 1917. On this occasion he read to the House a letter which he had addressed to the Prime Minister on May 13th, 1915. While it may be stated without fear of contradiction that the accusations made in the letters made public at the time of Sir Sam's resignation were serious, no one can say that they are half as serious as the accusations made in this letter which were as follows:—

Dear Sir Robert,

May 13th, 1915.

Since my return from England last November, I have repeatedly notified you that owing to the interference and plans of the "so-called" sub-committee and to the repeated hold-ups and needless obstruction

of some of my colleagues in the affairs of this department, the Contract branch has been very much hampered and practically blocked; delays have been very prolonged; the cost has been greatly enhanced and the goods supplied have been, in many cases, inferior. Indeed, the most ardent agents of the German Government could scarcely have been more successful in holding up the proper equipment of our forces, had they been in control.

As one of many specific examples. Take the trucks for the Second Division. They should have been ready last December, they are not ready yet. Some of my colleagues constituted themselves champions of this or that truck and brought about delays whereby untried trucks would be purchased; high prices would be paid in commissions to agents, and the Government, and the country, would be treated practically as a retailer. My policy, as you may remember, in this and in all other matters, was to force dealers to give the Government wholesale, or manufacturers' rates.

At the present time there are upwards of one hundred requisitions that have long been in. The Quartermaster-General has over and over and over again, until his heart has grown sick, brought them before me, they have been promptly passed on to the Director of Contracts, and the great majority of them, when passed on to the Privy Council, have been held up in Council, or by the Treasury Board, laid aside or sent back—but always delayed; while the Director of Contracts and his officers have unceasingly been interfered with, delayed, and given endless and unnecessary work by the sub-committee.

I saw, by an article in the Free Press, that it is current everywhere among the soldiers and officers, that they are short of nearly every class of equipment and supplies. In fact, three times recently I have been severely reproached about shortages in supplies and equipment, by outsiders who had learned of these shortages from soldiers and officers of the force.

Further, to my surprise, I was spoken to in Montreal this week, and informed that our Medical units going over were only half equipped, while many of our combatant units are not properly outfitted.

In addition to the serious aspect of the case and from the viewpoint of the efficiency of our soldiers, there is the disheartening side. It is not only unfair to the gallant boys, who are giving and willingly risking their lives for the cause, and making domestic sacrifices, but it is absolutely unjust to me and my officers.

Therefore, as Minister of Militia, I must respectfully enter my protest, as I have frequently before entered it, at the interference and delays caused in all these things. It tends, not only to the injury and inefficiency of our soldiers, thus jeopardizing the success of British arms, but it must politically reflect seriously upon the Government.

It is charged that the sub-committee have given contracts for soldiers' clothing to be made by jobbers, who sub-let them and never entered a stitch themselves. Women's linen underwear, women's blouse makers, women's corset makers and truss makers, have all been among these contractors.

We believe, we are in a position in this department to truthfully say that there never was such a volume of business so successfully and economically transacted, or under such an efficient system of purchase and inspection, as had been developed by us up to the time when I went to Europe, and when the sub-committee took control.

I feel very fortunate in having under me officers, both civil and military, in all the leading departments, in whom I can place absolute trust. They have done nobly, under very adverse surroundings, and I can conceive of no plan by which the work could have been more honestly, economically and effectively done, than was ours.

I regret to have to submit these facts once more, but in justice both to myself, as well as to the splendid gallant soldiers we are endeavouring to equip for the front, I must ask your serious consideration of these matters.

I have but one desire, the upbuilding of Canada, the

Empire and humanity.

Let me hope that you will regard this letter as written with due respect to myself, to my country, to you, as my leader, and in justice to our soldiers.

Faithfully,
(Sgd.) Sam Hughes.

Was there ever a more serious charge made than that made by the Minister against his colleagues? A few weeks delay in the supplying of this equipment may have cost our soldiers thousands of lives. Trucks which should have been ready in December, 1914, were not ready on May 13th, 1915, due to the fact that Ministers of the Crown could not determine the sort of truck to purchase or the commission which should be paid to agents. Necessary equipment for the soldiers had been held up for months. In short if German agents had been in control they could not have been more successful in holding up these supplies than this sub-committee of the Council.

We ask our readers if this whole thing is not too horrible to intelligently conceive of, and we ask ourselves if this is an example of the mismanagement that has been going on from the time Canadian soldiers first started to enlist? Surely these accusations are worthy of the most serious and thorough investigation.

WHY AMERICAN HORSES?

The British Remount Commission with headquarters in Montreal has for sometime been purchasing horses for the British and Canadian authorities. About November 15th, 1916, this Commission ceased purchasing horses in Canada and since that date has been buying horses in the various large cities of the United States. It is understood that about 2,000 horses per week are so purchased in the United States.

No official of the government seems to be able to say why American horses are purchased in preference to Canadian horses. It is stated on reliable authority that there are in Canada for sale thousands of splendid army horses. With the sacrifices being made by Canada and the Canadian people one would naturally consider that Canadian horses would be given the preference.

It is not the first instance where a Canadian product has been rejected and an American one accepted.

LATER:

On February 5th, 1917 the Right Honourable Sir Robert Borden read a statement in the House in regard to the purchase of Canadian horses by the British remount officers. This statement was prepared by Sir Charles Gunning, British Remount Commissioner, Montreal, and is as follows:—

"Am not purchasing horses in Canada at present time. No horses purchased in Canada since December first. Average number per week of horses now being purchased in United States nineteen hundred. No horses being purchased at Des Moines or Indianapolis. Number of horses purchased in Canada between March and November, 1916, six thousand and seventy-nine. Number of horses shipped from Canadian ports during 1916, thirteen thousand three hundred and ninety-six. I do not purchase in Canada during winter months as climatic conditions are such that it is impossible to keep horses in the open, which it is necessary to do for about five weeks to ensure being fit for shipment. It is my intention to resume purchasing in Canada in the spring. The British Remount Officers are in Montreal."

DIARY OF THE MONTH.

1917.
January.
- 1 Returned soldiers' meeting at Ottawa addressed by HON. R. ROGERS.
 - 3 SIR THOS. WHITE opened thrift campaign in address before Toronto Board of Trade.
 - 4 National Service meeting at St. John, N. B., addressed by HON. J. A. MURPHY, HON. J. D. HAZEN and R. B. BENNETT, M.P.
 - 5 National Service meeting at Halifax addressed by HON. J. A. MURPHY, HON. J. D. HAZEN and R. B. BENNETT, M.P.
 - 6 SENATOR J. B. R. FISET died at Rimouski.
 - 7 SIR FREDERICK BORDEN died at Canning, N. S.
 - 8 HON. MARTIN BURRELL addressed St. James Methodist Church, Montreal.
 - 9 HON. A. SEVIGNY sworn in as Minister of Inland Revenue. SIR SAM HUGHES addressed New York Canadian Club. HON. GEO. P. GRAHAM addressed Guelph Canadian Club.
 - 10 SIR SAM HUGHES addressed meeting in Toronto.
 - 11 COL. CURRIE, M.P., addressed meeting at Stayner, Ont.
 - 12 STAMFORD (Ont.) CONSERVATIVES annual meeting at Niagara Falls.
 - 13 HON. GEO. P. GRAHAM addressed South-West Toronto Liberals. HON. R. LEMIEUX addressed Liberals of Laurier-Outremont, Que. Other speakers were SEN. J. P. B. CASGRAIN, A. VERVILLE, M.P. Mr. P. R. Du Tremblay chosen federal candidate. Manitoba legislature opened.
 - 14 SIR THOS. WHITE addressed Ottawa Board of Trade. Meeting at Angus, Ont., addressed by COL. CURRIE, M.P., HON. A. E. KEMP, PREMIER HEARST and others.
 - 15 EAST YORK (Ont.) CONSERVATIVES annual meeting at Toronto.
 - 16 W. F. MACLEAN, M.P., addressed meeting at Calgary on national government.
 - 17 W. F. MACLEAN, M.P., addressed Calgary Canadian Club. W. T. ALLAN, Conservative, elected in West Simcoe (Ont.) provincial by-election.
 - 18 SHELburne (N.S.) CONSERVATIVES annual meeting at Shelburne.
 - 19 Meetings at Huntingdon and Ste. Martine, Que., addressed by HON. H. MERCIER, JAS. ROBB, M.P. (Huntingdon) and others. Meeting at Sherbrooke, Que., addressed by SIR SAM HUGHES, SEN. J. P. B. CASGRAIN and others.
 - 20 Liberal convention at Ste. Henedine, Que., chose Lucien Cannon, M.L.A., to contest Dorchester county against Hon. A. Sevigny in federal by-election.
 - 21 J. STANFIELD, M.P. (Colchester, N.S.), resigns as chief Conservative whip, retaining seat in House of Commons. First Dorchester campaign meeting at St. Prosper.
 - 22 NORTH OXFORD (Ont.) CONSERVATIVES annual meeting at Woodstock. Speeches by D. SUTHERLAND, M.P. (So. Oxford), and F. S. SCOTT (So. Waterloo). Seven new Senators appointed.
 - 23 Reform Club, Montreal, addressed by SEN. R. DANDURAND.
 - 24 EAST YORK (Ont.) CONSERVATIVES annual meeting at Norway.
 - 25 McPherson, Conservative, elected in North-West Toronto prov. by-election.
 - 26 SENATOR T. O. DAVIS died at Price Albert, Sask.
 - 27 SOUTH ONTARIO CONSERVATIVE ASSOCIATION annual meeting at Whitby.
 - 28 Saskatchewan legislature opened.
 - 29 BRANT (Ont.) LIBERALS annual meeting at Paris.
 - 30 MARKHAN (Ont.) CONSERVATIVES annual meeting at Unionville.
 - 31 Federal by-election in Dorchester county, Que., gave HON. A. SEVIGNY, Conservative, majority of over 200.
 - 32 CARLETON (Ont.) CONSERVATIVES annual meeting at Stittsville. Address by J. BEST, M.P. (Dufferin).
 - 33 SIR SAM HUGHES addressed Junior Bar Asscn. Montreal. Canadian Society of New York addressed by HON. R. LEMIEUX and SIR THOS. WHITE.
 - 34 WENTWORTH (Ont.) LIBERALS in convention at Hamilton chose H. E. Dickinson as next federal candidate.
 - 35 HON. A. MEIGHEN addressed meeting at Ottawa.
 - 36 Dinner in honor Hon. A. Sevigny at Quebec addressed by MR. SEVIGNY and HON. E. L. PATENAUDE.
 - 37 Montreal Conservatives addressed by HON. E. L. PATENAUDE at luncheon in his honor.
 - 38 NORTH VICTORIA and HALIBURTON (Ont.) LIBERALS annual meeting at Fenelon Falls.
 - 39 Reception to HON. A. SEVIGNY at Montreal addressed by MR. SEVIGNY, HON. P. E. BLONDIN and HON. E. L. PATENAUDE.

THE MONTH IN PARLIAMENT.

- January.
1917.
- 18 Preliminary meeting of Parliament. EDGAR N. RHODES (Cumberland), elected SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, succeeding Hon. A. E. Sevigny.
 - 19 FORMAL OPENING of seventh session of twelfth Parliament

Guarded all the way!
Every pound of
"SALADA"
is protected in sealed containers from the gardens to your table, so that you may enjoy the full fragrance of the fresh mountain-grown leaves. Every cup is alike—delicious!

- of Canada. SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.
- 22 Address in reply to Speech from the Throne moved by Gordon Wilson (L) (Wentworth), seconded by M. J. A. Descaries (C) (Jacques-Cartier). Debate on address by SIR WILFRID LAURIER and SIR ROBERT BORDEN.
 - 23 Debate on address continued by E. M. MACDONALD (L) (Pictou), H. H. STEVENS (C) (Vancouver), HON. F. OLIVER (L) (Edmonton) and D. D. MACKENZIE (L) (North Cape Breton).
 - 24 Debate on address continued by D. D. MACKENZIE, W. A. BOYS (C) (South Simcoe), E. W. NESBITT (L) (North Oxford) W. F. COCKSHUTT (C) (Brantford) and HON. CHAS. MARCIL (L) (Bonaventure).
 - 25 Proposed adjournment account of Imperial War Conference. Debate on address continued by HON. CHAS. MARCIL, W. F. MACLEAN (C) (South York), HON. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (L) (Rouville) and J. H. SINCLAIR (L) (Guysborough).
 - 26 Address on debate continued by A. B. COPP (L) (Westmoreland) and J. G. TURRIFF (L) (Assiniboia).
 - 27 Address on debate continued by G. W. KYTE (L) (Richmond) J. W. EDWARDS (C) (Frontenac), HON. CHAS. MURPHY (L) (Russel), J. J. HUGHES (L) (Kings, P.E.I.), D. NICHOLSON (C) (Queens, P.E.I.) and E. B. DEVLIN (L) (Wright).
 - 28 Debate on address continued by E. B. DEVLIN, SIR SAM HUGHES, SIR THOS. WHITE (Minister of Finance), HON. WM. PUGSLEY (L) (St. John City) and M. A. BELLEMARE (C) (Maskinonge). Debate concluded, address adopted.
 - 29 NATIONAL SERVICE COMMISSION—inquiry by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. REMOVAL RAILWAY MATERIAL TO FRANCE—inquiry by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. LIMITATION OF RACING MEETS—motion by O. J. WILCOX (C) (North Essex)—discussion by W. B. NORTHRUP (C) (East Hastings), W. M. GERMAN (L) (Welland), SIR ROBERT BORDEN and W. E. KNOWLES (L) (Moosejaw). PROPOSED ABOLITION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—motion by R. BICKERDIKE (Montreal, St. Lawrence).