

THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY

VOL. IV. No. 11.

OTTAWA, JULY 1917.

TWO CENTS

THE FIRST LESSON IN FOOD CONTROL.

Dear Uncle Sam, forget all about that political humbug and hypocrisy and please teach this little Chap all you can about Food-Control!



THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY

is issued from the Central Information Office of the Canadian Liberal Party. Hope Chambers, Ottawa.
PRICE 25c A YEAR

CONSCRIPTION AND REFERENDUM.

WITH the Conscription Bill and the referendum motion of the leader of the Opposition, as well as the six months' hoist of the measure proposed by Mr. Barrett, all voted on and disposed of, the present issue of the Liberal Monthly considers that a very fair and accurate measure of the different aspects of this remarkable piece of legislation is within its province. With this in view we present herewith five speeches delivered by Liberal members on the Military Service Act of 1917, as fairly indicative of the different appeals of the measure. The first of these is the speech of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, representative of the referendum view. The remaining four are made up of two in favour of the government measure, by Messrs. F. F. Pardee, chief Liberal Whip and Hon. G. P. Graham, respectively; and two in favour of the referendum by Hon. Chas. Murphy and Mr. A. B. McCoig, M.P. for Kent. Mr. McCoig voted for the measure after the defeat of the referendum proposal.

The people of the Dominion have by this time a very clear conception of the wide powers and scope of the conscription measure. They likewise have awakened to the significance of legislation of this kind in the circumstances. The rights and liberties of Canadians are threatened through the medium of the Empire, that is, a defeat of British democracy in the present struggle would have far reaching effects in this country. All parties recognize and admit this. Every section of the Liberal party favours the maintenance of Canadian military representation at the front in as large numbers as this country can furnish. The one point of difference of opinion lies in the best method to secure these additional troops. Some members of the Liberal party believe that conscription alone will secure the required reinforcements. These Liberals are entitled to their convictions, which must be, and are, respected by all true democrats. Others hold that a referendum would be more in accord with Liberal principles, considering the undoubted fact that the present parliament is a moribund body and absolutely without mandate from the people to deal with a matter of such vital importance, constituting, as it does, a departure from precedent of the most radical kind. Particularly strong is the position of advocates of an appeal to the people when the conduct of the administration in the matter of recruiting is considered. Every evidence points to glaring blunders and worse on the part of the government in this department. It is asserted by Liberals of the referendum school that voluntarism in Canada was systematically harrassed and finally killed by the adverse influences operating within the cabinet, a view which the controversy between the Prime Minister and the former Minister of Militia has greatly strengthened. Conscription Liberals, on the other hand, while admitting the maladministration of the militia department and the government, point to the necessity for more men at the front as sufficient reason for hoping and trusting

that the government will enact the measure fairly and impartially, despite their record in the case of voluntary recruiting. With these Liberals it is a case of faith induced by the alleged necessities of the situation. To them, haste is imperative and conscription points the shortest way. But will conscription secure the required men easier or quicker than a referendum would accomplish the same object?

We must not overlook the vital matter of national unity. It will not prove a real victory if we defeat the Hun and plant the seed of discord, sectional strife and jealousy among our own people. Such a victory would be a costly one indeed. Yet we cannot forget that in this matter the government has not kept faith with the people or their representatives. Repeatedly has the government assured the country that there was no intention of introducing compulsory military service, repeatedly has it informed representatives of the workers that no such step would be taken without giving the people ample reasons for such departure from our accustomed policy, and ascertaining public sentiment thereon. Up to within a few weeks of the introduction of the bill the premier repeated his promise in this regard. Nevertheless the measure was framed as a strictly party proposal and introduced as an administration bill. Constitutionally, therefore, the opponents of conscription without a referendum, appear to have a very strong case and one which embodies the true principles of Liberalism. To ascertain the voice of the people in legislation affecting the very circle of family life, in matters touching hearths and homes and loved ones is surely not an unreasonable policy. To conciliate, not to antagonize; to explain and reason and appeal, rather than to compel, is surely not a disloyal policy.

CANADA'S FINANCIAL POSITION.

THE financial situation in the Dominion is beginning to cause grave concern among those who make an intelligent study of national finances. The facts appear to be that we have borrowed such large sums of money during the past six years, and, of course, particularly since the war broke out that to-day we are facing what may easily develop into a crisis. The recent attempt of our Minister of Finance to borrow an additional \$75,000,000 in the United States was unsuccessful. It appears that owing to arrangements made at the time of the large Allied loan a few weeks ago no loans by any of the belligerent countries may now be offered on the American market. In addition the needs of the United States, which is now in the war on a gigantic scale, will require the conservation of its financial resources.

It is understood that the Canadian banks have intimated that while they might be in position to help out the government, such aid can be proffered only at the expense of the commercial community. The administration has been forced to accept this offer and the result cannot but have a serious effect in the country, when there ensues a curtailment of credit. The situation in brief is that the banks cannot finance the nation and the industrial and commercial interests at the same time. Naturally the national interest will have the call. The need for national economy is therefore very urgent.

CANADA FIFTY YEARS OLD.

NO more inspiring message could be given the people of Canada on our 50th anniversary than the words spoken by the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier on Parliament Hill, Ottawa, on Dominion Day, on the historic occasion of the formal dedication of the new and stately Parliament Buildings as a memorial to the Fathers of Confederation and to the valour of our Canadian soldiers at the front.

Those who spoke on this occasion were His Highness, The Duke of Devonshire, the Right Honourable Sir Robert Borden and the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

We quote herewith Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech on this occasion:

Fifty years ago the fathers of Confederation conceived and carried out the idea of joining together the scattered British colonies in the northern part of the American continent and uniting them in the principles of democratic government. It was a bold and new experiment. Many doubted its success but events had more than justified expectations. It was a new chapter in colonial history, a new page in British constitution.

It was the Nemesis of fate that the present occasion, which might be one of rejoicing, coincided with the saddest period in the history of Canada and the Empire, now under the shadow of war, into which had been thrown all her forces for the defence of her principles and ideals. In times of peace, the day would be one of universal rejoicing, with flags and bunting on every street and jubilation prevalent in every corner of the land, with the exuberance of overflowing hearts. But the gathering was not one of rejoicing. There were too many homes in mourning, too many others where the people lived in fear of the coming of sad news from the front, telling of the death of a loved one on the battle-front. The assemblage was in commemoration of the day and for the purpose of testifying once more the country's gratification and gratitude and admiration to those great men who carried out confederation, whom we delighted in naming fathers. They were men of broad vision, not limited to the horizon of the original four colonies. They had cast their eyes far beyond, over all the continent, from the tempestuous shores of the Atlantic, over lake and mountain, to the broad Pacific. What was their dream in 1867—confederation of all Canada—was an accomplished fact in 1917. New provinces had arisen out of the wilderness. To-day the Dominion embraced and comprised the whole of the continent. Distances had been overcome by railways until the two oceans had been brought nearer to each other than either was from the great lakes and had made accessible those new territories with their vast possibilities in production, mining and fishing. To these new territories Canada had invited the people of the nations of the world, had shared with them her lands. The only condition was that they swear allegiance to the King of England, the King of Canada, and that they should be true to Canada, true Canadians.

The men of 1867 had built far better than they imagined. Their example had been emulated all over the Empire, to Australia, South Africa and New Zealand, where scattered colonies had been made nations.

All these countries, in all latitudes, from the Northern Star to the Southern Cross, had been joined together in the intangible bonds of British unity. It was not a conglomeration of races held together by the iron rod of despotic rule, but, as in the happy words of General Smuts: "A commonwealth of free and open colonies." Looking back, the phenomenal progress and growth of law, order, prosperity and freedom was due to the work of the men of 1867. If more was to be said, the extraordinary development of British institutions never shone so conspicuously or so brilliantly as on the sad day we are passing through. When in 1914 Britain, seeing treat-

ies dishonoured, had accepted war, from that moment all her colonies had been behind her, for it was realized that if treaties were to be treated with impunity then civilization was at an end. The colonies did it spontaneously, willingly, voluntarily, in the full majesty of their legislative freedom. This could all be traced back to the men of 1867.

Looking back on the events of fifty years, it could be said that Canada had just cause for pride in the achievements of Confederation. Yet no one could say that Confederation had realized all hoped for it at the time. Much had been done; much more remained to be done. But nothing was to be feared if the Canadian people held sacred the principles of justice, tolerance and broad human sympathy, and if they always maintained to the front those ideals and used them as beacons to guide the nation in its vicissitudes. There would be storms—it was folly to hope otherwise—but they would be weathered if the people remained true to the faith and if their courage was equal to all emergencies.

QUEBEC AND RECRUITING.

SPEAKING in the House of Commons on Wednesday, June 20th, Mr. W. S. Middlebro, Conservative Member for North Grey, Ontario, gave a list of figures with respect to recruiting in the various provinces throughout the Dominion. This list gives the number of men enlisted and the percentages of enlistment of the total population in each Province, and is as follows:

Province	Population	Number recruited	Per cent of total population
Quebec	2,003,712	44,000	2 $\frac{1}{4}$
Prince Edward Island	93,728	2,700	2 $\frac{7}{8}$
New Brunswick	351,889	17,500	5
Ontario	2,523,074	168,300	6 $\frac{2}{3}$
British Columbia	392,466	39,200	10
Alberta	374,663	35,000	9 $\frac{1}{3}$
Manitoba and Saskatchewan	948,046	79,500	6 $\frac{2}{3}$
Nova Scotia	492,330	22,300	4 $\frac{1}{2}$

In the June issue of the Canadian Liberal Monthly a statement was issued showing the number of British Born (born in the British Isles) and also giving the percentages of native born in six of the nine provinces of the Dominion. We reproduce these figures which are as follows:

	British born (born in British Isles.)	Percentage to Native Born.
Quebec	68,000	3.7
Ontario	349,000	17.
Manitoba	91,000	34.
Saskatchewan	77,000	30.
Alberta	66,000	40.
British Columbia	107,000	63.

A careful study of these two tables proves that in every province where there is a large percentage of British-born (born in British Isles) enlistments for our Canadian Expeditionary Forces have been good. In fact, these figures prove conclusively the more "British Born" the greater were the enlistments.

AVAILABLE MAN POWER IN CANADA.

That our readers may better understand just what available man power there is in Canada, the following statement has been prepared. The figures quoted in this statement are taken from Government Records or from statements prepared by Government officials.

TOTAL MEN AVAILABLE.

The total number of males in Canada between the ages of 20 and 45 according to the 1911 Census were.....	1,583,549
Male Immigration into Canada, 1911 to 1917 (estimated).....	400,000
Natural Increase (Male) (estimated).....	200,000

These two sets of estimated figures, viz., 400,000 and 200,000 are taken from speeches delivered by Conservative Members of Parliament in the House of Commons. We have accepted the figures and include them in these totals but in doing so we must add that if 600,000 males between the ages of 20 and 45 have been added to our population since 1911 it means an increased population throughout Canada of 2,800,000, which everybody knows is absurd. However, not to be accused of being unfair we add these figures to our totals.

DISTRIBUTION OF MAN POWER.

Enlistments.—

Males enlisted for Overseas Service (June 20th, 1917.....)	421,767
(From statement of Prime Minister, May 21st, 1917.)	

Manufacturing for War Materials.....	397,421
--------------------------------------	---------

Made up of persons of all ages, as follows:

Food products.....	62,154
Textiles.....	74,443
Iron and Steel products.....	58,842
Timber and Lumber and their manufacture.....	68,276
Leather and its finished product.....	22,556
Chemicals and allied products.....	12,429
Vehicles for land transportation.....	36,824
Vessels for water transportation.....	5,531
Miscellaneous.....	56,366

(These figures are taken from the Census returns' Table I, Manufacturers of Canada, 1915).

397,421

Other Manufacturers.....	545,480
--------------------------	---------

Made up of males between the ages of 20 and 45, as follows:

Building Trades.....	160,700
Domestic and Personal Service.....	48,940
Civil and Municipal Government.....	46,310
Fishing and Hunting.....	20,680
Forestry.—Owners, managers, foremen and their office employees, shanty-men, other woodsmen and river drivers.....	27,850
Mining.....	40,990
Professional.....	41,110
Trade and Merchandising—Stores, wholesale and retail, and manufacturing of all kinds for our civil population.....	158,900

Making a total of..... 545,480
(This group of figures is taken from the 1911 Census.)

Agriculture.

According to the 1911 Census there are in Canada 714,648 Farms (Fruit and Dairy of one acre or more included) employing on an average 1.28 men per Farm or a total of.....

If increased production is necessary surely 20 per cent increase is not unreasonable. To provide for this will require 193,000 men.....	193,000
---	---------

Transportation:

Outside of steam and electric railroads little information is available in Canada of the number of men employed in transportation work. From the annual report of the statistical branch of the Department of Railways and Canals the total number of employees engaged on steam railways throughout Canada in 1916 is given as 144,770. On electric railways in Canada, 10,662. Making a total of.....

The number of employees connected with steamship companies are not available and consequently is omitted from this list.....	155,432
--	---------

TOTALS.....

2,630,948

2,183,549

MUNITION WORKERS.

In the 630 Munitions plants in Canada manufacturing munitions there are, according to statements given out by the Imperial Munitions Board, between 250,000 and 300,000 persons employed manufacturing munitions. As, no doubt, many of the persons thus employed were taken from the various classes of industry already referred to in this article, we purposely omit this number of munition workers from our totals.

From the figures on the previous page it will be seen that there are in Canada available men to the number of..... 2,183,549

Out of this number there are required for manufacturing war and other material, for agriculture, and for transportation as outlined, men to the number of..... 2,630,948

In other words for the requirements of war work there are 447,399 men short of the actual men available of military age.

If, therefore, Canada is to make up this deficiency in man-power some rearrangement is necessary. It is only fair to state that some of the manufacturing outlined in the foregoing paragraphs could well be done women and men not of military age.

WHAT IS THE AVAILABLE MAN-POWER IN CANADA BETWEEN THE AGES OF 15 AND 64?

By referring to the census figures of 1911 (See Census Bulletin XVIII, page 2,) the following table is given:

Males.

15 to 24 years of age.....	737,099
25 to 44 years of age.....	1,115,726
45 to 64 years of age.....	538,703
A total of.....	2,427,528

Thus we find that 2,427,528 is the total man-power in Canada between the ages of 15 and 64. Compare these figures with the number of men required to carry on the necessary work in Canada in connection with the successful prosecution of the war, namely, 2,630,948 and it is found that we are still short in Canada of 213,420 men. As stated above, no doubt a few women could take the place of men in connection with some of this manufacturing work but it is also fair to state that in these figures above quoted of our available man-power in Canada between the ages of 15 and 64, no deductions have been made of the men who are medically unfit to work, of the classes of people in Canada who are adverse to military service of any kind, and who have, by Order-in-Council, been exempted. If, therefore, another 100,000 men are to be enlisted in Canada one of three things must be done. Namely, our man and woman power brought to a National Service basis, or some one or all of the various works connected with the prosecution of the war interfered with, or the age limit changed.

FROM WHAT CLASSES ARE THESE MEN TO BE TAKEN?

Let us go over the list.

MANUFACTURING FOR WAR MATERIAL: Can any men be spared from this class? Perhaps so, but we imagine the manufacturers and those interested in supplying and equipping our soldiers will raise their voice in protest.

OTHER MANUFACTURING: A few men might perhaps be taken from this class but we must not lose sight of the fact that building to some extent in Canada must go on. Domestic and personal service might supply a few men; civil and municipal governments might also supply a few; fishing and hunting could hardly be interfered with, particularly the former, which at this time has much to do in regulating the high cost of living; forestry, even in times of war our forests must be protected and the industry not impaired. Mining, emphatically no, the supply of fuel is very important also the mining of nickle and other minerals used in connection with the war. Professional, trade and merchandise could hardly be expected to supply many men.

AGRICULTURE: Agriculture has already been sufficiently depleted and instead of further depletion some real effective measure should be adopted to increase our agricultural production even beyond the 20% increase provided for in these figures. In this connection one cannot overlook the action of the Government in taking from our farms in Canada at least 25,000 soldiers and then immediately filling the United States papers with advertisements calling for 25,000 men to take the place of our soldiers, promising these Americans that if they would come to Canada and take up this work that they would be exempt from compulsory service.

MUNITION WORKERS: The chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board, Sir Joseph Flavelle, has recently issued a decree that under no condition must munition workers be interfered with.

TRANSPORTATION: This class is the most vital with the exception perhaps of agriculture. The handling of munitions, of food, of our grain crops and sundry other necessities of life must not be interfered with. Most important of all is perhaps the transportation of fuel, particularly of coal. During the winter of 1916-17 Canada experienced what a real fuel famine might mean. Reports to-day are emanating from reliable sources stating that even now in mid-summer the condition is worse than it was a year ago. Great care must be taken in this connection or Canada will have a coal famine in reality during the coming winter.

THIS WHOLE QUESTION IS SERIOUS AND IT IS THE DUTY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DAY TO DEAL WITH IT IN A BUSINESS-LIKE MANNER AND NOT UNDERTAKE TO TAMPER WITH AN IMPORTANT ISSUE FOR SENTIMENTAL PURPOSES ONLY. WE LEAVE THE MATTER FOR THE PEOPLE OF CANADA TO JUDGE FOR THEMSELVES.

SPEECH

of the

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER

P.C., G.C.M.G., M.P.

In Moving Referendum Amendment to the

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917

ON MONDAY, JUNE 18th, 1917.

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

'The further consideration of this Bill be deferred until the principle thereof has, by means of a referendum, been submitted to and approved of by the electors of Canada.' "

Right Hon. SIR WILFRID LAURIER:

Mr. Speaker, a week ago the Prime Minister in his concluding remarks on introducing this Bill expressed the hope that the measure would be discussed with fairness and moderation and without any bitter words or taunts. I can assure him that so far as we on this side of the House are concerned it will be our endeavour, even though we do not agree with the Bill, to facilitate it and to find out the truth about it, and we shall do that in such a spirit as to represent the views of all those who in this matter have nothing at heart but the interest of our country as God gives them to see it.

Indeed, I will go so far in this direction as not even to challenge the ominous words, amounting almost to a threat, which the Prime Minister used when he said that he was less concerned with the day when this Bill should pass, than with the day when our soldiers might return and find this Bill not passed. Sir, let me with moderation take absolute issue with my right hon. friend upon this point. The Canadian soldiers are citizens of Canada. They have left their avocations to do battle for a cause which they deem, and rightly deem, the cause of freedom. I would be loath to believe that when they return they will forget the principle to which they have dedicated their lives, whatever may be the fate reserved for this Bill by a still free people.

Harmony Must Exist.

In approaching the discussion of this Bill with moderation and fairness we shall not depart from the path that every one of us in this Chamber has followed, and especially during the last three years. I appeal, Sir, to the sense of justice of all members of this House, whether, from the day that Canada entered the fiery furnace which has been raging now with unabated fury for nearly three years, we on this side of the House, His Majesty's loyal Opposition, have ever uttered one word of dissent from any measure which has been presented by the Government for the prosecution of the war. To every such measure we have given our assent without hesitation, having always before us the preservation of harmony between all classes and races in this country,—harmony which is so essential to the task we have in hand. If to-day this harmony no longer exists, the fault is not with this side of the House.

Compulsory Service against Free Government.

To-day the Government bring down a measure to substitute for voluntary service, compulsory service—compulsory service, which the Government from the day the war broke out, up to the 18th of April this year have said they never would resort to. But they have cast aside their oft-repeated assurances, and I rise to ask, with my humble voice, that we should pause and see whether or not this new measure will not be more detrimental than helpful to the cause which we all have

at heart. Up to this date we on this side of the House, although sometimes sorely tried by the lashes of the Government in the discharge of the momentous duties entrusted to their care, have never criticised except where criticism was unavoidable, and in such criticism we have always endeavoured to keep our divisions to ourselves, to uphold the prestige of England, and to show to the world, as far as we could, that all the races of this vast Empire were bound together in this tremendous struggle for freedom.

But I am sorry to say that the course which the Government is taking to-day is not in accordance with those principles of free government which we understand to be at the very foundation of the British constitution. If I rise to-day to oppose this Bill, it is rather a sadness to me than otherwise, for my views have not changed upon the objects to be attained in this war. My heart is where it ever has been from the day that war broke out; I have not changed at all, and if any there be who think I am not consistent in taking the position I now take all I have to say is: Hear me; hear me for my cause.

The Law of the Land against Compulsion.

The Prime Minister, in introducing this Bill a few days ago, said he was not deviating in any way from the law of the land. On that I again take absolute issue with him. The law of the land, which antedates Confederation, not by many years, but by many generations, and which was reintroduced very shortly after Confederation, emphatically declares that no man in Canada shall be subjected to compulsory military service except to repel invasion or for the defence of Canada. The law of the land goes so far as to give to the Government power to raise for the defence of Canada men not merely between the ages of 18 and 45, but between the ages of 18 and 60.

The law of the land gives power to the Government to repel invasion—that is what I understand by "the defence of Canada"—by summoning not only the class of men between 18 and 60, but by summoning everybody, old men of 70 and 80, and children of any age. They may summon everybody when the enemy is at the frontier, in order to preserve intact the soil of this our land. That is the way I understand the existing law. And in this the law of this land is not singular, for such has been the law of civilized nations everywhere. It was the law of France when Canada was in possession of France; it was the law of England when Canada came into possession of England. In France that law remained unaltered until 1798 when compulsion was introduced for the first time; it remained the law of England until last year. If ever there was a principle which was embedded in the very soil of Britain, it was that the King could demand no service of his people except for the protection of their land and the repelling of invasion. It is well known that the King of England could not for any other purpose claim the service of any of his subjects. The English people were always afraid of permanent armies; the English people again and again have fought against

their Kings to vindicate the principle that large permanent armies be not established in Great Britain.

Compulsion Bill is New Principle.

Now, the Prime Minister says that he is introducing no new principle, that he could have sent abroad the 400,000 men who have been sent, under the authority of the existing Act. Sir, I take issue with my right hon. friend on that, I say he had not any such power; I say that he could not under the Act as it is, send anybody across the ocean to serve in the war. He said the other day, and he has just repeated it, that the first line of our defence to-day is in Flanders and France. I claim against him that there never was any danger of invasion of Canada on the part of Germany. If I have taken the position I have hitherto taken it is not because I feared an invasion of Canada by Germany. Nobody could say consistently that at this time, or at any time within the three years of the war, Canada was for one instant in danger of invasion. If I have taken the position I have taken, if I have been, as I was and as I am, in favour of our participation in the war, it was not because I feared invasion but because I believed that the victory of Germany would mean for Canada, as for the rest of the world envelopment in the black shroud of German hegemony, with its insolence, cruelties, and barbarities.

In support of this contention of mine that this Government could not, under the Militia Act, send the forces that they did, I will contrast with the Government of to-day the Government of 1914. The Government then did not pretend that they were using the Militia Act in sending Canadian forces across the sea; they did not send them under that Act at all. Here is a despatch of His Royal Highness the Governor General, sent by the Prime Minister which is an absolute refutation of the doctrine which has just been asserted by him. This was sent by the Governor General to the Secretary of State for the colonies, and dated August 1, 1914:

Ottawa, August 1, 1914.

"In view of the impending danger of war involving the Empire my Advisers are anxiously considering the most effective means of rendering every possible aid and they welcome any suggestions and advice which Imperial naval and military authorities may deem it expedient to offer. They are confident that a considerable force would be available for service abroad. A question has been mooted respecting the status of any Canadian force serving abroad as under section 69 of Canadian Militia Act the active militia can only be placed on actual service beyond Canada for the defence thereof."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: If it was "for the defence thereof" what was the necessity of stating that there was doubt as to the status of these troops?

"It has been suggested that regiments might enlist as Imperial troops for stated periods, Canadian Government undertaking to make all necessary financial provision for their equipment, pay and maintenance."

Government had no Confidence in Militia Act.

Thus, at the very beginning of the war, it was recognized that the words "for the defence thereof" could not apply to this case; that the troops could not be sent under the Militia Act, and that they should be sent as Imperial troops and as serving voluntarily in the war. That is conclusive.

SIR SAM HUGHES: What is the date of that despatch?

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: First of August, 1914. Then there is an Order in Council, passed on August 6, as follows:

"The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 6th August, 1914, from the Minister Militia and Defence, representing,—in view of the state of war now existing between the United Kingdom, and the Dominions, Colonies, and Dependencies of the British Empire on the one side, and Germany on the other side, creating a menace to the well-being and integrity of the Empire, and having regard to the duty of the Dominion of Canada as one of those Dominions to provide for its own defense and to assist in maintaining the integrity and honour

of the Empire, that it is desirable to mobilize Militia units of the various arms of the service of such effective strength as may from time to time be determined by Your Royal Highness in Council, such units to be composed of officers and men who are willing to volunteer for Overseas service under the British Crown."

And so this was for voluntary service alone. Nor is that all. There was this despatch sent by the Governor General on 5th of August:

"My Government being desirous of putting beyond doubt status of Canadian volunteers requests that His Majesty may be pleased to issue an order bringing these volunteers under sections 175 and 176 of the Army Act."

Thus, being in doubt of the power of the Government to send troops under the Militia Act, they asked that the Government of Great Britain should issue an order to enlist them for the British Army. And so we have reason to believe that the Militia Act, as we have understood it, never applied to this case.

A New Condition.

But I go further. It does not matter whether the position taken by the Government to-day is taken under one statute or under another. It does not matter whether the Bill that is proposed is an amendment of the Militia Act or is a new law, as I contend; the fact is that to-day the Government are bringing in a compulsory service Act, though they declared in this Parliament, from the day war was declared until the 18th of April last, that compulsory service they never would resort to.

What, then, is the condition, Mr. Speaker? It is a new condition altogether. I shall be told, of course, that the people have the right to change the laws, and that if conscription has not been the law of the land up to the present day, the people have the right to change the law so that henceforth conscription shall be the law of the land. To this I have certainly no objection to offer, with this I completely agree, as every man must agree. It is the people who must change the law, and all I ask is that the people have opportunity if they so wish to themselves change the law and not this Parliament, which, I claim, has not the right. Let the people speak and I have no objection and no complaint to make. Let the people speak and express their will. With that I shall be satisfied; I ask no more.

No Authority to Act.

But, Sir, that is not all. I said at the commencement of my remarks, and I repeat it, that, according to the well understood principles of the British Constitution, this Parliament has no right to pass this law. The Prime Minister has no right to ask Parliament to pass this law according to its own declaration made once, and more than once, on the floor of this House. On the 1st of January, 1916, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) issued a message to the Canadian people that he would offer to contribute from Canada 500,000 men. My hon. friend referred to this in the opening sentences of his observations the other day, and he said that to this declaration no exception was taken, that with regard to it no observation was made, and that the credits for such a force were voted. He took that as a pledge. He had not intended it as a pledge, he said, but the Canadian people had so interpreted it. Here are his words, and I had better quote them in order that there may be no ambiguity:

"No criticism was made in Parliament of the action which the Government thus took; no motion was moved against the Government's action, and the necessary Parliamentary appropriations were voted unanimously. In many parts of the country my message was construed as a pledge. It was not issued as a pledge; it was the authorization of a further increase in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces; but it has been deemed to have been a pledge made on behalf of the Government and the people of this country, and I am content so to regard it."

Upon this point I have again to take issue with my right hon. friend. I say that the words which he pronounced upon an occasion subsequent to his offer, that is to say in the debate on the Address of that year, constituted on his part a pledge that these 500,000

ing
ans
use, the
ties
cept
ism;
to
now
this
ous
the
with
and
ion.
ness
ged
part
out;
ink
all
few
the
sue
on-
ns,
ler-
ada
ept
[he
ent
ely
of
: to
nce
ten
old
may
ier,
nd.
in
ten
aw-
ce;
es-
red
rst
ar.
the
no
eir
wn
ose
ish
he
st

men would not be raised except by voluntary service and not by compulsion. I take issue, I say, with my right hon. friend, and it is for the House to decide when he says that we voted the appropriations and that we made no observations. On the contrary we did make some observations. I wanted to know from him what it meant, whether this was to be done by obligatory or by voluntary service and in the debate on the Address I spoke in this way:

"My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has the first day of this year issued a statement that he was prepared to offer 500,000 men. I shall not to-day discuss whether or not the premature statement of my right hon. friend was exactly on the lines of parliamentary government. I put aside all these questions on such a day as this. I understand that we shall have a statement made upon the offer of 500,000 men, which it seems to me is a large contract, but, again, upon this I pass no judgment. I shall be prepared, and my friends around me will be prepared to listen to, and to discuss in the spirit in which all such propositions should be discussed, the proposition which the Government deems essential to carry on the fight in which we are engaged. But let me say—and I believe that upon this we should have an expression of opinion—that we must repel at once the impression which has been sought to be created that this offer is a preliminary step to conscription. There is to be no conscription in Canada. Sir, there has been an attempt made for many years to frighten the people with the spectre of conscription. There are some men in this House, as you know who in the elections of 1911 stated that the enactment of the naval law was a prelude to conscription. There are men in the province of Quebec who have been asserting that the moment conscription was adopted in Great Britain, conscription would be adopted or proposed in Canada. The Naval law has been for six years on the statute book. It is still there; it has not been repealed, as many members in this House were pledged to repeal it. It is there, and there is yet no conscription. Conscription has come in England, but conscription is not to come in Canada. So far as conscription in England is concerned, it would be in bad taste, nay, it would be impertinent for us to attempt to pass any remarks, either of approval or of disapproval with regard to it. For my own part I am free to say that I expected that Great Britain would be able to carry on this stupendous war under her old system of voluntary enlistment. The British Government have thought otherwise; they have thought that the magnitude, the stupendous magnitude of the war we have to face, compelled them to resort to conscription and the step taken by the government seems to meet with the approval of the great majority of the English people. But, Sir, the conditions are not the same in Canada as in Great Britain. The reasons why there can be no conscription in Canada are obvious."

Then I pass on to the conclusion:

"That there is some foundation for it I believe, but I do not think the movement has assumed such proportions as are here indicated. At all events, there is enough to show that it is important that we should have at once from my right hon. friend the Prime Minister an authoritative statement upon this point."

Premier said Conscription not Coming.

That is, I asked for an authoritative statement from the Prime Minister as to whether or not there was to be compulsion or no compulsion. My right hon. friend, thus challenged, answered, and here is the manner in which he answered when I asked him whether or not this offer of 500,000 men meant conscription or no conscription:

"My right hon. friend has alluded to conscription—to the idea in this country or elsewhere that there may be conscription in Canada. In speaking in the first two or three months of this war I made it clear to the people of Canada that we did not propose any conscription. I repeat that announcement to-day with emphasis."

Could anything be clearer than that this was not a step towards conscription, but that it was intended that the 500,000 men should be raised simply by voluntary enlistment?

But that is not all. Time went on and a great num-

ber of men were enlisted. In the debate on the Address of this very year, in the month of January last, this subject was referred to and this is the manner in which my right hon. friend spoke of the result of his attempts to obtain 500,000 men:

"With regard to recruiting, the response has been good—
SIR SAM HUGHES: What date?

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: In January, 1917; I have not the exact date, but it was during the debate on the Address.

"With regard to recruiting, the response has been good from all the provinces of Canada. It has been splendid. It may be that at first the Maritime Provinces and the province of Quebec were a little slower than some of the other provinces of Canada, but I know from information which has reached me recently that the enlistment in these provinces is now all that could be desired, and is thoroughly responsive to the call which has been made. It is appropriate that I should here pay a tribute to those Canadians of French origin who are fighting in France for the Fatherland of their ancestors. Among them are many who have distinguished themselves. At the moment I recall the names of Papineau, Barré, Dansereau and Roy. No greater, no more heroic deed has been or could be performed in this war than that of Major Roy, who died in the endeavour to save his men from danger. His name for that gallant deed, ought ever to be blazoned in the memory of all Canadians."

These words were spoken not more than six months ago, in the first days of this session, in the debate on the Address, and you will find that, certainly by these words of the Prime Minister, it was not his intention to resort to compulsion. Nay, he was quite satisfied with the progress in recruiting that had been made in all the provinces. Yet, that is not all. Time went on and the Government seem to have been changing their opinion.

Men for Home Defence.

Rumours were commencing to be heard to the effect that, after all, there would be conscription. Then another view prevailed, and it was not to have military service but to call for 50,000 men for home defence. And on the 16th of March last an Order in Council was passed authorizing the Minister of Militia:

"To raise 50,000 men for home defence, excluding troops already called out under Order in Council dated August 6, 1914, and that it forms part of the force of 500,000 men to which reference is made in Order in Council dated January 12, 1916. It is understood that the conditions of enlistment applying to the above-mentioned partial mobilization of the active militia apply only to service in Canada for home defence."

Service for home defence? Against whom were these men called upon to defend Canada? Who was threatening Canada in the month of March, 1917, so that she required 50,000 men to look after her defence? Where was the enemy? Sir, that was not the real intent of this Order in Council; it was a pretence. The real intent is to be found in the numerous paragraphs which appeared at that time in the ministerial press to the effect that these men were to be trained and that after they had been trained they would probably enlist voluntarily for overseas services. Sir, this Order in Council was certainly passed with great levity. Who could have expected that the Government would find men ready to enlist for home defence, that is to say, to kick their heels in the streets of the cities, without having anything to do and no enemy to fight against? Who could have expected that any man would come forward and proclaim himself a coward, that he would not enlist to go and fight, but that he would enlist for home defence only where there was no danger? This Order in Council was repealed almost as soon as it was passed—I do not know whether it was actually repealed, but if it was not repealed it was at all events not acted upon, and it is still dormant in the dust of the pigeon holes of the Militia Department. But, now, after all this, suddenly, without any preparation, without a word of advice, all of a sudden the Government, on the 18th of April last, come forward and say that they are going to introduce compulsory military service.

Extension of the Life of Parliament.

That is not all; there is something more. In the speech from the Throne in 1916, there was a statement that an extension of the term of Parliament was to be asked. Parliament was to expire in the month of October of that year, and the statement was put in the mouth of the Governor General that an extension of the term of Parliament for one year more would be asked. In due time the resolution came up for the acceptance of Parliament. When it first came up, shortly after the debate on the Address, we had still in our ears the pledge of the Prime Minister that there would be no conscription whatever, and that the 500,000 men would be enlisted on the voluntary principle. And having that pledge in our ears we granted voluntarily an extension of the life of Parliament until the month of October of this year. Would any one believe that if the Government had told us at that time that they contemplated introducing the new, radical, principle of conscription, Parliament would have been extended? If that statement had been made, if Parliament had been led to believe that there was to be conscription, that compulsory service was to be proposed, would Parliament not have said: Let the Constitution take its course, and let the people at once deal with the question. That would have been the attitude of Parliament.

Moribund Parliament has no Right to Act.

Sir, in the face of all those pledges made by the Government to Parliament, and through Parliament to the people, I say that Parliament has not the right to pass the law which it is now asked to pass. It has the power to pass it I know, this moribund Parliament may have this might, but it has not the right, and might and right are two different things, as we know. Right against might is the very principle for which we are fighting in this war. I ask my right hon. friend if he is doing fairly by the people of Canada when he asks this moribund Parliament to enact such a law. Yes, it is not only a moribund Parliament, it is a rump—it is nothing but a rump Parliament at the present time. There are twenty seats vacant of the members elected in 1911. There are twenty more seats to be filled which must be filled by the new provinces of the West whose population justifies this additional number being added to their representation. So that you have vacancies of over forty members out of two hundred and twenty members, almost twenty-five per cent of the whole membership of this House. And yet, you are asking that this Parliament should take on itself to pass such a law as this. For my part I say, and I place myself in the judgment of the country, and of this Parliament also, that when the Government asks this moribund Parliament to pass such a law it is an abuse of the authority which has been placed in them by the people of Canada. But I shall be asked, perhaps: can you not do what has been done in the United States?

Conscription in States Different.

In the United States they have just passed a law establishing conscription, and is our constitution inferior to the American constitution? Inferior? Our constitution on this point is superior to the American constitution. Our constitution is elastic; the American constitution is drastic and rigid, it cannot be extended. But, Sir, under our constitution it is a principle now admitted that if any new question comes up during the régime of a Parliament—a question which would vastly change the whole condition of things in the country—then under such circumstances it is preferable to have a dissolution, and to have the people pass on it. Then we may be told, perhaps: But what is now asked of the Canadian Parliament was also asked of the British Parliament, and it is hardly one year ago since the British Parliament itself passed the law of conscription in the two kingdoms; Ireland being excluded. Sir, again there is a vast difference. It is true that the term of the British Parliament has been extended. It is true that that law has been passed. But it is true also that it was passed after long preparation; it was not brought on of a sudden. Another fact is that the British Parliament through by-elections was complete

and has been complete at all times throughout the war. Every seat as it has become vacant has been filled, and by this means the British House of Commons has been kept in touch with the people. But here we have not had a by-election for two years except elections in cases when newly appointed Ministers of the Crown were compelled to seek re-election. Outside of these there has not been an election; Parliament has not been in touch with the country for two years and more, and it seems to me that this is an additional reason why we should not proceed with this Bill.

Coalition.

But, sir, there is more than this. Let us put aside this aspect of the question altogether and let us come down to the merits of the question now placed before this House. Hitherto I have discussed the power of this Parliament to pass the law. I do not dispute that Parliament has the power, but again I dispute its right to exercise the compulsion which it is sought to impose to-day.

My right hon. friend made a passing allusion to the fact that he had asked me to go into a coalition with him in order to pass a conscription law, and the correspondence which passed between us has been placed before Parliament. I stated then that I could not agree to go into a coalition Government.

Should have Consulted Liberals.

I suggested to him that if my humble advice in regard to this law would be useful I should have been called in sooner, so as to be able to discuss the principle itself. It seemed to me, in the fitness of things, that that would have been the proper course in the interest of the country—that the services of the Opposition, such as they might be, should have been called in for the purpose of initiating such a new policy. The first thing to be done, in my belief, was to consult the Opposition in regard to that policy, but I was called upon to be an adjunct, an appendix, to endorse a law which had been already framed, and to go into a Government one-half of which would have had to go out, if I had come in. I submitted my objection to my right hon. friend. He told me, however, that he thought it preferable that the Bill should be prepared before submitting it to me. When I stated my position to my right hon. friend he said he thought differently, and I knew he thought differently. He knows now that I thought differently also, and it is for the country to judge who thought wisely upon that occasion.

Shall We have Conscription?

Coming to the merits of this proposition: Should we, or should we not, have compulsion. That brings me to the very basis of the whole question. Conscription is a new word in the language of Britain. It was in existence in France 100 years before it came up for discussion in England, but when it was discussed in England it was thoroughly discussed. The war broke out in August, 1914, and in January, 1915, the matter was brought up by Lord Middleton in the House of Lords and was fully considered. It was brought up again in the House of Commons, and again later on, in October, 1915, the Derby system of enlistment was introduced, and that system was supposed to lead to conscription, and conscription was passed. But even when the measure was made law it was not endorsed by everybody. Sir John Simon, one of the luminaries of the Bar then Attorney General, resigned his seat, and, when it came to the final division, some forty of the Liberal members went in with him to the Opposition lobby. All this shows that the country was prepared for conscription when it was brought up. It was not dashed at them without preparation.

People should have been Consulted.

It was not introduced, as it has been in Canada, without any preparation of the people by educating them to an understanding of it. The one thing which I suggested to my hon. friend and to his Government—the one thing of all in which I think he failed—was the fact that there was a public opinion in the coun-

try which had to be reconciled upon this matter, and that any such legislation as this is always sure to bring forward a very sincere opposition. This is exactly what has happened, as we see to-day, because, after all, everybody in this House is aware that at the moment am speaking there is a deep cleavage amongst the Canadian people. I ask my hon. friends opposite are we entitled to vote on this question now? Under this system no doubt a few more recruits will be obtained, but they are encouraging a line of cleavage which is already too far advanced. When I speak of cleavage I do not mean cleavage between province and province, but cleavage among classes of the same origin, and the same language, all over Canada, because everybody knows that, if there is an accentuated opposition in one province, to which I shall refer later, there is in all the provinces of the Dominion at the present moment, amongst the working classes, an opposition to this measure which is not wavering, but which is becoming stronger every day. We all know that resolution after resolution is being passed by organized labour and associations, not only in one province, but in all the provinces of the Dominion from British Columbia, on the Pacific to the provinces washed by the Atlantic.

Why is Labour Against Conscription.

It is asked why the labouring classes should be opposed to conscription. It has been asked if they were less patriotic than the other classes of the community. No, they are not less patriotic. They have as much at heart the success of our cause as have any other, but it must be remembered that there are no classes of the community upon which the sacrifices, which are involved in war, fall so heavily as upon the labouring classes. This is the reason why I shall ask the Parliament of Canada to take some further step, to which I will allude in a moment, before such measure is enacted. I repeat what I said a moment ago, that the sacrifices and hardships of the war fall most heavily upon the working classes. The wealthy young man who goes to war is a hero. He goes to war and sacrifices his life at a time, perhaps, when life has the greatest attractions. In this he is not on a different footing from his poor neighbour, who sacrifices his life, and to whom life is just as dear as to the man who happens to be wealthy. If he loses his limbs, or is crippled in any way the wealthy man comes to a home in which he will find every comfort, but the poor man has to go to a home where he cannot have comforts, since because of his physical infirmity he is no longer able to earn his living. It is no wonder that among these classes there should be opposition to the scheme, not because they are less patriotic, but because they feel that if they are to be conscripted, and called upon to pay that tribute with the rest of the community, at least certain things should be done which would somewhat equalize matters. And what do they ask? They ask that if they are to be called upon to give their blood, the wealthy class should, at least, give their wealth in support of the cause.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Is an Appeal to the People an Unjust Measure?

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: They have asked something more. They have asked that this Parliament should not pass this law until it has had the advantage of being thoroughly debated before the people, and that the people should have an opportunity to express their opinion upon it? Is that an unreasonable or unjust demand? No, Sir, it is neither unjust nor unreasonable, but it is denied. I ask now: is it too late to ask the Government to yield to the petitions which have been received from all the working classes, praying that the people shall be consulted? No, it is not too late, and in the name of union and good-will, I personally present the plea of these classes at the bar of this House, and I ask that the people be consulted.

But there are objections stated to this course, and what is urged by those who object? They say: "No, this cannot be granted, because recruiting must proceed at once, and the gaps must be filled immediately." So be it. I do not deny that, but I ask, which is the course most conducive to success in the war compulsion with irritation and bitterness and a sense of intolerance

and injustice, or, consultation, with consequent union and universal satisfaction all round?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

The Quebec Situation.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: This is the cause for which I constitute myself the humble apostle before the Canadian Parliament at this moment. But there is another class which has been strongly opposed to conscription, I refer to the French Canadian portion of our population. This is a tender subject, and I desire to approach it with all moderation, as I belong to that race.

It has often been wondered why the people of Quebec have not volunteered in larger numbers. It has been asked: Has their blood degenerated? It is sufficient to say that those French-Canadians who have enlisted have given answer to that question upon the battle-fields of France and Flanders, where they have performed their duty in such manner as to win the applause of all their comrades in arms, and of all the Canadian people.

The fact that the men of Quebec have not enlisted in larger numbers does not mean that they have degenerated. Conditions prevail in the province of Quebec which do not exist elsewhere. According to the figures of enlistment which were brought down a few days ago, the English-speaking portion of the community contributed 280,000 men; of these about 125,000 were Canadian-born; the remainder were English-born. The number of French-Canadians enlisted was given as 14,000. I have given a good deal of attention to this subject. I followed the enlistment movement very closely as it proceeded. A friend of mine who is competent in statistics, and who followed matters closely for me, tells me that he thinks the figure of 14,000 is inaccurate, and that the number of Canadians speaking the French language who enlisted is about 20,000. The figures may or may not be correct; I shall not dispute them. Even at 20,000, it is very small compared with that which represents the enlistment of English-speaking Canadians. If the enlistment of French-Canadians does not compare favourably with the enlistment of their compatriots speaking the English language, it is to be noted that the disparity between the enlistment of men who are Canadian-born and men who are British-born is also somewhat marked.

English (British) Born Heads List.

What can be the cause of this disparity? The English-born are at the top of the list, the Canadian-born speaking the English language come next, and the Canadian-born of French origin are at the bottom of the list. It is suggested that enlistment has proceeded negatively in proportion to the length of time that the men have been in the country. The French-Canadians, who have been longer in the country than any other class of the community, have contributed fewer than the others. The native most. At all events, the French-Canadians have had no relations with France since 1760. I am sure that not one man in the province of Quebec has any relatives natives of France, unless it be as a result of recent marriage. I think it may be truthfully said on the other hand that there is not an English-speaking family in Canada which cannot claim relatives in Great Britain. Immigration has been constant from the British Isles, and the connection between the British settler and his motherland has been maintained. This is not the case as between the French-Canadian and old France.

French Were Disarmed.

But there is another circumstance to which attention should be given. The French inhabitants were disarmed shortly after the long struggle between England and France for the possession of the northern part of the continent—a struggle which was carried on over this portion of the continent from Cape Breton to the Ohio river. They were disarmed shortly after the last contest in this great struggle between Montcalm and Wolfe, which resulted in the defeat of Montcalm, a defeat which the Chevalier de Levis could not retrieve. The disarming was not done brutally, offensively, or after the German manner; yet it was done. As soon as the

struggle between France and England ceased, rumblings of discontent were heard in the British colonies, and the British Parliament not unnaturally thought that it would not be prudent to leave arms in the hands of His Majesty's new subjects. I hold in my hand a proclamation issued by General Amherst, who was at that time commander of the British forces on this continent. In this proclamation, which was issued about three weeks after the surrender of Chevalier de Levis at Montreal, the disarmament of all Canadian subjects was ordered. It is in French, but I will translate it:

"Let it be known that we have constituted and established Monsieur Gage, Brigadier of the armies of the King, to be Governor of the city of Montreal and of its dependencies; and that we have also appointed Monsieur Burton, Colonel of His Majesty's troops, to be Governor of Three Rivers and of its dependencies. All the inhabitants under the government of Three Rivers who have not yet surrendered their arms must deliver them at such places as shall be designated by Monsieur Burton."

There is another paragraph to the effect that officers shall be permitted to retain their arms and that arms may be possessed also by those who hold special permission.

SIR SAM HUGHES: That was before the treaty of peace was signed.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: That was before the treaty of 1763, immediately after the capitulation to General Amherst of the French troops in Montreal under Chevalier de Levis. From that date to this there has been a total abandonment of military organization among the French people of Quebec. Any military organization that has existed has been on paper only; it was never actually established in the province. The Act passed in 1863 to create regiments all over the country remained a dead letter in the province of Quebec. A few regiments were established in the cities, but in the rural parts of the community the Act was a dead letter.

The Nationalist Platform: "No Participation in Wars."

Such was the condition of public opinion on these matters, or rather the absence of public opinion—until 1910 when the Naval Bill was introduced in this House. Everybody remembers that the Naval Bill was fought with great bitterness by the Nationalists in the province of Quebec. The Nationalists had been organized by Mr. Bourassa in 1903, the first article of their platform being: no participation by Canada in Imperial wars outside her own territory. This was the doctrine preached by Mr. Bourassa and his friends from 1903 up to the date I have just mentioned. In 1910, when the Navy Bill was introduced, this doctrine was preached by the Nationalists with new vigour and with new bitterness. It was first put to the test in the election in Drummond-Arthabaska. Everybody is aware that the doctrine of "no participation in war" won Drummond and Arthabaska for the Conservative party at that time. Then came the election of 1911, in which there was a close alliance between the Conservative party of that day and the Nationalists in the province of Quebec. On the issue which I have mentioned this election was fought—in the province of Quebec, at all events—and the result is well known.

Nationalists Divided Quebec.

Well, Sir, whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap. The Conservatives obtained a victory. In the province of Quebec the Liberals went into the contest with 50 seats on their side, fifteen being held by their opponents. We came back with 37 and the Conservatives with 27, and almost every man of those 27 was elected on the platform and the promise that Canada should never participate in the wars of Great Britain. The polling figures are still more significant. The Liberal vote polled in that election was 164,281, and the Conservative 159,299; so the people were divided pretty equally. In view of these figures, and the fact that those 27 were elected upon the platform of no participation by Canada in the wars of Great Britain, is it surprising that there has been so little enlistment in Quebec? When the Government wanted the people of Quebec to

enlist they could appeal to only one-half of the province and not to the other half.

Quebec Enlisting Neglected by Government.

But that is not all. I have another reproach to address to the Government of the day. They never took any steps and never did anything conducive to enlistment in the province of Quebec. If Quebec had been properly appealed to, for my part I believe the people would have responded on an equal footing with the other provinces."

SIR SAM HUGHES: Were any different steps taken in the province of Quebec from any other province?

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: Oh, yes.

SIR SAM HUGHES: Not at all.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: I will say this. The selections that were made were very unhappy indeed. After all, men are composed of flesh and blood, and if my hon. friend had put at the head of recruiting in Quebec a man of their flesh and blood the results would have been different. The French people of Quebec are no better than any other class of people in this country; they are no worse either. They have their passions and their prejudices; I do not deny that they have their prejudices. In a matter of this kind it is wise to appeal not to the passions but to the good feelings and the pride of men.

Quebec Poorly Organized.

I repeat that if my hon. friend had taken any share in that respect the results would have been different. To the testimony of the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) I will oppose the words of a member of the present government, one of his own colleagues. I cannot give him a better answer than this: Mr. Blondin took off his coat—

SIR SAM HUGHES: Pardon me, Colonel Blondin.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: I stand corrected. There are so many colonels in this country that I had forgotten this one. I am blessed with a pretty good memory, but there is a limit even to counting, and I do not know whether the ex-minister himself knows how many honorary colonels he has appointed. But let that pass. Colonel Blondin say in his letter:"

"Short as it was, it was enough to show that if Quebec had been well organized from the French-Canadian point of view at the beginning of the war, and if the organization had been immediately placed under the direction of a man like General Lessard, and an appeal made to all French-Canadians to enlist in French-Canadian units and preserve their identity, Quebec would have replied en masse."

Those are the words of Colonel Blondin. Though I do not often agree with him, in military matters or in anything else, I feel satisfied that on this occasion he spoke absolutely correctly and conclusively.

French Regiments were Discouraged.

Shall I give my hon. friend one instance where a mistake was made? Mr. Asselin, with Mr. Bourassa, was one of the organizers of the Nationalist movement. He was a man of considerable authority, and was one of those who said that under no circumstances should Canada ever fight for Great Britain. But to his eternal glory Mr. Asselin came to the front in 1915 and offered his services to the then Minister of Militia. I am proud to say that the minister accepted his services; he even offered to make him a colonel, but Mr. Asselin had no desire to become a colonel; he accepted a minor rank, as he said he had no military experience, and he helped raise a regiment. That regiment should have been sent to the front immediately it was raised, but instead it was sent to Bermuda, and when eventually it was sent from Bermuda to England it was broken up and the men scattered in different units. If Major Asselin's regiment had gone to the front intact, it would have made a reputation for the French Canadians, because if there is one man of courage it is Major Asselin. If his services had been utilized in recruiting, or the services of Captain Papineau Colonel Barré, or the other men mentioned by the Prime Minister at the beginning of this session as having

distinguished themselves in the war, the results would have been very different."

SIR SAM HUGHES: Every gentleman my right hon. friend has named tried to recruit and failed.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: Captain Papineau never was asked to recruit."

SIR SAM HUGHES: He was hooted off the platform in Montreal not so very long ago. Papineau came home and failed as regards recruiting, if my recollection serves me right.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: There are Papineaus and Papineaus. Captain Talbot Papineau, who by the way is a great grandson of Papineau the agitator, and a second cousin of Mr. Bourassa, has never to my knowledge returned to this country since he went to the front, but it is not too late even now, I hope. I say that when my right hon. friend had in his possession such a letter as that from his colleague, Colonel Blondin, he was not justified in changing from the policy of voluntary recruiting to compulsory service before making another attempt with the voluntary system.

General Lessard should have been put in charge in Quebec.

There is another man who should have been sent to Quebec immediately war broke out, and that is General Lessard. He is a French-Canadian, at least partly so, and a good soldier. He was brought up in Quebec, served in South Africa, and has a splendid military record. According to Colonel Blondin, if General Lessard had been sent to Quebec immediately on the declaration of war, the results would have been very different.

SIR ROBERT BORDEN: Might I interpose to correct an impression which might be created by my right hon. friend's remarks. I did ask General Lessard about a year ago, in June, 1916, to take charge of recruiting in the province of Quebec. Further than that, I would ask my right hon. friend to remember that General Lessard has been recently engaged there in recruiting with Colonel Blondin, and I regret to say with not very great success.

SIR SAM HUGHES: Perhaps my right hon. friend would permit me to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

SIR SAM HUGHES: If the right hon. gentleman does not wish to get it now, he will get it later.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: The objection did not come from me. Go on.

SIR SAM HUGHES: During the very first year of the war General Lessard was asked to go to Quebec. He stated that he had no influence in Quebec, that he detested the place, and that they detested him. Moreover, I spoke to leading French-Canadian gentlemen, and they advised me not to send him there, as he had no influence in the province; I think that statement has been borne out by the results of his campaign with Colonel Blondin.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER: As to the controversies between the ex-minister of Militia and General Lessard, I have nothing to say, as I know nothing about them. I have simply stated what Colonel Blondin says, and I repeat it:

"Short as it was, it was enough to show that if Quebec had been well organized from the French-Canadian point of view at the beginning of the war, and if the organization had been immediately placed under the direction of a man like General Lessard, and an appeal made to all French-Canadians to enlist in French-Canadian units and preserve their identity, Quebec would have replied en masse."

I repeat that, in my humble judgment, when the Prime Minister had in his possession such a letter as that, coming from his own colleague, he had no justification for substituting compulsory service for voluntary service.

Compulsion is not conducive to harmony.

This is not a case of the province of Quebec alone; it applies to all the provinces of the Dominion. We have before us one of the most complicated questions that has ever come before Parliament at any time. There is no

doubt at all in regard to it there are deep differences of opinion in the country, and deep differences of opinion in this House. There are here to-day men with whom I have worked in political association for thirty years, who are in favour of conscription; and men there are on the other side supporting the Government who are opposed to conscription. When you have such a state of affairs you see how deep are the differences on this question. Can you say that it is wise, that it is good policy, that it is conducive to harmony, in the face of such a condition, to force upon the people compulsory service? It seems to me that the Government would have been better advised if, instead of proposing compulsory service, they had maintained the unity of all the elements that compose our population. There is no use in blinking the facts; the facts are as I have stated. Let us face the situation courageously, and face it so as to have harmony amongst ourselves, and so that we may bring the greatest strength to the support of our troops at the front as well as to the cause of the Empire in the war in which we are engaged. We live under British institutions. We are a democratic country. Problems we have, problems we have always had and shall always have. The solution of our present problem is to appeal to our people, to appeal to them to lay aside passion and prejudice and ask them to make a sacrifice of something that they hold dear upon the altar of our common country.

South Africa appreciated the blessings of British Liberty.

Before I depart from this subject, may I be permitted to refer for a moment to a speech delivered a few days ago in the city of London by General Smuts of South Africa. The Prime Minister, I am sure, will be the first to admit, having met General Smuts, having been with him in the Imperial Conference, that for the time being he was the lion of London. It was natural that whenever he appeared in London or elsewhere in Britain, every one should recall the fact that fifteen years before South Africa was at war with Britain, and that he himself had been one of the foremost generals opposing Britain in the war. To-day he comes to Great Britain to represent his country, now part of the British Empire, and endowed with the blessings of British liberty. Here is a spectacle which is not seen every day—which has never been seen, perhaps, anywhere except in England itself. What a spectacle it is: what a lesson; what a triumph for British institutions. The Romans used to make slaves of defeated nations; it was their custom to chain the most illustrious of their captives to the chariot wheels of their victorious generals. Britain makes freemen of her defeated enemies, and places the most illustrious of them at the head of the procession in every triumphal march. This could not be anywhere but in England.

These facts are known to everybody, but I may be permitted to refer to the lesson they have for this country. In 1901 Mr. Bourassa, then member for Labelle, brought in a resolution to condemn the course we had taken in the South African war. I had to reply for the Government, and I said that in my estimation Britain's cause in the war was absolutely just and that under the circumstances she could not avoid war. I reminded the House that President Kruger had invited British immigrants to settle in South Africa under the promise and pledge that they should be treated as citizens of the Republic. I told how British immigrants came in large numbers, had opened mines, had founded cities, had added greatly to the wealth of the country and contributed heavily to its treasury. I told them that the pledges made by President Kruger had been violated; that instead of being made citizens of the Republic these immigrants were made outlanders; that the period of probation had been extended from one year to five years, from five to ten, and from ten to fourteen years, making it absolutely impossible for them to become citizens of the Republic; yet they were heavily taxed, and yet deprived of power to present their case in Parliament. I reminded the House of the telegrams, the audacious telegrams sent by President Kruger, calling upon the English to get out of South Africa. I said that these Dutch had appealed to the arbitrament of war, that

they had lost and must take the consequences. And I added:

"I pledge my reputation and my name as a British subject, that if they have lost their independence they have not lost their freedom. There is but one future for South Africa, and that future is a grand confederation on the pattern of the Canadian confederation. It is a federation in which Cape Colony and Natal, and the Orange Free State, and the Transvaal, and Rhodesia, shall be united together under a federal constitution, under the British flag, and under the sovereignty of England."

The prophecy to which I pledged my word and reputation has been more than verified. The Transvaal was conquered. But in 1906 Britain gave them a charter of freedom as complete as we have in this country, as complete as they have in Great Britain. Of that new country, that British country, General Botha became the Prime Minister, and it was a colleague of General Botha, General Smuts, who was in England to represent his country at the Imperial Conference. I come now to the words which were spoken by General Smuts at a banquet given him a few days ago in England by the two Houses of Parliament. I wish I could quote his whole speech, but I shall give only a few sentences."

"All the Empires we have known in the past, and that exist to-day, are founded on the idea of assimilation, of trying to force human material into one mould.

You don't want to standardize the nations of the British Empire; you want to develop them towards a greater nationality. These communities, whether they are the offspring of a Mother Country, or territories, like my own, which have been annexed after the vicissitudes of war, must not be moulded in any one pattern.

That is the fundamental fact we have to bear in mind—that the British Commonwealth of Nations does not stand for standardization or conventionalization, but for the fuller, richer and more various life of all the nations comprised in it."

If there is any place where these words should be remembered, it is in this country of Canada.

Unity of British Empire Necessary.

If they mean anything they mean that we should always remember that all human flesh cannot be put in the same mould, they mean that if the British Empire is to live, as I hope it will, it must be in accordance with the idea of unity in diversity, and diversity towards unity. If these words of wisdom uttered by General Smuts were to be remembered throughout Canada, whether it be Quebec or Ontario, or any of the other provinces, the bickerings and suspicions which too often prevail between race and race would be forgotten and there would be that growth in the commonwealth of British nations of which General Smuts has spoken. That is the idea which I want to impress upon this Parliament and this country. We are of diverse races, but we are all British subjects; we want to remain British subjects, and to preserve the unity of all the races that compose the British Empire. But if we are to attain that end we must respect one another. There is the prejudice which I have spoken of. The French people have not enlisted as they should have. That I admit, and nobody regrets it more than I. But in British countries there is only one way, and the sovereign way, of meeting all these differences. It is to appeal to the country and to appeal to the whole country, not to one section, but to all sections, and when the country has pronounced then the question is settled and all must submit to the law.

A Referendum and a consultation of the People.

What I propose is that we should have a referendum and a consultation of the people upon this question. I have taken the referendum, not that I have been very favourable towards it, but I find that the idea of the referendum has made enormous progress in Canada, and that it has been adopted by the political associations in the western provinces as a method of political action. If we are to have peace, if there is to be unity, we must

meet the wishes of the labouring classes, who have asked for this privilege.

A Pledge.

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 submit, and I claim to speak at least so far as is concerned for the province from which I come. Is that an unfair situation, is that an unfair appeal? Can anybody say that it is not in accordance with true democratic principles? This I leave to the consideration of those whom I see before me.

But in presenting this motion I do not intend—and I beg to make myself perfectly clear upon that—to bind any man of those who sit behind and around me and with whom I share the honour of representing Liberalism in this House. If there is ever to be a time when every man should think for himself, decide for himself and act for himself, it is the present. This moment is too solemn, the issue is too great, the questions involved in the measure are of too far-reaching importance to have them decided by any other voice than the voice of each man's individual conscience. 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. I beg to move, therefore, seconded by Mr. Oliver:—

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

"The further consideration of this Bill be deferred until the principle thereof has, by means of a referendum, been submitted to and approved of by the electors of Canada."

The Soldiers must Vote.

Before I sit down let me at once answer an objection which has been made. It has been stated that this referendum should not be taken because the soldiers could not vote. Soldiers could not vote? What does it mean? Soldiers are electors and if they are electors they have the right to vote and must vote. But, it has been stated that they cannot vote because they are at the war. What nonsense is that, I want to know. Why could they not vote because they are at the war? To tell us that they cannot vote because they are at the war is to tell me something I do not understand. We know that there may be difficulties in the way. We pointed that out two years ago when we discussed the Bill providing for soldiers' voting, but we obviated those difficulties and before the Bill was passed we asked the Government that it should be submitted to the War Office to ascertain whether there was any objection to it. The War Office responded that they had no objection to it. The Bill was sanctioned. Then, it was said that it would take a long time to take the votes of the soldiers, that the boxes could not be sent without delay. The boxes have been in England for two years; they were sent immediately after the Bill had been sanctioned, at a time when it was supposed and stated, that the people were clamouring for an election in tones louder than thunder. So, the boxes are there, the thing can be done, and, Mr. Speaker, if there is a referendum at all, every class, every interest, the soldiers included, should be given an opportunity of casting their votes so that we shall have the true verdict of the people. 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. And again I repeat the pledge I gave a moment ago on behalf of my own province that every man, even although he is to-day opposed to the law, shall do service as well as any man of any other race."

SPEECH OF F. F. PARDEE, M.P. FOR LAMBTON WEST, ON THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

Delivered in the House of Commons on June 21st, 1917.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): Mr. Speaker, to my mind there is one thought, and one thought only, in the minds of the people of the Dominion of Canada to-day. That one thought possesses our people in their waking, and I had almost said in their sleeping hours; that thought is of the crisis the Empire is struggling through, and of the means by which we may use all our resources to bring the war to a successful conclusion for the Allied powers. I am speaking here to-day, Sir, as a Canadian to Canadian, and not as a party man to party man, for this is not an hour for partisan speeches.

Free Democracy.

Democracy has made great strides. Prior to August, 1914, I take it, there was not a man in this House—there was scarcely a man in this Dominion—who would have believed, that in this twentieth century, any nation or any people would attempt to strike a blow at the very foundation of democracy, with all the ambitions it inspires in the human heart and with all the benefits it has conferred on the world—and to substitute for it an autocracy, which through the ages has crushed the human race. Tyrannical to the last degree, cursed with militarism in all its phases, the right of free speech denied, and the people's own parliament practically elected for them, Germany stands opposed to democracy, and for the maintenance of a nation of men in bondage instead of a free people. It is of Germany that Mr. Balfour has said there could be no greater danger to the world than the menace of a nation which believed itself to be superior to all law, human and divine. By the power of might over right Germany seeks to compel other nations to act according to her tenets. Does Canada want that? If that be a true picture of Germany, and I do not think I have overstated the case, is Canada not prepared to say that with all her resources in men and money and in the pride of her young democratic nationhood she shall stand to protect her free institutions against this Prussian slavery, and to help her sister enlightened nations to repel the onslaughts of Prussian barbarism on civilisation? These are the thoughts that appeal to me; these are the thoughts that must come home to every one who ponders on the present day situation in world affairs. I say, Sir, that Canada cannot afford to allow the tenets of Germany to prevail through our lack of effort.

Do the people of Canada realize that to-day they are enjoying the greatest freedom to be found amongst nations? Do they realize that, if Germany conquers, they will become bondsmen instead of freemen? That they do realize it to the full, I have reason to doubt, judging by what has taken place during the last year or year and a half. We entered the war with the greatest enthusiasm; we cheered our men off to the front; we threw our hats in the air; we pledged ourselves that we would stand for what we thought was right. The war has gone on. The war has lasted longer than most Canadians ever thought it would. We are now getting on to the end of the third year, and does the thought ever strike us that very possibly the Canadian people are commencing to take this war as a matter of course? Do Canadians, men and women alike, not need an awakening? Heaven knows that our women have done wonderfully as have most of the men, but the fact remains, in my humble judgment, we have got to rise to the stern needs and duties that lie before us. The people of Canada living at home in peace, comfort and happiness, if they desire to hold up their heads amongst the peoples of the world, must show that they have real Canadianism enough to make the necessary sacrifice to support the men who to-day are protecting us in the enjoyment of all that life holds dear. We have got to have enough red blood in us to say that if the gallant men fighting in the trenches are willing to make the greatest sacrifice, we shall make some commensurate

sacrifice on our part. Does the rich man realize, as he rolls down the street in his motor, with his wife and his daughter, that did he live in Germany and walk along the street of a German city, unless his wife or daughter made way for a German officer, she would be spat upon or slapped on the face with a sword? Does he realize in his wealth how small the sacrifice that he and others of his class have made? Does he realize that in neglecting to make that sacrifice, he becomes a unit in the force that is helping Germany?

Partyism Must Go.

This is not the day for soft words and soft actions. The time has long since gone by for that. Now the Canadian people, men and women, need an awakening which can only come through strong individual and concentrated leadership. Failing that, everything is at a standstill; failing that, our last condition may be worse than our first.

We must not think too much of party; we must remember that whatever party be in power, our country remains and her problems remain with her. The fate of parties, to my mind, matters not so long as we do our part for the cause of liberty and right and the preservation of our democratic institutions. Four hundred thousand of our people have gone; they went voluntarily, they went as young, red-blooded Canadians should have gone. Does anybody think for a moment that they went because they loved war and all that it means? No. They went from the highest motives of national and Imperial feeling; they went to uphold the liberty that our fathers and forefathers have secured and handed down to us. They went as young patriots. They are gone—they are yonder—fighting, bleeding, dying, sacrificing themselves in this greatest war for principle, honour, and liberty. Is it not apparent that the duty of the Canadian people, and of this Parliament, to see to it that the men who have gone shall have the backing of the men who stay at home?

These are the reasons, imperfectly though I may have expressed them, that appeal to me in considering this question. There are thousands of young men scattered all over this country to-day who are not necessary for the purpose of carrying on the business of the state, and if they will not fight they are not fit to be free; and the man who is not fit to be free ought to be made to fight. Every citizen has the protection of the state, and when the existence of his protector is imperilled it is his duty to give that protector his support, to the offering up of his life if necessary.

Let me say, in passing, that I am speaking to-day only of the province I know. It would be presumption on my part to speak for any other. But this I do know, that in Ontario, in the towns and villages of this province, there are thousands of young men whose place should be at the front, and I have absolutely no objection to saying to them here, that when the time comes, so far as I am concerned and great although I know the responsibility is, through this vote of mine, to the front they must go.

The Referendum Motion.

I come to the amendment that has been moved by my leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and I may say to you, Sir that I find myself politically in the most painful position of my life. I have been a follower of Sir Wilfrid Laurier since I knew enough to be a Liberal. I have admired him; I recognize the fact that to-day, among the statesmen of Greater Britain, he stands pre-eminent. I recognize the fact that he guided the destinies of this country for many years, and that no man could possibly have better filled that high office. I recognize further, and I say it with no disparagement whatever that although to-day he is but the leader of the Opposition, he is a predominating figure in the British Empire.

You can well understand, therefore, that, in differing from a man of whom I hold that opinion, I feel that my action may be presumptuous. I do it only for the reason that my sincere conviction is that my course is right—I could not do it otherwise. To my other friends in this House, my French-Canadian friends, let me say this, that although I differ from them on the matter of a referendum, I fully recognize that they have for years fought a fight that has been as full of patriotism and as full of Canadianism as has been fought by any group of men in this House. All I can say to them is that, although I disagree from them, I believe their convictions to be as honest and as earnest as my own, and honest and earnest convictions are always worthy of respect.

Referendum would be Defeated.

Of the referendum let me say just a word. It may seem a paradox for me to say what I have to say, yet the world is to-day full of paradoxes. There is not much logic to-day. What is stood by to-day is knocked down to-morrow in the way of opinions. The true reason why I am not in favour of a referendum is that I believe that, in the present moment of unrest, it is not desirable. The Government made a promise that conscription would never come. It has thrown suddenly into the political and national ring the widest and biggest question that the people of Canada, or their representatives, have ever had to consider, without any preparatory education to bring the people's mind to a state of calm and sober judgment. Under these conditions I believe that the referendum would be defeated, and I fear, with that defeat, the door would be shut absolutely in the face of recruiting and in the face of all other kinds of conscription which ought to be made. You may tell me that the opinion of the people should rule; you may tell me I am going against the will of the people. I say in answer that along these lines and others the people of the Dominion of Canada are to-day asking to be led, and not to do the leading. So it is that I must vote against the amendment proposed by my revered leader.

Lack of Recruiting Leadership.

I have desired and endeavoured to keep absolutely away from the flavour of it. Yet it must be recognized that mistakes have been made. Let us be quite fair, let us be quite frank with ourselves. Mistakes have been made; there has been lack of recruiting leadership, there has been lack of organization; there has been lethargy; there have been blunders in administration, and I am sorry to say there has been the strongest sort of partisanship in this crisis. It appears to me that there has been an absolute failure to rise to the possibilities and the necessities of national and patriotic service. We have not done it, we have not got out of the rut. We have not literally raised ourselves by our own boot straps as we ought to have done.

What has been done cannot be undone; but the mistakes, the blunders, the lethargy, the failure to give leadership, which, more than anything else, have contributed to the situation which confronts us now, must be atoned for by the most vigorous, honest and consecrated effort on the part of Government and Parliament from this time on. The Canadian people must be assured that henceforth the members of the Government

and of Parliament, the men who have assumed the tremendous responsibility of calling citizens to the colours by compulsion, will themselves consecrate all their energies, all their abilities, all their endeavours, to the cause for which they demand that their fellow-citizens shall fight.

Conscription of Wealth must come.

I would say to the Government, earnestly and sincerely, that when to-day we are here voting for the conscription of men, we should also conscript other resources of the people of Canada. This Government and this Parliament will be accused, and rightly accused, if we bring not forth further conscription of wealth and of resources. It must not be said that we, sitting here calmly in our places in this chamber, are willing and content, by a mere yea or nay, to spill the blood of the youth of Canada, but that we are afraid to spill the rich man's money. I may be told that there has been part conscription of wealth to-day, by reason of the business tax, but I do not think the pocket of the rich man in this country has yet been touched.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PARDEE: Go where you will, north, south, east and west, and you will find every evidence of a surplus of wealth. The Government is absolutely bound, in duty and in fairness to the men who to-day in the trenches of France are protecting that wealth, to make those rich men give out of their abundance for the sustenance of the soldier. Whether the Conscription Bill will pass or not I cannot tell. I have concluded to ask this Government a thing that is dear to me, something I cannot disabuse my mind of, even though I vote for the principle of the Bill.

Let Voluntary Recruiting be given Another Chance.

The Prime Minister has asked members of this side of the House for suggestions. May I meet that request by earnestly urging the national advisability of preceding the operation of the Bill by a last big and sincere appeal to the patriotism of young Canadian manhood to voluntarily come forward to back their brothers at the front. Under direct and real Government leadership in this respect—and with the conscientious co-operation of Canadians of all parties, all classes, all provinces—I believe that Canadian patriotism would yet make the actual operation of the compulsory service measure unnecessary. Such an appeal, backed by an earnest educational campaign, and conducted in the true spirit, would, I verily believe, result in the coming forward of the 100,000 men required, and more. If this can thus be done—and I yet believe it can—is it not worth while to save a situation fraught with serious possibilities of schism and strife, a situation which may all too easily produce a moral effect neither creditable to Canada nor helpful to the cause we aim to serve? I sincerely trust that the Prime Minister will give earnest consideration to this suggestion.

I have to disagree with many of my party, and with my honored and revered chief, but let me assure the House that I have thought long and earnestly over these matters—so long and so earnestly—that my conclusions are no longer opinions; they have become sincere convictions.

SPEECH OF THE HON. CHARLES MURPHY ON THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

Delivered in the House of Commons on June 21st, 1917.

"Win the War."

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, the slogan in the country to-day is, "win the war" That slogan will be the key-note of my criticism of the measure under consideration by the House. It has been made all the easier for me to adopt it by reason of the fact that the first citizen from the county which I have the honour to represent in this House who offered up his life in the great struggle which is convulsing the world

was a young French-Canadian, a boy named Hector Filion. Other citizens of that county representing divers races and creeds have since followed that French boy's example, until to-day the casualty honour roll of the county of Russell, like that of so many other counties in this Dominion, is distressingly large.

At the outset, may I be permitted to say—not in a boastful spirit; not as asserting any claims that may not with equal truth be asserted by every hon. gentleman in this House—that in a desire to help win this war,

I yield to no man in Canada. For that reason, Sir, if I object to the Bill brought down by the Government, it is because I am profoundly convinced that in the principle as well as in its application that measure will hinder rather than help in winning the war. My reasons for that conviction, Sir, I will place before you and before my colleagues in this House as briefly as possible.

The Offer of 500,000 Men.

It will not detract in the slightest degree from the gravity of the matter that we have in hand if I say that it was in accordance with the traditions of the day that the Prime Minister, without consultation and without deliberation, on New Year's Day, 1916, took the resolution, and then publicly announced, that Canada would contribute 500,000 men to the Army of the Allies. Like other resolutions formed by other people on a like occasion, the Prime Minister has found it impossible to carry out his. Because of that failure he now asks Parliament to help him out of his difficulty by enacting this Bill.

The Prime Minister's difficulty does not appear now for the first time, nor is the Bill before the House the first attempt to relieve him of it. That difficulty presented itself very shortly after the Prime Minister's promise was made. In an endeavour to extricate himself, the right hon. gentleman last summer created the National Service Board, but it was speedily found that the cure was no better than the disease. Now, rather than admit his double failure, the Prime Minister proposes another remedy no more efficacious than the former one. That, Sir, is the condition with which we have to deal.

For the purpose of the argument that I wish to develop, let me point out that in making a promise not based on data of any kind the Prime Minister might have undertaken to send 600,000 or 700,000 men with just as much reason as he had for promising to send 500,000 men. Had he chanced to promise either of those larger numbers, could it be contended in the case of the 500,000 that Canada had failed to fulfil her pledge? Canada made no pledge; that the Prime Minister frankly admits. Canada was not consulted; therefore Canada must not, least of all by Canadians themselves, be held up to the other nations as a slacker nation. Canada has done voluntarily, without pledge or compulsion of any kind, that which stands to her credit in this war; and I submit that it is derogating from the high reputation Canada has won in the estimation of the world through voluntary service to attempt now to substitute compulsion of any kind for the free-will offering she has already made and which she is prepared to continue to make if equality of sacrifice be established and if her people be consulted as to the leadership they desire to enforce that equality.

At this stage of the Bill it is not customary, nor is it my intention, to discuss details which can be fully dealt with in committee. I therefore propose to confine my criticism to certain outstanding objections that cannot be too strongly emphasized.

Parliament has no Mandate to Pass Bill.

In the first place, I submit that Parliament has no mandate to pass this Bill. Elected in peace times, its constitutional term extended by itself, this Parliament exists only on suffrage and has no authority to impose harsh legislation of this kind without first consulting the electors. It is of equal importance to point out to the House and to the country that the Government has no request, no warrant from the men at the front, to introduce legislation of this character. On this point the words of the Prime Minister may profitably be recalled. He said:

I bring from that splendid manhood of Canada at the front an earnest and thrilling message that we shall stand beside them in the stress and welter of this struggle and bring them such support that the effort and sacrifice which have been consecrated to this supreme task shall not be in vain.

Stripped of its rhetoric, this pronouncement makes it quite plain that the men at the front made no request for conscription. In fact, it is not pretended that they

have made a collective request of any kind. But, Mr. Speaker, whether these men asked or did not ask for support, it is our duty to see that they lack nothing which Canada can send them. That, however, as I propose to show later, does not imply that it is only by conscription that we can perform our whole duty towards those brave men who have first claim upon the physical, the moral and the material support of their grateful fellow-countrymen.

Voluntary Enlistment has not Failed.

Whether the reason for introducing this Bill be advanced in precise terms or be left to the public to infer, the impression made is the same, namely, that it has been brought down because voluntary enlistment has failed. That I deny absolutely. Voluntary enlistment did not fail, for the excellent reason that voluntary enlistment was never given a fair trial. The proof of this we have in the way things were conducted. Who can forget the rip and tear and smash—the special trains—the parades—the reviews—the crop of honorary colonels—and the noisy press agencies, of the first two years of the war? We all remember those things, and we know that while they prevailed voluntary enlistment was not and could not have been properly attended to. But apart from this, we have from the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) himself a most important statement with regard to the failure of voluntary enlistment. Speaking at Lindsay on the 28th of April last, the ex-Minister of Militia said:

More than one year ago an agitation was begun on the question of labour. We were recruiting "too many regiments"; we were "taking too many men away from work"; "munition manufacturers and others would be at a standstill"; "farmers could not put in their crops"; and "Canada has already done her full duty," were daily recited. They unfortunately had an effect upon the Prime Minister. The result was that I was asked in March, 1916, not to press recruiting, and recruiting to-day is, and has been dead in Canada for fighting purposes. "Safety First," or the useful and well paid, but not dangerous jobs, are readily filled; but for the gallant boys in the trenches there is little or no backing.

That is a most damaging statement made by a former member of the Government, made, he alleges, because of things that happened while he was a member of that Government, and that statement reflects not only upon the Government methods and action, but upon the Prime Minister himself. Up to the present time, that statement has not been disputed. Such being the case, how can Parliament or the country be expected to accept the statement now advanced, that voluntary enlistment has failed? Equally, may I ask: How can Parliament or the country be asked to accept this Bill as a substitute for that which was not given a fair trial?

Survey of Man Power not Made.

In considering this Bill we have also naturally to consider whether the Government in the first instance, went ahead on the basis of any survey or calculation of the man-power Canada could supply in a war such as this. Evidently they did not, and it is equally evident that they have not done so even now. We are told that there are five divisions in the Canadian Army, and that this Bill is intended to fill the gaps in those five divisions. It has been stated—and I have seen no contradiction—that there is on file in the Militia Department in Ottawa a report made by Imperial officers sent over here for the purpose stating that, having regard to Canada's population and to all the data that must be taken into account in estimating the numerical basis of an army for this country, Canada should confine her fighting forces to three divisions, so as to be able to meet all possible demands from wastage in the ranks when on active service. That report, I understand, was made before the war. The events of the war have proved its correctness. What explanation has the Government to give for ignoring that report; and when they chose to do so, how can they expect us to approve this Bill as a cloak for their inattention

to the most elementary detail of military organization?

The Government should state frankly what the Needs are.

This brings me to the consideration of another practical matter which I have not heard mentioned in this debate thus far. It is said that the men required are to fill the gaps in the ranks at the front. But how many are required? Who knows? Surely we ought to have answers to these questions before we are asked to proceed. Who can answer them? Frankly, I do not know. It would, however, seem to me that the man most likely to be able to answer would be the Commander-in-Chief of the Canadian forces. If that be correct, then what does he say as to the number of thousands of men required to fill the gaps in the Canadian ranks? Does he say that the number already enlisted are not sufficient to furnish these thousands? If he does not, should not that fact be made clear? Otherwise, how are we to know just what we should do? It is true that statistics have been brought down, but they do not reach the crux of the situation. At best, these statistics are only careful estimates; they are not and cannot be complete or conclusive from the standpoint of military requirements. Therefore, I suggest to the Government that every effort be made to get the information I refer to before this Bill is advanced another stage. If, moreover, it be established on reliable military advice, that we have too many divisions, does it not seem to be common sense, based on what I understand to be sound military practice, to readjust the organization and to consolidate the men that are available in the way best adapted to make their number most effective?

A New Principle Involved.

The discussion thus far upon the Bill and the amendment introduced by the leader of the Opposition has elicited facts and views that are helpful as disclosing the real position of the Government, and as an aid in determining the real value of the Bill. By reference to the Orders in Council and the official despatches of the Government, the leader of the Opposition, in refutation of the Prime Minister's argument that the Bill contains no new principle, was able to show that a new principle is involved, and that at the outbreak of the war the Government was not of opinion that the principle embodied in the Militia Act was the same as the principle set forth in this Bill. My right hon. leader's argument and reasoning were so cogent, and it is so important that the public be seized of his viewpoint, that I ask the indulgence of the House while I restate his views on this subject in his own words: This is what he said:

Now, the Prime Minister says that he is introducing no new principle, that he could have sent abroad the 400,000 men who have been sent, under the authority of the existing Act. Sir, I take issue with my right hon. friend on that. I say he had not any such power.

Then later on he said:

In support of this contention of mine that this Government could not, under the Militia Act, send the forces that they did, I will contrast with the Government of to-day the Government of 1914.

The Government then did not pretend that they were using the Militia Act in sending Canadian forces across the sea; they did not send them under that Act at all. Here is a despatch of His Royal Highness the Governor General, sent by the Prime Minister which is an absolute refutation of the doctrine which has just been asserted by him. This was sent by the Governor General to the Secretary of State for the colonies, and dated August 1, 1914:

Ottawa, August 1, 1914.

"In view of the impending danger of war involving the Empire my Advisers are anxiously considering the most effective means of rendering every possible aid and they welcome any suggestions and advice which Imperial naval and military authorities may deem it expedient to offer. They are confident that a considerable force would be available for service abroad. A question has been mooted respecting the status of any Canadian force serving abroad

as under section 69 of Canadian Militia Act the active militia can only be placed on actual service beyond Canada for the defence thereof"

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: If it was "for the defence thereof" what was the necessity of stating that there was doubt as to the status of these troops?

"It has been suggested that regiments might enlist as Imperial troops for stated periods, Canadian Government undertaking to make all necessary financial provision for their equipment, pay and maintenance."

Thus, at the very beginning of the war, it was recognized that the words "for the defence thereof" could not apply to this case; that the troops could not be sent under the Militia Act, and that they should be sent as Imperial troops and as serving voluntarily in the war. That is conclusive.

Sir Sam Hughes: What is the date of that despatch?

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: First of August, 1914. Then there there is an Order in Council, passed on August 6, as follows:

"The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 6th August, 1914, from the Minister of Militia and Defence, representing; in view of the state of war now existing between the United Kingdom, and the Dominions, Colonies, and Dependencies of the British Empire on the one side, and Germany on the other side, creating a menace to the well-being and integrity of the Empire, and having regard to the duty of the Dominion of Canada as one of those Dominions to provide for its own defence and to assist in maintaining the integrity and honour of the Empire, that it is desirable to mobilize Militia units of the various arms of the service of such effective strength as may from time to time be determined by Your Royal Highness in Council, such units to be composed of officers and men who are willing to volunteer for Overseas service under the British Crown."

And so this was for voluntary service alone. Nor is that all. There was this despatch sent by the Governor General on 5th of August:

"My Government being desirous of putting beyond doubt status of Canadian volunteers requests that His Majesty may be pleased to issue an order bringing these volunteers under sections 175 and 176 of the Army Act."

Thus, being in doubt of the power of the Government to send troops under the Militia Act, they asked that the Government of Great Britain should issue an order to enlist them for the British Army. And so we have reason to believe that the Militia Act, as we have understood it, never applied to this case.

It is quite true that other hon. gentlemen have joined issue with my right hon. friend on this point. The subject was debated at some length by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) the other day, and by my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) this afternoon. But with all respect for these hon. gentlemen, and for any others who may share their view, I prefer the view of my right hon. leader. I rely upon his forty years' experience in this Parliament, and upon his intimate connection with the change that was made in 1904 in the Militia Act which has been under discussion. I have only to add that if this Military Service Bill makes no change in principle, but merely a change in the method of selection, what is the reason for bringing it in at all? Why not merely bring down an amendment to the Militia Act if the difference was so trifling as that? Is not the refutation of that contention contained in the very fact that this Bill has been introduced?

The Labour Situation.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition dealt with the labour situation as affected by this Bill. His argument was challenged by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). May I digress for a moment to say that in all probability, with the exception of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, no hon. member of this House has had such a long and genuine admiration for the debating power and eloquence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce as myself. I well remember the first occasion upon which I heard him, now more years ago than I care to recall. From that day to the present I have always acknowledged his great

power as a debater. I do not think that power was ever more eloquently displayed than when he spoke in this Chamber a few days ago. Notwithstanding that, I take the liberty of joining issue with him. In the course of his speech the other day, addressing himself to the argument of my right hon. leader on the labour situation, the Minister of Trade and Commerce instanced the position of labour in Great Britain and the United States under compulsory military service. I submit that the comparison failed to meet the argument of my right hon. leader for two reasons.

The Derby system preceded compulsory service in England.

In the first place the Derby registration scheme preceded the introduction of compulsory military service in Great Britain; and in the second place the United States Government recognized labour as soon as it decided to go into the war, and immediately availed itself of the services of Samuel Gompers, the leader of organized labour in the United States. Even after three years of war this Government has done nothing like that in this country. If my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce and other hon. members of the Opposition will not heed the advice of the leader of the Opposition, perhaps they will listen to the advice of a friend of their own. Foreseeing the effect of this Bill on labour, Sir Joseph Flavelle addressed a letter to the Canadian manufacturers of war munitions, in which he says:

Dear Sirs.—May I, on behalf of the board solicit your serious co-operation in personal attention and forethought whereby misunderstandings or difficulties with your work-people may be averted?

I am led to say this because I remember the necessity of securing further support for the men at the front means there will be considerable impairment of the present factory working forces in Canada.

As there is great industrial activity and a general shortage of efficient labour, it is to be expected that restlessness in labour circles will be increased rather than decreased when men now at work are taken out of employment and used for military service.

That statement should give the Government pause in the course upon which they have embarked, and into which they are trying to rush Parliament and the country. Munitions must be produced and forwarded, or you imperil the lives of the men at the front. Food must be produced and forwarded or you sap the strength of the men at the front. Is it not better to have one man in the trenches well armed and well fed than two men poorly armed and half fed? That is the practical situation which presents itself to the mind of Sir Joseph Flavelle and of every other practical man in the country. I have no doubt that that was the situation that presented itself to the mind of the new food controller appointed in Great Britain, Lord Rhondda, who within the last forty-eight hours flashed across the ocean a message almost pathetic in its appeal to the United States and Canada to come to the assistance of Great Britain and the soldiers in the matter of the production of food.

Toryism says "People must be Ignored".

Then there were one or two other observations of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to which I desire to refer. With fine old Tory contempt for the people, the minister scouted the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition. Let the verdict, he said, be passed by the people later on, or by history. In other words, when the Tory party is in power with a safe majority in both Houses why should we ever have an election? As I listened to my hon. friend, the glitter of the new Mace on the Table caught my eye, and recalling that we are near the end of the sixth year of this Parliament, I wondered whether my hon. friend had convinced himself and the other members of the Government that a Cromwell can not appear twice in history. If he has not reached that conclusion he might give the matter further attention in the light of this discussion.

My hon. friend who sits beside me (Mr. Oliver) has seconded the amendment proposed by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. When speaking in support of the amendment he declared himself to be in favour of conscription. He was questioned by the Solicitor General as to whether he would entrust the administration of a conscription law to the leader of the Opposition, who is opposed to conscription. The hon. member for Edmonton said that he would, and he had ample warrant for that reply. In fact, had the Solicitor General reflected for a moment he never would have asked the question. How could the hon. member for Edmonton have replied otherwise than he did, when the Solicitor General knows that the Prime Minister asked the leader of the Opposition to join him in a coalition government to pass conscription and to assist him in the administration of it? Surely the Solicitor General will not condemn what his own leader thought was so eminently proper.

Many Classes against Conscription.

It is an axiom of general acceptance that a law which is not sustained by the moral sanction of the people cannot be enforced by constitutional means. This afternoon the Solicitor General said that above all it is the enforcement of the Bill that we must keep in mind. I quite agree with him. We have ample evidence that the Bill we are considering is not sustained by the moral sanction of the Canadian people. Let me cite some of the evidence. Speaking in Toronto in December last, the Director of National Service, the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett), had the courage to say to some interrupters in the audience he was addressing that, as the result of representations made to him in the western provinces, which he had just visited with the Prime Minister, he was convinced there would be civil war if an attempt were made to force conscription on the people of Canada. Mark you, Mr. Speaker, that opinion was formed by reason of conditions in Western Canada, not in Quebec. Since then organized labour has declared against conscription; so has the largest employer of organized labour in the Dominion, the Canadian Pacific Railway, through its president, Lord Shaughnessy. From the rural districts of the country, already depleted of man power, have come strong protests against conscription.

All these represent such a powerful body of public opinion against the measure that more should not be required to prove its un wisdom and untimeliness. But, there is more. The Bill itself specifically recognizes that the Mennonites and other sects are opposed to it and the people of these denominations are exempted from its operations. Without taking into account any other classes of the population than those I have mentioned, those alone make it plain that such a measure cannot be generally administered. The Solicitor General this afternoon said that it is the enforcement of the Bill above all that we must keep in mind and again I say, I quite agree with him. While this is the fact you would at times be led to think by the writings of certain journalists and the speeches of certain individuals that the only people opposed to conscription are the French Canadians. As I have just shown, there is no justification for any such idea but the campaign by which it is sought to give currency to this idea in the English parts of Canada is fraught with such possibilities of grave danger to the State that I know of no better public service that can be rendered at this juncture than to place before Parliament and the country the resulting situation as it affects the whole people and to suggest how best, in my judgment, to deal with the situation.

Sir George Foster congratulated Nationalist's Victory.

We have heard a great deal about recruiting not being satisfactory in the province of Quebec. Indeed, the Minister of Trade and Commerce addressed himself to the

leader of the Opposition as if that hon. gentleman alone, although in Opposition, were responsible for the poor recruiting in Quebec. In effect, the Minister of Trade and Commerce said to the leader of the Opposition: "Look here, Sir Wilfrid; we want to govern the rest of this country but you must govern Quebec and we will hold you responsible for everything that happens in Quebec." That from an hon. gentleman who, on the night of the Drummond-Arthabaska election in 1910, joined with the Nationalists in intoning the Te Deum over their victory by sending a telegram couched in the words: "Anything to beat Laurier."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have heard of that telegram so often that I would be infinitely obliged to my hon. friend if he would give me a copy of it.

Mr. MURPHY: I will try to oblige my hon. friend. I think this is the first time he has ever asked to be furnished with a facsimile of his own writing.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do want it now badly. I would like to put it in my scrap book.

Government must not Shift Responsibility.

Mr. MURPHY: If it be the case that recruiting is not satisfactory in Quebec the Government cannot shift the responsibility from its own shoulders. What did the Government do to encourage recruiting in Quebec? Nothing. It did even worse than that, if I may be pardoned a Hibernicism, it placed in charge of recruiting in Quebec an English-speaking clergyman, of estimable character and highly respected, it is true, but not a soldier, and differing in race, language, and religion from the over-whelming French-Catholic majority of that province.

Mr. Speaker, that was not giving the French people leadership—that was denying them leadership. And, all the time, the Government had at its disposal the services of General Lessard, a brave and accomplished French Canadian soldier, with a magnificent record in South Africa, a man whose appointment at the head of recruiting in his native province at the outbreak of the war would have appealed to the imagination and the enthusiasm of his fellow-countrymen and would have stimulated enlistment as nothing else would have done. But General Lessard was kept away from Quebec; he was assigned inferior duties in other parts of the country, and Canada and the Empire were the losers. The Government's initial blunder in Quebec was followed by others just as inexcusable. These I need not enumerate, but I may point out that a belated recruiting campaign was started by the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Blondin) a short time ago and was then abruptly called off. But it lasted long enough to enable the Postmaster General to publicly declare that recruiting in Quebec had been bungled from the start, and that if proper methods had been adopted in the beginning the response of the French-Canadians would have been satisfactory in every respect. There is the testimony of a member of the Government, responsible for recruiting. How can the Government escape the condemnation of one of its own members, and how can the Government justify a Bill which one of its own members makes it manifest is introduced for the purpose of covering up its own blunders?

Recruiting in Quebec.

There is another state of affairs of which notice must be taken if we are honestly desirous of understanding the attitude of French Canada towards recruiting. One phase of that situation is created by the open and covert attacks made upon the French people. Let me cite a few instances, beginning with one mentioned the other evening by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). Not many weeks ago, as hon. gentlemen will recall, it was publicly charged that a troop train was stoned while passing through the province of Quebec. The charge was widely circulated, and some credence was given to it even in this House. Much indignation was aroused, and, as usual in these cases, there was some senseless talk about reprisals. To the credit of the Government, I must say that, when my right hon. friend

(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) asked that the charge be investigated, the Government promptly appointed a commission for that purpose. And what was the result? The inquiry completely exonerated the French residents of the place where the stoning of the train was said to have occurred. It did more; it placed the blame on some of the soldiers themselves. Incidentally it revealed that if the disturbers had had a knowledge of the French language, in all probability there would have been no trouble at all.

Attacks on Quebec Deplorable.

Let me refer to another incident in another part of the country. At a conscription meeting held in Queen's Park, Toronto, a returned soldier, who is not, I am convinced, a fair representative of his comrades, is reported to have evoked the loudest cheers of the afternoon by saying that the Government should conscript the foreigners, and that the returned soldiers would fight the French. I am within the judgment of every fair-minded man in Canada when I say that such language as that is deplorable, deplorable in the highest degree. And yet, Sir, in the newspapers of the city where Lount and Matthews gave up their lives that the principles of liberty and justice might survive; in the newspapers of the city where George Brown and Edward Blake lived and preached the gospel of democracy and freedom, I have failed to notice one word of regret or reproof for the language that was used at that meeting. Worse than that, Sir, we have heard an echo of that very language in this very Chamber. In moving the introduction of this Bill, the Prime Minister, speaking of the Canadians who had enlisted, said:

If what are left of 400,000 such men come back to Canada with fierce resentment, and even rage in their hearts conscious that they have been deserted and betrayed, how shall we meet them when they ask the reason? I am not so much concerned for the day when this Bill becomes law, as for the day when these men return if it is rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I ask if it would be possible to use language more unfair to the soldiers who have fought for the principle that public opinion must be respected; that there must not be government without the consent of the governed; the soldiers who have fought for the very principle embodied in the amendment of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)? I ask, would it be possible to use language more unjust to those who oppose this Bill on principle, but who are ready and willing to obey its provisions when approved by a majority of the people? I ask, Sir, would it be possible to use language more provocative, more destructive of that very spirit of fairness and moderation for which the Prime Minister himself appealed in the discussion of this Bill? The words of a mob orator, unskilled in public speaking, without responsibility and carried away by the excitement of the moment, may at times and on public grounds be excused; but no such excuse can be advanced for the words of a Prime Minister, speaking in a deliberative assembly such as this. Much as I regret the Prime Minister's words, it is not my intention to retort in kind. Rather, Sir, would I appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober; rather would I ask the Prime Minister to bear in mind his own dictum that it is easy to sow the wind of clamour, and to apply, in quarters where it is most needed—and they are not far distant from his own political household—his own conclusions that those who make that sowing may reap such a whirlwind as they do not dream of to-day. If my right hon. friend will do that, I am confident he will decide that the first application of the lesson should be made elsewhere than in the province of Quebec.

Conscription does not tend to Unity.

But, Sir, it is not merely to such attacks as those I have alluded that we are to attribute the lack of that united effort which it is pretended this Bill will supply. These attacks are bad enough, but there is a more deep-rooted cause of discontent, which this Bill will undoubtedly not remove, but which I am profoundly convinced

this Bill will make much worse. It is evident to every Canadian who is concerned about his country's welfare and the unity of his people, that neither can be secured while our French fellow-citizens are disturbed by the belief that there is a disposition on the part of the English majority to deprive them of the use of their language. At such a critical time as this, it is useless to argue whether that belief is well or ill founded. Argument of that kind will accomplish nothing. The sensible, the courageous, and the patriotic thing to do is to frankly recognize that the belief exists, and to seek to dispel it at the earliest possible moment. The statesman of the Government that will adopt that course will do more to stimulate recruiting, will do more for the boys in the trenches, and will render better and more effective service to Canada and the Empire than all the Bills this Parliament can pass.

In this same connection, I would offer a friendly suggestion to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). He is designated in the Bill as the minister by whom its provisions are to be carried out. For reasons that will readily occur to my hon. friend, without my stating them, it would, in my judgment, be better to designate some other minister for that work; in fact, as this is a war measure, its proper administrator would seem to be the Minister of Militia, and should that hon. gentleman require any legal assistance, it can be provided in the Act that such should be furnished him by the Solicitor General.

Mr. BURNHAM: Will the hon. gentleman state why he objects to the Minister of Justice administering the Act?

Mr. MURPHY: I do not object, if the minister wishes to act. I am merely making a suggestion.

No Political Party can Enforce Conscription.

Referring to the speech of the hon. gentleman from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), I may observe that in form and in tone that speech was as unexceptionable as any I have heard delivered in Parliament. I may say the same about that of the hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Pardee); and, as I am in a generous mood, I think I would extend that compliment to the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen). I desire to say further, with reference to the speech of my hon. friend from South Wellington, that I do not agree with his arguments and conclusions, save in one instance, namely, when he said that he did not believe that this Bill would be successfully enforced by a single political party. I share that belief in its entirety. The Government would do well to hearken to the warning contained in the speech of the hon. gentleman from South Wellington, because it is manifest that the Government alone cannot put this Bill in force. Mr. Speaker, let us rid ourselves of cant. This Bill attempts the impossible. That the Govern-

ment knows this to be the case was hinted by the hon. Minister of Labour yesterday when he intimated that the operation of the Bill might be postponed. Is that not why it contains the provision that it is not to come into force until a proclamation is issued? It is not yet too late for the Government to be frank and courageous. Let them acknowledge that their action was hasty, and that it is better to yield before than after they have caused a disastrous cleavage in our national life.

Baldwin and Lafontaine.

In conclusion, I have a last appeal to make. On Parliament Hill there is a monument composed of two figures, those of Baldwin and Lafontaine. United in life, this Parliament wisely decided that in the nation's memory they would not be separated in death. There they stand, and for all time they will stand, gazing into the distance across the Ottawa river and beyond the sky line of the Laurentian hills—two figures, the embodiment in bronze of a noble ideal, typifying the union of the two great forces in our national life, both consecrated to the attainment of a lofty and a sacred purpose. As we pass by that monument should we not, particularly in these days of our country's stress and trial, take vision and inspiration from the history of the two great Canadians whom it commemorates? And what more inspiring chapter of that history can we recall for the benefit of our fellow citizens and to point their way to present duty than that which tells us that when Baldwin was defeated in the province of Ontario he was promptly elected for the county of Rimouski in the province of Quebec, and that, when later on, Lafontaine met defeat in his native province, he was just as promptly elected for one of the divisions of the county of York, in the province of Ontario? That is the spirit that we should strive to have prevail in every province in this Dominion. That is the example we should follow, and we will follow it only if our minds be illumined by the constitutional light that guided the steps of Baldwin and Lafontaine, only if our hearts be attuned as theirs were, to constant forbearance and mutual good will. What was possible in Canada three-quarters of a century ago should be possible to-day. Nay, more; what was possible in Canada three-quarters of a century ago should much more easily be possible to-day. Believing that, I urge the Government to withdraw this Bill or to suspend its consideration until the people shall have been consulted. If neither of these courses be adopted, it is my conviction that the best service that can be rendered in behalf of national unity is to vote against this Bill, and if the Government persists in its announced intention of forcing a division upon the amendment placed in your hands by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, I will vote for that amendment as an earnest of my desire to promote peace and unity at home and content and effectiveness among our soldiers overseas.

SPEECH OF THE HON. GEORGE P. GRAHAM ON THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917, Delivered in the House of Commons on June 22nd, 1917.

The Rights of Minorities.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, as a great portion of my public life has been devoted to defending the rights of minorities, even to the point of generosity as charged by my opponents, to-day, being in the minority among my own friends, I ask from them the kind consideration which I have always endeavoured to extend to them. We are asking the men of Canada to be ready, aye ready. We, in this House, might add a slogan for our own benefit: Be steady, aye steady. If there ever was a time in the history of this country when men should curb their passions and prejudices simultaneously with their tongues, that time is now, and this is the place. Nothing can be gained Mr. Speaker, by recrimination. We are citizens of a common country, having the same ideals, having the same

objects, and, I take it, every man in this House no matter from what province he may come, or from what stock he may have sprung, believes in his country, is attached to his country, and believes, further, that the destiny of his country is bound up in its relationship with the great British Empire. We may differ on details, but only on details. Sir, the people of Canada, the people of the Empire, and the nations of the earth, are looking at Canada at the present moment. Should we say or do aught to disturb the harmony that exists among the peoples of different origin in this country, we will add to the gratification of our enemies and detract from the comfort of our friends.

Liberalism gives Freedom of Speech.

In attempting to speak as one of the minority on this

side of the House, I do it without any trepidation. I say, frankly, if I were on the other side of the House, I would not feel such freedom. Liberalism, as I have learned it, allows the fullest freedom of thought to every member who advocates Liberalism, and I want to say that, while I differ with my revered leader, I have his absolute consent to take whatever course I think best at the present time. Every member on this side of the House is at liberty to act, speak, and vote as he chooses, and, by doing so, he is not severing the ties of affection that bind him to his grand old chieftain, neither is he slinking away, in any sense, from the great Liberal party and the causes which it has always stood for. We have had, Sir, attacks made on my revered leader. I resent those attacks just as warmly to-day as I would, or could if he and I were agreeing. We are not disagreeing on any essential a bit more than members of different churches are disagreeing on the one essential belief, and trying to get to heaven, each picking his own path. The great Liberal chieftain stands to-day where he has always stood, as the advocate of what he thinks is best for Canada and for the Empire. He is as anxious about winning this great struggle as I am. He sees difficulties in the way, in my point of view, but he recognizes my right to have that viewpoint. I do not see those difficulties, but I want to point out that he and I, as well as every member of this House, are joined in one resolve that our best must be done for the winning of this great struggle, and it is only on the details of how that is to be accomplished that I differ from him. I may be wrong in my attitude, and he may be right. Young men may forget that, when they were boys, the Liberal chieftain was fighting for the great principles, the benefits of which they now enjoy. In 1896, facing the greatest opposition, and the greatest influence that was ever brought to bear on man in this country, he stood for the principle of provincial rights, and other men from the province of Quebec stood behind him on that principle, and, as a result, it was established. He was right. Those who sat on the other side of the House were wrong. That may be the case in this instance. On the question of the Canadian navy, the events of this moment prove that my leader was right.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Sir Wilfrid Right on Many Questions.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would ask hon. gentlemen who live in the interior of Canada to go to the Pacific and to the Atlantic coasts, and come back and tell us what they find that they would not have found, if there had been a Canadian navy. In 1911 my leader was again right, as the Government has acknowledged by its action. He may be right in this case, but I think he is not. We differ, having both one object in view.

Thanks to Quebec we are still a portion of the British Empire.

Sir, just a word or two as to our fellow citizens from the province of Quebec. We cannot get anywhere in this country by recrimination. Readers of Canadian history must not forget—they cannot forget, though some gentlemen speak as if they were not conversant with Canadian history—that the fact that to-day we are still a portion of the British Empire is due in a measure to the loyalty of the Frenchmen of the province of Quebec in the years gone by. During recent years, in the province of Quebec, our fellow citizens have not been imbued with the military spirit with which we in the other provinces are imbued. They have not in Quebec, throughout the villages and small towns, the drill halls and military centres to the extent that we have them in Ontario. They have not had a centre of military education, by having officers stationed all through the province of Quebec. They have gone their way, as we have gone ours in the other provinces, believing that the time would not come, for many, many years at least, when they would be called on to perform military service. We must meet the situations as we find them, and we

cannot possibly by vituperative language, accomplish the purpose we have in view.

French Race Logical.

Having said this, I want to refer to another matter. The French race is much more logical than we are. There are very few English-speaking members of this House who know the French-Canadian character as intimately as I do; I have had daily business relations with the French-Canadian people. They are brave, chivalrous, truthful; above all, they are logical. Having been told time and again by the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition that there would be no conscription in Canada, they hardly believe it possible that conscription has been proposed. They cannot understand it. They are logical, but we are not. We can change with conditions much more readily than can our French-Canadian fellow-citizens. These considerations must be borne in mind in the discussion of the question now before the House. It is the duty of those who differ from the French-Canadian people to look at these matters from their viewpoint and to discuss them accordingly. To my mind, the surest way of being fair is to put ourselves in the other man's position, to find out what we would do if we were subject to his environment, his history, his characteristics. If every one does that there will be an exemplification of what is best; there will be not recrimination, but a closer drawing together of the two races, with the result that after this Bill is passed it may not be necessary to put it into operation.

Recruiting.

There are three classes of Canadians: those who have gone to the front, those who cannot go, and those who ought to go. Of those who have gone nothing too good can be said. They have gone from Quebec and from Ontario, from the East and from the West, from the families of the rich, of the middle classes, and of the poor. Mingling on the field of battle, irrespective of position that they held in this country in the way of class or occupation, they are fighting side by side in order that your children and mine may enjoy that liberty and freedom of individual action which has always been the pride of our race. In that respect there is no distinction of class. I know men of great wealth who have sent practically all their sons, some of whom have suffered; all honour to these sons and to these parents. I know the sons of workmen who have gone. Many widows have sent their only sons, some of whom have died, leaving the mothers without support and without comfort. The people of Canada are imbued with the spirit of sacrifice, knowing full well that if we lose in this great struggle nothing is left to us who so long have prized the liberties which we enjoy. Our forefathers fought in 1812; better a thousand times that we had lost in 1812 than that we should lose in 1917. Had we lost in 1812 to-day we should be under another form of democratic government—that would be the only change. But if we lose in this conflict we lose all that democratic government stands for; we become not our own masters, but the slaves of others.

This brings me to the matter of recruiting. I do not wish to indulge in undue criticism, but having taken part in the work of recruiting, so far as I could in my own feeble way, I think I am in a position to point to some of the reasons why the voluntary system failed. When the war broke out, recruiting leagues, designated by various names, but all working for a common cause were formed throughout Ontario. But from the Government's standpoint there was no organization. Any man in this House from the province of Ontario who will recall the recruiting operations in his own territory will realize that the successful work along this line was done by civilian organizations. Not only did these civilians work, but they paid the expenses as well; there is, I suppose, not a man in this House who has not paid out large sums of money from his own pocket in order to assist the work of recruiting in his own vicinity. If we had had proper Government organization in Ontario—I speak of

that province only—recruiting would have been 25 per cent greater than it was. To the citizens of that province much more than to the Government, is due the credit for the success of recruiting in Ontario.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Why should not the same course have been followed in Quebec?

Mr. GRAHAM: I shall come to Quebec in a moment; my hon. friend must not worry. If I leave anything out, and the House, having not wearied of my remarks, will direct my attention to it, I shall deal with it.

No Organization for Recruiting.

This, then, is my first criticism of the Government: there was no real organization in the matter of recruiting. It is true that recruiting officers were sent here and there. I look into the faces of men who spoke at various meetings and who had charge of various committees. They will agree with me that many of the recruiting officers were of no value whatever to them in getting recruits. I do not wish to speak disparagingly of those officers, but they were not the right men to get recruits. Some officers were sent out who hindered civilians from getting recruits. I have stood on the platform with men for whose language I had to apologize in order to bring the audience back to a frame of mind in which they would consider my request for recruits. No man can hope for success in recruiting who begins by abusing the young men or the older men and calling them slackers. That is not the way to get recruits. We had too much of that in Ontario, and our recruiting was not what it should have been, although it was by no means a failure.

More Men than Needed.

The first real jolt that was given by the Government to recruiting in Ontario was when the ex-Minister of Militia said that he was getting more men than he needed. At the first meeting that I attended after that statement had been made, I was laughed at. Men said: we understand that the Government are having no trouble in getting men; that they are getting more men than they can equip; that the men are climbing over each other to enlist. For months that statement of the then Minister of Militia was a serious handicap, because the men naturally concluded that if the Government were getting more men than they could equip, there was no use in enlisting until the work was caught up. This emphasizes my contention that there was lack of organization somewhere, somehow.

Graft and Rake-Off Hurt Recruiting.

Then other things came up; I do not want to refer to them in a critical way. The manufacturer was not allowed to sell directly to the department; people got in between, and were receiving certain commissions. This tended greatly to injure recruiting in Ontario. The ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) told us the other day that the Prime Minister himself, after Sir Thomas, now Baron, Shaughnessy, issued a certain statement, intimated that the pressure upon recruiting might be relieved for a little time. I think the ex-minister said that the Minister of Finance brought back that report after a visit to Toronto.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I made a statement in this House—I think it was on the 1st or the 2nd day of February last—which is the exact and literal truth, so far as I am concerned in this matter. I purpose, before this debate closes, making a further statement on the subject, which I hope will place the matter beyond question. On no occasion did I ever ask recruiting to be slackened or delayed. What I did do—and this I have stated many times in this House—was to endeavour to have recruiting officers so direct their efforts that skilled men, who were of greater service to the country in the occupations they were engaged in than in military service, should not be taken, when other men capable of going to the front and of much less service to the State at home could be sought and secured.

Mr. GRAHAM: I leave that to the Prime Minister

and the ex-Minister of Militia. That was not my strong point in this case. I was repeating what the ex-Minister of Militia said.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I interrupted only because I understood my hon. friend was attributing to me some action which had occasioned a slackening in recruiting. I desire absolutely to deny that.

Mr. GRAHAM: Again my answer must be the same. The trouble was that the ex-Minister of Militia, being a member of the Government was believed throughout the country when he made the intimation that the pressure on recruiting was to be lessened, and recruiting practically stopped. The head of the Canadian Pacific Railway did issue a statement regarding recruiting along certain lines, and either that or something else at that period undoubtedly interfered with the progress of recruiting in Ontario.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the exact period to which the hon. gentleman refers?

Mr. GRAHAM: I forget the dates; I have not them with me.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does the hon. gentleman mean the summer of 1916?

Mr. GRAHAM: My recollection is that the ex-Minister of Militia said that it was in March, 1916. These are just a few of the things that interfered with recruiting, but the great thing, to my mind, was the lack of organization from a military standpoint. But thanks to the work of the citizens of Ontario, who formed associations, leagues, committees in every town and county, their work being aided in a measure by the Militia Department, recruiting was fairly successful in the province, but not nearly so successful as it might have been had the conditions to which I have referred not existed.

Methodist Clergyman Appointed Chief Recruiting Officer for Quebec.

I come now to Quebec. Hon. gentlemen have referred to the appointment as chief recruiting officer of a clergyman of the church to which I belong. That may seem a small matter, but as I said in the beginning of my remarks, if we are to accomplish our object, which I presume is the securing of recruits, we must meet the people with whom we have to deal from their own viewpoint. We might as well expect the Archbishop of Montreal to be welcomed as editor of the Orange Sentinel, as to have a Methodist clergyman, no matter how great a preacher he is, chief recruiting officer amongst the French-Canadian people. That, however, is only a minor matter.

Nationalists were against Recruiting.

I come now to a more delicate point, and I raised this question in this House in the early stages of the war. I wish to speak of this without any recrimination, without even questioning for the moment the stand-point of the men to whom I refer, but merely as a matter of history and of fact. Since the war began, I said in this House that the doctrine preached previously to 1911 by certain people in Quebec, namely: that we owed nothing to Britain and should not send a man to fight her battles, had more to do with slowness of recruiting in Quebec than any other cause. Another cause was that when the war broke out the Government of Canada had as three of its members, men who had taken that position at every church door in Quebec, and the young men to whom this Government was appealing to enlist had been told by those men that it was no part of their duty to enlist to fight overseas. As I have said before, the French mind is logical; you cannot turn it upside down over night, and when men were found in the Government, helping to direct the affairs of this war, who had told the young men of Quebec that such a war was no concern of theirs, those young men challenged the sincerity of the men who were asking them to enlist. Under similar circumstances any one in Ontario would have done the same thing; I certainly would have; I would not have listened, under like circumstances, to any appeal. Fur-

ther than that, when this war broke out, the Government of Canada had not a French-speaking member in it who dared to go on the platform in Quebec and ask for recruits.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Wrong.

Mr. GRAHAM: Wherein am I wrong? If my hon. friend can show me where French-speaking members of the Government were making speeches when this war broke out, I will tell him whom he sent to make the speeches. He sent the late Mr. Casgrain, who was not then a member of the Government, who had never bowed the knee to Nationalism, but who had been a straight line, loyal Tory all his life. Who else was sent on behalf of the Government of Canada? Mr., now Justice Marechal, of Montreal, who was also a straight line Tory and not a Nationalist. Those two men stood on the same platform with my leader, with the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and other Liberals, at several meetings if I remember correctly.

Mr. SEVIGNY: What meetings?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend should know; he has been keeping pretty close track of the matter.

Mr. SEVIGNY: It was one meeting at Sohmer Park, Montreal.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: One in seven is a pretty good average for you.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say "seven." I said "several." My hon. friend should wake up. I am serious in this matter. I am not saying it because of any hard feelings I have for these gentlemen; that is not my object. I am pointing out, as I pointed out months ago in this House, that that has been the great stumbling block from the beginning of this war to securing recruits in the province of Quebec. After that, Mr. Casgrain was brought into the Government and he was the only Tory brought in. After his death the Prime Minister brought in the very man who I say should have been asked to step out when this war began. I maintain that General Lessard should have been sent to Quebec at the beginning of the war and given charge of recruiting in that province. There is no question but that he would have been welcome and would have achieved results.

Mr. MORPHY: Was any request made by any one in the province of Quebec that General Lessard should be sent there to look after recruiting? If so, what was his name?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not in the Government, so I cannot tell. But if my hon. friend thinks the fact of the Government's not being asked to send him there excuses them for not sending him, then he cannot vote for a compulsory measure.

Mr. LALOR: What success did he meet with when he did go there?

Armand Lavergne.

Mr. GRAHAM: General Lessard was sent to Quebec in March last with Colonel Blondin, or Colonel Blondin was sent with him, I do not know which. And what was the very next thing that this Government or somebody else did? They put Armand Lavergne in uniform—I saw him in uniform in the city of Montreal—as part of the recruiting force, going up and down saying: "You must not recruit for overseas, but only for home service," and at the very same time General Lessard and Colonel Blondin were saying: "You must recruit for overseas service." How could you expect success under these circumstances? I am not going to follow this up any further, but I maintain that these are some of the reasons why Quebec did not respond to the call for troops. The call was made in the most irritating way and by men in whose sincerity the people had no confidence.

General Lessard should have been put in charge.

I will go further and say that I believe that if General Lessard had been given charge of recruiting in the province of Quebec at the beginning of the war and had been given a free hand to gather around him the men he wanted, we would not now be criticising the province of Que-

bec, for it would have had its full quota in the ranks to-day.

The Women of Canada.

I come to another class, and the House I hope will bear with me in this. I mean the class composed of those who cannot go. In this class, outside of the nurses, we find the women of the Dominion of Canada, and let me say that the good women of this country have sacrificed more than the men of this country. They have given up many of their amusements, many of the things in which they took pleasure, and have devoted themselves day and night to caring for the boys at the front, sending them comforts, and caring also for those our boys have left behind. It is all very well for us fathers and brothers to think we have made sacrifices; our sacrifices are great indeed, but they are not to be compared with the greatest sacrifice of all which a mother makes when she gives the boy she bore to risk his life for his country. To the women of Canada will be devoted perhaps one of the brightest pages in the history of this great struggle.

The Business Man.

Then we have those men who are engaged in business, and at this point I propose to discuss for a few moments the subject of a resolution of which I gave intimation a few evenings ago, but of which I did not give notice on the Order Paper, and which consequently I am not out of order in discussing now. The resolution, though general in its terms, is intended to point in a certain direction, and reads:

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that steps should be taken forthwith by the Government to provide that accumulated wealth should contribute immediately and effectively to the cost of the war, and that all agricultural, industrial, transportation and natural resources of Canada should be organized forthwith so as to ensure the greatest possible assistance to the Empire in the war and to reduce the cost of living to the Canadian people.

Having flung a general motion of that kind into the arena I feel that I ought at least to say what I mean by it. I do not pretend to be a financier, and I make no pretensions to be an overly shrewd business man. I am but an ordinary everyday plodder, so that anything I may say can undoubtedly be criticised by the Minister of Finance, and I should not be at all surprised if he brings in the question of exchange before I get through. But I have some general views which are embodied in this motion.

The Labour People.

Some people have spoken of the conscription of wealth, but I have not used that term. It may mean that in the eyes of the public, but I would rather deal with the question from a broader point of view. The first thing I would do would be to call in the heads of labour, and not only the heads of labour but the heads of industries, the men of capital. But I would certainly not omit the representatives of labour, because these are times when our efforts must be co-ordinated, and we cannot hope for success in working out these problems if any large class is objecting to one course. I can see no difficulty at all in having the work thus carried on harmoniously and with creditable results.

Conscription of Wealth.

The Minister of Finance will ask me right away, what next? He knows what I am going to say about wealth before I say it. I repeat what I said some weeks ago in this House, that I can see no earthly reason why men with large incomes should not be contributing, and contributing generously, to the carrying on of this war. I would not have an income tax for the man with the ordinary income because he has difficulty enough

now in living, but there are in Canada a great number of men who receive a great deal more money than they earn, and a portion at least of their excess income ought to go hand in hand with the labour and the soldiery of Canada for the prosecution of this war. Two illustrations occur to me. Here is a young man engaged in business or in the practice of a profession, making perhaps \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year. He has a small family, and has saved enough to make a start in life. When the call comes he does not wait for conscription, but locks his office door, leaves his wife and children and goes to the front. The wife and children of this man will not accept assistance from the Patriotic Fund. They have no other resource but the pittance the husband can send from the front, and soon the little stock of money they have saved dwindles, and when the husband comes back, if he ever does, minus a leg perhaps, or an arm, or maimed in some other way, he finds himself without a business and his little stock of money gone, and he has to start life over again.

This is what he may look for if he does come back. And he may never come back—he takes that great risk. Compare this with any sacrifice you can ask of the man with the large income. If he had to give all his income except just sufficient to live on he would be contributing a bare mite in comparison with the contribution of the young man to whom I have referred.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) will say: Oh, we are taxing many of these men who have their money in business. That is true. But the fact remains that the expenses of managing the business are taken out before the business tax is levied, and among these expenses is the big salary of the man. So this salary is not subject to taxation at all—it is exempt from the business tax as part of the expenses of the business. Generally speaking, wherever there is a large income this Government ought to step in, and step in now, and tax it more heavily to help in carrying on the affairs of the nation.

In what I am about to say now, perhaps I may cover ground upon which the financial amateur should not venture. Certain things, however, seem quite plain to me. At the present moment the Finance Minister, through legislation, compels certain companies to invest a portion of their money in Government bonds. They have the money to invest, and for that money they might receive seven or eight per cent, but they are compelled to invest in Canadian Government bonds, the rate of interest upon which is what the Government desires to pay. I quite agree with that policy. But why not apply the same principle to the man who has a big investment, but not in one of the companies subject to this law? Would it not be right that every man of capital in the Dominion should be compelled by law to invest a large portion of his capital in Canadian bonds for the carrying on of the war? My hon. friend will say that they are doing it voluntarily? But a great deal is not being done voluntarily that might be done under compulsion. Many of these gentlemen have invested in foreign securities. What, then, can we do? Suppose that these investments are in United States securities, this is the suggestion I make: The Government might well say to the holder of United States bonds, for instance: You give us these bonds and we will give you Canadian war bonds for them. The proceeds of these United States bonds could then be used in trade between the Dominion of Canada and the United States and the Government of Canada would thus be relieved from the necessity of borrowing large sums of money directly. I think that would work out. Perhaps it would not; but I have not been able to find any suggestion in my own mind why it should not. I would go further than all this, if necessary; but I think that would be far enough for a first step—a long way further than the Minister of Finance has gone yet. If it were necessary for the carrying on of this war I would take other steps by which capital should be called upon to contribute more than by the methods I have already suggested.

Land Tax.

I am not sure that the Government would not be

warranted, also, under present circumstances, in making every acre of vacant land in Canada, which is held for speculation, pay a certain amount of taxation during war time at least. That would have a double result. It would bring revenue, or, if the owner of such vacant land wished to escape taxation, he would have the land cultivated, and this would bring good to the country as a whole and would furnish traffic for our systems of transportation.

These are just a few ideas which, I think, could be amplified, and by the use of which the treasury of this Dominion could be greatly enriched. The Minister of Finance may say: We are getting along nicely, we get enough revenue for the present moment. But we are not getting enough revenue for the present moment if the hon. gentleman will allow me to differ with him. And why not pay our way, or approximate that condition more than we are doing at present? With all our borrowings, so long as we can borrow freely, our expenditures are not going to be so economical as they would be if we were not trying to borrow but were raising our revenues by taxation. The people to-day do not feel the burden of our borrowing. But are we not, by neglecting to use our present resources, helping to create a burden of taxation which the soldier returning from the front will have to help to bear? These men ought not to be called upon to bear a heavy load of taxation; they will have done their share before they return. To-day, Canada, through her industries and her agriculture, is prosperous, and I believe the people will uphold the Government in imposing a greater amount of taxation and thus enable the Dominion to pay its way, or to come nearer paying its way, than it is doing at this time.

Agriculture.

The next point to which I wish to refer is agriculture. I do not pretend to be an authority on agriculture, and I think a lot of the lectures given to the farmers about how to conduct their business are so much wasted energy. Most of the farmers I know understand how to carry on their business better than do any of us who might be inclined to give them lectures. We tell them when they are engaged in growing wheat that they ought to go in for mixed farming. Well, if they can make more out of wheat, they are likely to stick to growing wheat; but if there is money in mixed farming, then you may expect to see them go in to mixed farming. The farmers at present labour under a lack of assistance; this is true of my own province, and I suppose it is true of other provinces as well. Young men are going from the colleges, from the collegiate institutes and high schools, into the country to spend their vacation. Their midsummer examinations are allowed them if they are able to show that they have spent two months with a farmer. This kind of help is not the strongest help for the farmer, but it is far better for him than being left alone. Any system of re-distribution of labour that does not in a measure provide the farmer with assistance, will not be complete. I am not sure that a man forced to work on a farm would be of much use; there would not be enough people there to keep him at work. But I believe there are thousands of people, men who are not able to go to the front, boys, and others, who would willingly go on the farm if some co-ordinated effort were made to get them there. Some arrangement should be made under this Bill or otherwise, for the distribution of labour on the farm as well as elsewhere. I believe that could be done without any compulsory effort.

Greater Production and Transportation.

But, after all, production on the farm, labour being given, depends on the profits from the farm, and the profits from the farm depend more largely on transportation than on anything else. Let me speak of that. I want to criticise the Government in that they did not co-ordinate the transportation facilities of this country months and months ago. I do not know what the situation is to-day or what the Government proposes about railways. I have not time just now to go into this question. Our

minds are full of something else, but I do say that, no matter what happens, we must keep the railways of Canada running or else the farmers cannot produce. If they do produce they cannot sell. We have been told time and time again that we have too many railways in Canada. I make the assertion now, and I believe I am justified in doing so, that for the productiveness of Canada we have not yet sufficient railway mileage. The productiveness of Canada is the thing that I am speaking of and not the products of Canada. Months and months ago in this House the Department of Railways and Canals was asked why more business was not done on the Transcontinental railway. No cars; no rolling stock. What an answer for a Government that is managing a railway to give. The business that should have gone to the Transcontinental railway from east to west was brought by the Intercolonial railway to Montreal and handed to another railway. It made a good showing for the Intercolonial but it starved the Transcontinental railway, and the reason given was—no rolling stock. I am not going to say that there was any motive, but the fact remains that the Transcontinental railway has not been used as it should have been used, while the Intercolonial has been overcrowded, and the reason given is—no rolling stock. This matter was brought to the attention of the Government months and months ago, but because of the lack of such rolling stock it seems that the Government cannot deal with the supplies in the West that should be brought forward quickly, during the winter months, if necessary, and stored at Quebec or shipped from St. John and Halifax. What happens down in Halifax? The Government has no machinery of any consequence to handle the grain that they do deliver there, and when they get it there no ships are available to take it across the ocean. The Government ought to take more power even than it has given to the Board of Railway Commissioners to co-ordinate the efforts of the railways of Canada, and they ought to provide that no railway can hold back traffic when there is another railway near which could carry that traffic. They ought to compel the use of any railway that is not crowded by a railway that is crowded. The Government and the people of Canada criticised the Grand Trunk Railway because it could not move coal owing to lack of rolling stock. Why did the Government allow that condition to exist? It must have known that it would arise. I regret that the Government, through lack of organization, did not many months ago provide rolling stock for all the railways in Canada, in order that goods might be carried from the west to the east and from the east to the west, and in order that the agricultural products of the country might be moved in the quickest possible time. They should not only co-ordinate the railways, but they should take possession of them, if necessary. If they took possession of the railways they would be able to carry the transcontinental traffic this way or that way. What happens at the seaboard? We have no ships. This matter was brought to the attention of Parliament time and time again and the Government were pressed to make some provision for building ships in which our products could be carried across the seas. Nothing was done. Recently the Government, I believe, has been advancing money to the British Government and various shipbuilding industries in Canada are building ships, not for us but for the British Government. That is right so far as it goes, but our shipbuilding industry in Canada, or a portion of it, should have been building ships for Canada months and months ago. Then we would not have been in the position that we are in now. I would go on and build them myself if I were the Government. It may be too late, but better late than never. If the Government desire to help out agriculture, the suggestion I make is that they co-ordinate our transportation. One of the most important things to do in this connection is to relieve the shortage of rolling stock on the Government railways. The hon. gentleman who now leads the House (Sir George Foster) will have it in mind that a few weeks ago the general manager of the Government railways resigned and a very few days afterwards the new manager gave an order for 5,000 cars. He rose to the situation, he knew what was needed, but for some reason his pre-

decessor did not do that. There were some 500 passenger cars ordered by the Government in the United States. I asked the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals some weeks ago how many of these 500 cars which had been ordered in the United States in June, 1916, had been delivered and the answer was: Five or six. As a result of this delinquency, this lack of organization, of co-ordinated effort in our forces of transportation, we find that our railways have no rolling stock, the Government railway is short of rolling stock, we have no ships; and yet we talk about promoting agriculture when we have neglected the prime requisite for successful farming.

Mr. LALOR: Is not the fact that the same condition of shortage of rolling stock prevails in the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not sure but that such is true, but it would not be an excuse here. They are building their own ships and working away. Although this condition was called to the attention of the Government as likely to arise, we find that the Government railway itself got so far behind with rolling stock that a few days after the new manager was appointed he ordered no less than 5,000 box cars and several engines.

Let me speak of the co-ordination of industry in natural resources. A great many of our industries have been taken charge of by the Imperial Munitions Board, and some of them have been pretty well organized, but there are still in Canada industries that are turning out goods which are not essential to the prosecution of the war. They are turning out goods that are luxuries, not essentials, not necessities. There ought to be a sizing up of all these industries and every industry that is not producing something that can be used in the war, or which is a necessity, ought to be asked to turn its attention in some other direction in order that the war may be carried on more successfully. The industries of Canada have shown that they can produce anything that can be produced anywhere in the world, as well and as cheaply. An inventory of the various industries of this country should be taken and those that are producing non-essential goods might well have their efforts directed to the production of necessary goods. Co-ordination of that kind would prevent overlapping between industries and we would have turned out in Canada in one steady stream from our own industries the things which are required for the prosecution of the war, and we would not find ourselves short of one commodity at a time when there is a big surplus of some other commodity.

Natural Resources.

Then, take our natural resources. The first thing this Government should have done was to have taken a firm grip of the nickel supply of the Dominion of Canada. That is one of the very essentials of modern warfare and modern shipbuilding, and by no circuitous route, but by a direct grip of the hand, this Government should have taken possession of the nickel mines, or taken control, at least, and should have seen that the nickel products of Canada went for the benefit of the Allies, and for nobody else. And also that they went at the cheapest price, and if necessary, this Government should have had a nickel refinery industry in Canada, managed and worked by itself. Thus all the nickel should go straight to the Allies, and not through any other channel. We have our fishing industry, and we have been told, in a recent report, that fish is one of the best foods that could be sent to the Old Land, but, to a large extent, that export has fallen down. Why? Because arrangement has not been made with the railways to carry this freight by refrigerator cars, in which it could have been sent in greater quantities, than by express. The fishing industry has been neglected, and that industry, which should have supplied fish in great quantities, has practically fallen down or largely so. I understand that a prominent gentleman who was here to propagate the fish industry in Canada for the benefit of our boys at the front, has gone to the Old Land, to endeavour to form a company, and to come back here, and do what the Canadian Government should have done months ago. I will now refer to our

other minerals, coal, oil, gas, and I might say shale.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

The Coal Situation.

Mr. GRAHAM: These are things that enter into the every day consumption of necessities of life, both industrially and domestically. We hear every day of coal mine troubles. A fuel controller has been appointed, but we have heard of trouble in the coal mines every session since the war started. Last year there was a shortage of coal here, and a shortage of coal there, and only a few weeks ago did the Government of the country wake up to appoint a man to take a grip on the situation. Whether that is the right thing to do, I will discuss in a moment, but something should be done. Sir, the coal mines, as well as the other mines of this Dominion, belong primarily to the people of Canada, and the necessities of the day, when our boys are at the front when everybody is sacrificing something, demand that every coal mine in Canada that can be worked must be worked. Perhaps all the blame is not on one side, but the labour troubles should be dealt with in as fair a way as this Government can deal with them. I do not think the best way to deal with the labour trouble is to send a Conservative member of Parliament to settle it. It looks like some party manoeuvre, to send this member of Parliament, instead of selecting an independent man to take hold of the situation; and when the truth comes to be known, it may be that the people out there acted accordingly. Every coal mine should be operated and dealt with, and if it cannot be operated successfully under the present system, it is the duty of the Government to see that the people of the country get all the coal they need, for we possess the coal, and we ought to get it from the bowels of the earth.

Cost of Living and Appointment of a Food Controller.

With reference to the question of reducing the cost of living, the Government has appointed a food controller and a fuel controller, both good men, personal friends of mine. But does not the hon. gentleman who is leading the House think that, if he were an elector in the country, a Liberal who had sent two boys to the front, would he not look upon the appointment of an ex-Tory member of the Dominion Parliament, as fuel controller and the appointment of a Tory member of the Government of Ontario, as food controller, one right after the other, as a proof that this Government still maintains that they are the only party interested in the war? I am not objecting to these two men, but simply pointing out this fact. I will refer to another matter. Does my hon. friend think that the representative of the Standard Oil Company in Canada is the best man he could select to deal with his fellow trust men throughout the Dominion?

What is the United States Doing?

Having said that, I leave that question and go to the active work. I see Mr. Hanna has gone to the United States, which is a very splendid idea. What is being done in the United States? First, the women have been registered in that country as well as the men. Every woman between certain ages in the United States is compelled to register, just as every man is compelled and she carries her registration card, just as her husband does. What does that mean? That she has enlisted, prepared to work in harmony with the food controller, to do her part, so that the waste that takes place, or has hitherto taken place, may be stopped. I saw a statement the other day that if one pound of bread per week per resident of the United States were saved, it would provide the interest on the whole of the Liberty loan. I did not figure out the calculation, but that statement was made. The first thing that ought to be done in the Dominion of Canada so far as home consumption is concerned is to get the co-operation of the women in the households.

If I had not been speaking at such length, I would read an appeal made by the President of the United States along that line. The controller of food in the United States has also dilated upon that question. But, Sir, something can be done. We have been years getting around as far as we have gone, and now we have to go to the United States for an example, and that country has only been in the war a few weeks. This matter should have been arranged months and months ago. There is sufficient food wasted in our hotels and restaurants to keep a large portion, if not all, of the poor of the cities in which these hotels are located. These are small things, but they are at the foundation of economy in the food consumption. The Government has appointed a Board in reference to the grain question. My only criticism is that the Board is too unwieldy, and too big, I think, to do any practical work. In that, however, I may be mistaken. In this case, in order to get the best results, you almost require to have a man with autocratic power and democratic ideas.

The Cold Storage of Food Products.

But, Sir, food control comes about in various ways. I have seen some reports these last few days, in which it is said that everything is all right about the cold storages of Canada. I do not know how that is, but I do know, that in Canada, millions of dozens of eggs are put in cold storage the minute the price dips a little, and the supply is thus stopped, till the price goes up, and the public, which should have had the benefit of the cheap eggs has to pay the big price. A real food controller would stop that, although it would interfere with trade. I have been looking into that question. I had a certain party look after the garbage in a certain city not long ago, to see how many eggs unfit for food were found in the garbage, and, in the collection of one day's garbage, cold storage eggs, that should have gone to the consumer fresh, and at a cheap price, were found in the garbage by the hundreds of dozens, thus proving two things, first, that the consumer did not get what he paid for, and second, that the consumer did not get fresh eggs at a reasonable price, but that he obtained comparatively stale eggs at a high price. I could take my hon. friend to one or two cold storage plants in Canada where a few weeks ago enormous quantities of provisions were piled up and being held until prices should rise. I do not wish to interfere with any business, but this is a time when people must make sacrifices. If Canada is successfully to come through the stress of the shortage of food, as we believe she will, the individual must make sacrifices for the general good of the people.

The Conscription Bill.

I now come to the class that ought to go to the front, and this brings me to a consideration of the Bill itself. England started with this slogan: England expects that every man this day will do his duty; but England later took measures to designate the man and to specify his duty. I believe that had proper organization been effected in Canada we should not now be face to face with the conditions that confront us. To my mind the Bill was thrown into the arena of public opinion in a most irritating way. If my memory be correct, after the Prime Minister and his colleagues returned from the old land the Minister of Public Works gave an interview, in which he said that the Government hoped to proceed without the introduction of any compulsory measure. Practically only a few hours after the people had been given to understand that the Government would proceed further with voluntary enlistment notice of the introduction of a compulsory measure was placed on the Order Paper, without previous intimation, without any education of the people in respect of its need, without any suggestion to the people that such a thing was coming. I repeat, Sir, that this Bill was placed before the public in an irritating and an awkward way.

If this Bill should take away all the men required for our farms and industries I would not support it. But I believe that after we have provided for our industries

and our farms we shall still find in Canada a large number of young men, who, while consuming, are adding nothing to production. I do not know whether this Bill will take them or not, but these are the first men that ought to go. I am inclined to think, however, that they will go when the time comes. As to the references which have been made to enlistment in Quebec, I may say that I have been in various cities of Canada outside of those in Quebec during the last four or five months, and I find that in all those cities there are young men who can be spared from the life of the country in order that the boys in the trenches may be relieved. I am in favour of conscription, because I believe that it will have some effect in stimulating the filling up of our battalions. I cannot bring myself to vote against any measure that may have the effect, directly or indirectly, of assisting in the prosecution of the great struggle in which we are engaged.

The Referendum.

Now I come to a consideration of the proposal for a referendum. I claim to be a democrat; I believe in the people being consulted. But let me say to the House and to the country that the Government are going to consult the people; they are getting ready for an election. Since the day the Minister of Public Works put his foot on the ship to go across the seas to visit the soldiers, the Government have been getting ready for an election. The Prime Minister himself, in a suggestion made some days ago, intimated that the people ought to be consulted before this Bill is put into force. I took that as an in-

dication that there was to be a general election. But we had another indication last night. When an hon. gentleman on this side was speaking about a referendum or an appeal to the people, the member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) asked him if he would be satisfied if the people were appealed to immediately through a general election. The member for St. Antoine is close to the Government; I took it for granted that he had been discussing the matter with the Government and was trying to find out what the members thought about the proposal of a general election. I think, therefore, that there will be a general election, when this question as well as others can be threshed out. Perhaps the best way to clear the atmosphere and to arrive at a solution of the difficulties which present themselves is to go to the people and have them say what we are to do and who are to do it. I take no stock in the objection to a referendum because of its taking time; if anything, a referendum could be had in shorter time than a general election. But I believe that the people of Canada will be asked to divide on this issue among us as individuals—for on this question we are not divided into parties; many gentlemen on the other side of the House accept the view of gentlemen on this side, and some on this side hold the view entertained by gentlemen opposite. We will have to go to our electors upon our personal attitude in this matter; and I am not sure, as I have said, but that an appeal to the people would clear the atmosphere as nothing else would.

For the reasons which I have given at, perhaps, too great length, and for others which I might mention, I am disposed, Sir, to vote against the proposal for a referendum and in favour of the Bill.

SPEECH OF MR. A. B. McCOIG, M.P. FOR WEST KENT, ON THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

Delivered in the House of Commons on June 28th, 1917.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (West Kent): Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on this, undoubtedly the most important question that has ever been before Parliament, at least since I have had the honour of being a member, I wish at the outset to say that I have the good fortune to represent possibly the largest urban and rural constituency in Ontario. In that constituency we have citizens of every nationality and of different religions. I am glad to say, however, that from those different denominations I have never received a letter asking me not to do what I thought was the very best in the interest of the future of this country and of the British Empire. I am more fortunate than my hon. friend (Mr. Chabot), who has stated that he has received many letters threatening him if he took one stand or the other. The only proposition put up to me by any of my constituents was not to support the amendment to the amendment, which means that we are to do nothing to assist the Mother Country. From my constituency, of which I am justly proud, we have sent 2,000 men to take part in the great struggle which is now going on. Many of those men have been fortunate enough to return. Many of them have come back wounded, and many of them have made the supreme sacrifice on the battlefields of France and Flanders. Many of them are in the trenches at the present time. We cannot give these men too good treatment. On many occasions when I have listened to hon. Members speaking about how we should get recruits, the thought has impressed itself upon me that if the members of this House were serious and would make some further compensation to those men, other men would be more encouraged to enlist. Those men enlisted voluntarily at a time when the cost of living in this country was much less than it is at the present time.

Put on Income Tax to Assist Soldiers' Families.

These men have agreed to serve their country for

\$1.10 a day. If they could have been home last winter and seen the hardship their families had to contend with I feel satisfied they would demand that the Government increase their pay before they return. The Government might tax large incomes of \$10,000 and upwards, which would mean a considerable sum in the treasury by the time when these men return, and if they did not return the money would enable their families to make a new start in life. Many of our industries are thus setting aside large sums of money for the hard times that are expected after the war.

The hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) said last night that it was impossible to get any more recruits. I feel satisfied that if we doubled the pay of the soldiers we would be able to get the number of men the Prime Minister promised without any form of compulsory service.

American Farm Labour.

Let me read a despatch in this connection:

800 Chicago Students for Canada's Farms.

Chicago, April 26.—The Agricultural College of the University of Illinois has given 800 students to Canada to help harvest the "war-winning wheat crop." The first contingent, composed of nearly 500 men, left Chicago for the Saskatoon district in Western Canada to-night.

The Canadian Government guarantees the boys a minimum wage of \$50 a month and board, it pays two-thirds on their railroad fare in Canada, and promises each of them a homestead of 160 acres after they have served six months harvesting the 1917 crop.

If this be true I ask this Government to give the boys at the front who are protecting this young nation the same consideration after the war is over. I believe we should then be able to get the required number of men. I have another advertisement here which appeared in

the different American newspapers up to the 1st of May last:

FARM HANDS WANTED.

Western Canada Farmers Require 50,000 American Farm Labourers at Once?

Urgent demand sent out for farm help by the Government of Canada. Good wages. Steady employment. Low railway fares. Pleasant surroundings. Comfortable homes. No Compulsory Military Service. Farm hands from the United States are absolutely guaranteed against conscription. This advertisement is to secure farm help to replace Canadian farmers who have enlisted for the war.

A splendid opportunity for the young man to investigate Western Canada's agricultural offerings, and to do so at no expense. Only those accustomed to farming need apply.

For particulars as to railway rates and districts where labour is required, or other information regarding Western Canada, apply to

C. J. Buroughton, 112 W. Adam St.,
Chicago, Ill.,

Authorized Canadian Government Agent.

More Pay for the Soldiers.

Am I unreasonable in making this plea for the soldiers at the front, of whom so many kind and complimentary things have been said by every hon. gentleman who has spoken in this debate? Am I asking too much when I ask Parliament to supplement the pay of the men who are rendering such great service at the front for this country and the Empire, and to offer a higher amount to the men they propose to coerce into military service in the future?

The county which I have the honour to represent in this House has sent many boys to the Royal Military School at Kingston to take the artillery course. This course costs the parents from \$800 to \$1,200. On the first day of June many of my constituents who had taken this course at Kingston were sent overseas. They had had a thorough training in the artillery branch of the service, and naturally expected to continue that branch, but after they arrived in England they were transferred from the artillery to the infantry. This was not done by the British authorities; they had nothing to do with it whatever. The whole matter was in the hands of the Canadian officials. In view of the treatment meted out to these men, how can the Government expect to get more recruits from that county? As the Prime Minister is not in his seat, I appeal to the hon. gentleman who is leading the House to give this matter his immediate and serious attention, and have this wrong righted. If the people are to have confidence in recruiting officers, the Government must stand behind the pledges given at the time of enlistment, and not transfer men from one unit to another contrary to the understanding at the time of enlistment.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) said the other day that what Canada wanted was leadership. These are his words:

I prefer that this House of Commons—not fresh from the people, but yet from the people—I prefer that they, having knowledge which others in large degree cannot have, should give the people of this country a lead in this great matter.

Assured his Constituents that National Service Cards did not mean Compulsion.

With that I am absolutely in accord. When the National Service campaign was being carried on and cards were being sent out, hundreds of men came to me and asked if they would be subject to compulsory service if they signed the cards. I assured them on the word of the Prime Minister of this country that we would not have compulsory service in Canada. I also told them that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), when acting for the Prime Minister, had assured the labour delegates who waited on him that registration was no step towards compulsion. I also pointed out that

the right hon. leader of the Opposition had stated that we should not have compulsory service in Canada. I have also here an interview in the Toronto Mail and Empire of October 10, 1916, with Hon. Mr. Hearst, Premier of Ontario:

The Prime Minister found little, if any, sentiment among the British people, urging compulsory service in Canada. There may be some among Canadian army men but the British people have received so much more help from Canada than they looked for at the outset, that they are not disposed to demand more.

When we have such authorities making the statement that there will be no compulsion in this country, can you be surprised when you hear that there is some opposition to this proposal, and especially in the absence of an educational campaign to place before the people the reasons for adopting a measure of this kind? While I am alluding to the views of those who, I admit, are amongst the foremost men in Canada, I think I might appropriately refer to an editorial which appeared in a paper that enjoys the greatest reputation for reliability and enterprise in supplying war news to the people of this land.

Toronto Globe against Conscription.

In reply to criticism with regard to the stand that paper had taken, the Toronto Globe published the following in its editorial columns:

The Globe, in its editorial columns, has constantly pointed out that in a country such as Canada conscription is an impossibility, and that no responsible statesman of either party, capable of forming or leading a Canadian War Ministry, would propose compulsory service. Nor has The Globe unduly criticised the failure of the Borden Government to do more than it has done to assist volunteer recruiting. The criticisms of The Globe and of most Liberal papers have been exceedingly mild when compared with the vitriolic denunciations of the Toronto Telegram, the Winnipeg Telegram, the Montreal Mail, and other journals that have absolutely no sympathy with the Liberal party.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Will the hon. gentleman tell me if the Globe has changed its opinion since?

Mr. McCOIG: I am not the editor of the Globe.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the date of that?

Mr. McCOIG: It is dated July 13, 1916. When the announcement had been made by all these leading gentlemen and by such a reputable journal as the Toronto Globe, can you be surprised that men throughout the country had expected that compulsory service would not be an issue in the future? That was the reason why I assured every constituent of mine who came and talked with me that compulsory service would not be an issue until such time as there should be a general election, or at least until it was submitted to the people through the medium of a referendum. I stand in that position at the present time.

Favours a Referendum.

As far as the Bill before Parliament is concerned, I am desirous of doing everything possible to assist in having it carried through if it is going to be any assistance whatever to the Allies in their great struggle. While I support it, I grant there are portions of the Bill that are more favourable to the objects sought to be accomplished than are the provisions of the Militia Act, now upon the statute-book. I feel that in this new measure there will be an advantage and therefore I feel bound to support it. But, not wishing to appear illogical, not wishing to take a stand which may seem inconsistent to some people, I want to assure the House that having promised my constituents that I would support a referendum under which the questions will be submitted to the people, and not having an opportunity of doing it on the third reading, which would be the proper time, I intend to support the referendum when the opportunity presents itself.

We have had many speakers on both sides giving the question of a referendum very scanty consideration and referring to it as an improper method to adopt on

an occasion of this kind. I have heard some observations by the hon. Mr. Balfour read in this House and I believe it is perfectly in order to read them again. These are the words of Mr. Balfour who addressed this House a short time ago. Speaking in November 29, 1911, on the question of tariff reform, he made the following statement:

The advantage of a referendum is this: that the issue is quite clear and quite precise. A referendum has an enormous advantage. It does not involve a general election; it does not involve all the personal bitterness inevitably involved in a contest between the two competitors for a seat; it does not carry with it a change of government; and it does get a clear verdict from the people.

I doubt if there is any one here who will question the great ability of the Hon. Mr. Balfour, or the importance that must be attached to any statement that he makes.

Prohibition.

Now, coming back to the province of Ontario, I would remind the House of the campaign which is proceeding in favour of the adoption of war-time prohibition. Every hon. Member of this House must have had a petition sent to him asking for the adoption of a prohibitory measure. We have had petitions sent to us, not from one organization in the city of Toronto, but from every church in every section of the country—certainly from every part of my own county, and I have no doubt they have been sent from other counties as well—asking for war-time prohibition. What do the signers of these petitions say? The petitioners ask that the manufacture and importation into the Dominion of Canada of intoxicating liquors and beverages shall cease, or words to that effect:

Or in the alternative, if it is deemed desirable to have a vote of the electors on the question, that your honorable body may pass such an Act to go into operation within three months of the voting thereon.

Why are people asking for referendum on Prohibition and against referendum on Conscription.

Does any hon. member of this House say that these men, representing the leading religious organizations of this country, are not justified in sending an appeal to this Parliament asking us, if we cannot agree on this great question, to give them a chance to have a referendum, in order that they may express their opinions at the polls? If a request of that kind is made by these representative men with regard to the question of prohibition, I feel, when I say that I intend to support a referendum on conscription that I am only doing what I believe to be the proper thing in consulting the people on such an important question as this. We recall that in days gone by we had in Ontario that grand old statesman, Sir Oliver Mowat, whose success in public life was largely due to the fact that he adopted the motto: Trust the people. With reference to the present measure it is proposed to place upon the statute book legislation which many speakers have said will not have the endorsement of a majority of the people. In that connection let me call the attention of the House to the stand taken by a distinguished gentleman who has recently been appointed to an important office by the Government of Canada, and who, while a member of the Government of Ontario, pointed out the futility of placing a measure on the statute book unless it had behind it the support of a majority of the people. I refer to Hon. W. J. Hanna, who has recently been appointed food controller of Canada. When introducing legislation in the Legislature of Ontario with reference to local option, he said that no legislation should be placed upon the statute books unless it had the endorsement and support of at least three-fifths of the electors to ensure its enforcement. No one will question the opinion of that distinguished leader of the Conservative party, who has now gone to his reward, the late Sir James Whitney, and he expressed the opinion on many occasions that any Act that was passed by the legislature of the province

should have the endorsement of at least three-fifths of the people if it was to be properly and honestly carried out.

Would Referendum Defeat Conscription?

Now, I come back to the question of conscription. It has been stated in this House that conscription, if submitted to a referendum would be defeated by three to one. Well, if this measure has not at least a majority, how do you expect that it will be properly enforced in the face of such strong opposition unless you give time to conduct a campaign to educate the people to a realization of the necessity of the measure, so that they may be fully acquainted with the facts? A referendum would give an opportunity to every man who was serious in his desire to do his part in this great struggle, to assist in educating the people and show them why this legislation should be passed. It would take no longer to conduct an educational campaign along this line than it would take to hold an election. The Prime Minister said: Pass the Bill, this Bill, then set it aside, form a coalition government and we appeal to the country before putting it into effect. It would take no longer to have a referendum than it would do to carry out the suggestion of the Prime Minister culminating in a general election. It would not only take less time but in the meantime we would be able to take a most important step toward the holding of a referendum. The Prime Minister has promised to bring down a woman suffrage bill. No one denies that he intends to do it. The passing of that measure and the holding of the referendum on conscription would give the women of the country an opportunity of casting their votes upon the most important question that the electors have ever been required to pronounce upon. It would be their duty to give the matter very serious consideration, something that the women of Canada are quite capable of doing. Would it not be a fresh token of respect and regard on the part of this Parliament to give them that privilege, especially when they have rendered such great service in this struggle? They have rendered a greater service possibly than any other class of the people of Canada unless it be the men who are in the trenches. Trust the women and give them an opportunity of voting on this question, and if you do I feel satisfied that the result will be all that we could wish.

Greater Food Production.

We had a campaign carried on during last spring by the Government urging greater food production. That was a campaign that we were all willing to take part in, and in that campaign the statement was made and repeated that increased production was not only urgent but absolutely necessary. Let me draw the attention of the House to the statement of the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) that Canada's need was great in this matter. We have in the Ottawa Citizen the report of a statement made by the Hon. Mr. Balfour at Washington in which he said that what was needed was "food first; military aid later." The article in the Citizen is headed in this way:

Food First, Military Aid Later

Is the Request of the Entente War Commission to the United States Government.

Allies have pooled all food supplies but France and Italy still face acute shortage. Commission may establish board of experts in U. S. to act until end of war.

Then it goes on to state that what the Allies need most is food and not men. Mr. Balfour was only a ship or two ahead of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) in coming from the Old Land, and will any member of this Parliament say that Mr. Balfour was not in touch with the requirements of the Allies to as great an extent as the Prime Minister who came over only a few days later? Then, we have a statement from old

London made by Lord Rhondda, the Food Commissioner on June 19:

Allies rely on Canada and U. S. to supply food We are doing what we can off our own bat by increasing home production and decreasing consumption, but in the main the solution of the primary problem of supplies lies in the hands of our American Allies and Canada. I am sure they will not "let us down."

Shall we accept the leadership of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in this matter or shall we rely upon the words uttered by the Controller of Food in old England and also the statement of Mr. Balfour? We have the Minister of Trade and Commerce saying one thing and we have these British statesmen saying another. Let us give this question serious consideration before we take a rash step for fear it may not be the right one and for fear it may be considered as a reaching for political effect.

Voluntary System has not Failed.

I would point out to the House that under the volun-

tary system this young country has raised as large an army as has ever been produced in the history of the world out of the same population. If this young nation enjoys the credit and distinction of this great achievement, is it not an incentive to us to join together and by a united effort try to get the required number of men without having to apply coercion or compulsion to the young manhood of this country? Let us only say that we will do this and I feel satisfied that Canada will have the proud distinction, a record which will be handed down from generation to generation, of being the only nation that was able to raise a volunteer army of 500,000 men. Let me appeal to the Government, if this campaign is carried on, to establish large military districts throughout Canada. We could carry on a campaign in these military districts for the number of men assigned to each according to population and where these districts give the required number of men it should be understood that the compulsory service measure, even though enacted, will not be applied.

PEEPING THROUGH THE KEYHOLE.



Ben-1917
DAYSFORD

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENT, CONSCRIPTION, REFERENDUM.

Leading Statesmen Express their Views.

The "Conspiracy of Silence" which is evidently in vogue in Canada to prevent the views of those opposed to the Borden Military Service Bill from reaching the public has not been confined to this Country. There is ample evidence that the conspiracy in question extended to the United States, and that the columns of many of the leading newspapers of the neighboring Republic were closed against the publication of any argument advanced by those in favour of a Referendum on the Conscription Bill. A notable exception, however, has been the New York Evening Post. That paper, in order that its readers might have the benefit of the views of the leaders of all shades of public opinion in Canada on the subject of Conscription, sent a special correspondent to Ottawa, who obtained statements from leading members of Parliament and others, and these statements have since appeared in the columns of the New York Evening Post.

Premier Borden and Minister of Justice Doherty opened the discussion, and their contributions were followed by some of the leading Members of the Opposition and other Liberals. Space will not permit the publishing of all of these statements in this issue of the Liberal Monthly. We include four, and others will appear in the August and succeeding issue.

"VOLUNTARY RECRUITING IN CANADA HAS BEEN FAR FROM A FAILURE. IT HAS INDEED BEEN A TREMENDOUS SUCCESS."—The Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, in the New York Evening Post, June 29th, 1917.

"THE PROPOSED MEASURE (CONSCRIPTION) IN NO WAY SPECIALLY AFFECTS THE PEOPLE OF ANY PROVINCE, RACE, CREED OR CLASS."—Hon. C. J. Doherty, Minister of Justice, in the Borden Government.

"THE MILITARY SERVICE BILL NOW UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT MAKES EXPRESS PROVISION AGAINST THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY OF SERVICE AND THE ARGUMENTS PUT FORWARD IN ITS SUPPORT INDICATE THAT IT IS NOT INTENDED TO REINFORCE THE FIRING LINE SO MUCH AS TO REINFORCE THE MUNITION PLANTS OR OTHER ESTABLISHMENTS OPERATING FOR PRIVATE PROFIT." —Hon. Frank Oliver, Member for Edmonton, and ex-Minister of Interior.

"I CANNOT UNDERSTAND THE LIBERALISM OF A MAN WHO SAYS THAT HE BELIEVES CONSCRIPTION WOULD BE DEFEATED IN REFERENDUM BUT WHO STILL INTENDS TO VOTE TO MAKE IT LAW."

"I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT TO DEFEAT PRUSSIANISM, THE BEST WAY IS TO ADOPT IT." —Hon. Sydney Fisher, ex-Minister of Agriculture.

Extract from the statement of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden which appeared in the New York Evening Post on Friday, June 29th, 1917.

"Voluntary recruiting in Canada has been far from a failure. It has indeed been a tremendous success. Every true Canadian reflects with pride on its marvellous achievements. Though many thousand miles from the seat of war, more than 402,000 have enlisted for service and more than 325,000 have gone oversea. Our fighting strength now at the front continues, undiminished in number, unexcelled in equipment, unsurpassed in morale. Glorious deeds of our sons on many a battle field have become the most treasured memory of the

Canadian people.

"Under the unparalleled demand of a war like this, there comes a time in the history of every nation that commences with the voluntary system, when the resources of such a system are exhausted and when a call must be made upon those to whom compulsion alone appeals. This becomes necessary chiefly, it is true, from the standpoint of military requirements, but as well from the standpoint of economic necessities at home. That time has arrived in Canada."

Statement of Hon. C. J. Doherty, Minister of Justice, which appeared in the New York Evening Post on June 29th, 1917.

"The proposed measure in no way specially affects

the people of any province, race, creed, or class.

"It bears equally and evenly on all Canadians in all parts of Canada.

"The only distinction between Canadians made in the bill lies in the order in which different classes of men may be called out; the classes, however, are differentiated only by the ages, and by the status as being married or unmarried, of the men composing them.

"Neither is the measure inspired by punitive intent. The sole purpose of its principal provisions, it is quite correct to say, is, while securing the soldiers essential to the reinforcing of the existing divisions in the field, to avoid the impairment of the agricultural and industrial development of Canada.

"Nor will its application produce any punitive effect. Its provisions for adjudication as to claims for exemption put that adjudication in the hands of local tribunals in each province. The method of appointment of these tribunals is such as to secure to the individual an absolutely fair court, familiar with his surroundings, and appreciative of his viewpoint."

Hon. Frank Oliver, Member for Edmonton and ex-Minister of the Interior, in the *Post* on June 30th, 1917.

"I have always taken the position that universal compulsory service is the only logical service under such conditions as prevail in the world at the present time, and that it is the only logical and efficient method of bringing to bear the full strength of the country, provided there is equality in the distribution of the burden, an equality that does not exist in the case of voluntary service.

"While such has been, and still is, my view, I am opposed to the Military Service bill now before Parliament. The present Parliament holds no authority from the people to introduce or pass such a measure as the one proposed by the Government. It was elected in September, 1911, for a period of five years. To-day it exists by reason of the fact that it has chosen to extend its own life, without consulting the people.

"A brief analysis of the present composition of the House of Commons will make plain how unrepresentative this Parliament is. In the present House of 221 members, there are 9 seats vacant by death, 11 by resignation, 2 double seats (that is, 2 members each sit for 2 seats), 5 unavoidably absent, 26 under military orders and pay, 20 elected to oppose military service for the Empire, 2 are under-secretaries, with pay, and 2 occupy special positions, without pay, but with allowances. That makes a total of 79 seats which are either vacant, or the representatives of which are not in the position of an absolutely independent Member of Parliament.

"Under our last redistribution act there would be in the House of Commons after a general election 235 seats. Of these, as I have just shown, 79 are either vacant or are represented by members who are not independent; 22 are under-represented, and 8 are over-represented, making a total of 109 seats, or nearly one-half, not represented as they ought to be. It is this Parliament which proposes to put through a Conscription Bill compelling 100,000 of our men to give military service at the front, under the plea and pretence that the loyalty and military enthusiasm of our people have failed us in this time of stress. Against such pretence I have voiced my protest, and have seconded the amendment proposed by my leader, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, calling for a referendum, so that the voice of the people may be heard.

"If I believed that the Borden Military Service bill was framed for, or intended for, the purpose of reinforcing the Canadian lines in France by imposing equal obligations of military service, I would support it, if Parliament had a mandate to pass it.

"I do not read in its terms, nor do I conclude from the record of the Government, that in introducing it this is its purpose. If the purpose of the bill were to equalize the burden of necessary military service upon all sections of the country, and all citizens in those sections, it would say so. This was the fundamental principle of the Ca-

nada Militia act, and it is the foundation principle of the Conscription bill of the United States.

"The Military Service bill now under consideration by the Canadian Parliament MAKES EXPRESS PROVISIONS AGAINST THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUALITY OF SERVICE, and the arguments put forward in its support indicate that it is not intended to reinforce the firing line so much as to reinforce the munition plants or other establishments operating for private profit.

"I am for the conscription of man power for military service on fair terms; I am against the conscription of man power for industrial service for private profit, which is, as I understand it, the principal purpose of the Military Service Bill introduced by Premier Borden."

Hon. Sydney Fisher, ex-Minister of Agriculture, in the *Post* on June 30th, 1917.

"Speaking as an old Liberal with radical proclivities, I wish to say that the situation is very complicated and deplorable. There is, however, one clear line which men of my views can take, and only one line, and that is to uphold our Liberal principles.

"The first of these is that authority and government and power come only from the people and that the will of the majority of the people is paramount. In Canada to-day the Parliament is not representative of the will of the people. IT WAS ELECTED SIX YEARS AGO ON OLD ISSUES WHICH HAVE NOTHING WHATEVER TO DO WITH THE PRESENT SITUATION. Even in that Parliament there are twenty-one vacant seats out of the 221. There have been no by-elections since the war began in which the questions now at issue have in any way been pronounced upon.

"Under these circumstances a proposal has been made of the most radical character to introduce conscription after abundant assurance from the Government and leading men in the country that conscription would not be resorted to. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has proposed that this question should be referred to the people by means of a referendum thus eliminating from the issue the party questions and any personality of leaders. A number of Liberals seem to have been stampeded. I do not wish to go beneath the surface as to their motives but I cannot understand the Liberalism of a man WHO SAYS THAT HE BELIEVES CONSCRIPTION WOULD BE DEFEATED IN REFERENDUM, BUT WHO STILL INTENDS TO VOTE TO MAKE IT LAW. This is contrary to my fundamental belief in Liberalism, and in representative institutions. I do not mean to say that members of the Liberal party who are going to vote against the referendum will necessarily be defeated in their respective seats, but I do say emphatically that in the Province of Ontario the feeling that is against conscription is not represented in the House and has no means of making itself felt or of voicing its opinion and this opinion is widespread. Great newspapers in a centre like Toronto are in favor of conscription and are going so far as to largely ignore any arguments against it. I have means of coming into fairly good touch with a large part of rural Ontario and I have no hesitation in saying that a large proportion, if not a majority, of the rural electorate is against conscription. They do not hesitate to say that they are short of labor to work their farms; that they are being appealed to and urged to produce more food, and that if conscription applies to rural labor and farmers that not only can not increase their food production, but cannot even maintain it, and that the harvest this year will be seriously interfered with if conscription is enforced. I will not say anything about the opposition to conscription from the laboring classes and the labor unions. They can be voiced much better by somebody else.

"As regards the situation in Quebec, I live in an English speaking rural community with a certain French population mixed with the English and Protestant, I find there that the great majority of the English-speaking Protestant farming population is against conscription. Voting upon it in a referendum they would be almost unanimous. If the vote comes in a party election

a considerable number of the Tories would vote for the Government candidate and support conscription for party reasons, though I have come into contact with a large number who have always voted Conservative who declare they will not do so to support the present Government. This is not entirely due to conscription, but has been growing for the last two years as a protest against what they consider the inefficiency and mismanagement of the whole nation's affairs by the Government and as a protest against the presence in that Government of Mr. Rogers and some others.

"In the city of Montreal there are a few Liberals who have been carried away by the disgust they feel at what are called "the slackers" and a large number who have their sons, brothers, husbands, and fathers at the front who are influenced by Sir Robert Borden's appeal to help these. The English population in Montreal is largely Protectionist and largely belongs to what are here called "the interests," and some Liberals among these who heretofore stood out against Tory influence are weakened in the present situation; but the bulk of the English Protestant Liberal feeling in Montreal is strongly in favor of the referendum as truly Liberal.

"I want to say that while much is made of the opposition of the French to conscription it is not by any means only the French of Canada, who are against conscription. One of the great misfortunes of the present situation is the effort on the part of the Government and certain

leaders of public thought to divide the country on this question on racial lines. This is not the real division. It is true that nine-tenths of the French are against conscription without the people being consulted but I have yet to find one who will not bow to the will of the majority of the people as declared at the polls. If the present moribund Parliament passes a conscription law and the Government attempts to put it into force as prescribed by the present bill there will be strong resistance on the part of many French Canadians, possibly going so far in a few instances as rioting, but I am satisfied that even with this improper imposition of this new law there will be nothing that could be fairly called rebellion or civil strife. It does indeed seem a pity that these difficulties cannot be avoided, an opportunity being given to the people to vote. Personally I believe that a vote will defeat conscription. I do not deplore that because I am sure that then a greater assistance to the boys at the front will be brought about than can possibly be brought about in the way proposed to-day before Parliament. I HAVE YET TO FIND THE LIBERAL WHO IS NOT JUST AS EARNEST IN REGARD TO THE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR, AS DESIROUS OF GIVING ALL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT TO THE CANADIAN BATTLE LINE AS ANY ULTRA-TORY CONSCRIPTIONIST, BUT THEY DO NOT BELIEVE THAT TO DEFEAT PRUSSIANISM, THE BEST WAY IS TO ADOPT IT."

CONSCRIPTION OF MANHOOD AND WEALTH.

WE reproduce herewith two editorials which have appeared in recent issues of the Grain Growers' Guide of Winnipeg, Manitoba. The Grain Growers' Guide is controlled by the organized farmers of Western Canada and is an entirely independent paper. No publication in Western Canada better voices the sentiments of the farmers of Western Canada than the Grain Growers' Guide.

The editorials in question are as follows:

Distribute the Sacrifice.

Since Premier Borden announced the intention of the government to introduce conscription it has been the chief subject of debate throughout Canada. It is usually accepted as a practical fact that in a time of national crisis the state is entitled to mobilize its entire resources for national defence. It is also freely declared by public men the world over that every citizen should be compelled to bear his or her full share of the national burden, and with this conclusion most people will agree. But even if these two principles are admitted, it does not even yet furnish an argument in support of conscription of men in Canada to-day. Practically 400,000 young men have voluntarily enlisted and have won undying honor by their great achievements on the field of battle. The government has concluded that voluntary enlistment has reached its limit and compulsion must be established. But before tearing 100,000 young men from their homes and forcing them to sacrifice their lives for the rest of the people, the responsibility of such an action should be carefully weighed. Men are only one factor in determining the result of the war. Money is the other chief factor, for with it can be supplied food and munitions. Has the government of Canada done its duty in distributing the burden upon those who remain at home? We believe not.

It is easy to understand that Premier Borden and other members of the government who have visited the firing line in France, and been eye witnesses of the heroic deeds and sacrifices of our soldiers, have come home with the one idea of sending across more soldiers. But we do not believe that either Premier Borden or the other members of his government have fully realized the grave responsibility they accept in actually compelling young men to enter the army. Has Premier Borden and the other members of the government made any sacrifice in the slightest way approaching the sacrifice

they are demanding of 100,000 young men? Premier Borden is reputed to be a millionaire and has no children. The Hon. Robert Rogers, Sir Edward Kemp and Sir Thomas White are reputed to be wealthy men and there are a number of very wealthy men in the government party. These men live in luxury to-day and we will venture that not one of them has made a sacrifice that is really serious. None of them would be expected to join the army. They are needed to conduct the affairs of the country. But let them give up their wealth when they ask other men to give up their lives. Let this national burden be adjusted in some measure on an equitable basis.

The soldiers who have already gone to the front have left their families at home. Since the war began the government has raised the tariff tax on practically all of the necessities of life. The families of these soldiers are being taxed to pay for the war while their husbands and sons are giving their lives on the battlefield. But those soldiers who return will still be taxed to pay for the cost of the war, towards which they have already done more than their share. Any man who fights for his country on the battlefields of France and Belgium should, if he returns, be exempted from the payment of all taxes incurred by the war. And while he is fighting, his family should enjoy the same immunity, but this is impossible under our Canadian taxing system.

In demanding conscription the government is forcing a select few to make the sublime national sacrifice, while hundreds of thousands of others in Canada are actually making profit out of the war. Practically all the money for the war is being borrowed and the burden of repayment is being shouldered on to the future. Before demanding conscription the government should tax every person in Canada to the full limit of his ability to pay, and should conscript the wealth of those who have it before conscripting human lives.

Another factor which is overlooked is that conscription is forcing young men into moral dangers, the horrors of which cannot be imagined. Statements in the British House of Commons show that our soldiers in training camps in England are surrounded by temptation which has absolutely ruined thousands of men. They will never see the firing line, yet they will come back to Canada in a far worse condition than many of those who have been wounded. This responsibility rests largely upon British authorities, and it is gratifying to know that Premier Borden has reprimanded the British authorities for their laxness in this respect.

We have in Canada a large number of people whose

sympathies are with the enemy, who contribute nothing to our patriotic funds and are paying no taxation whatever except by the tariff. They are growing comparatively wealthy and the government is doing nothing to make them pay their share fair of the burden. The idle land all over Canada held by the speculator is paying not one red cent towards the cost of the war. Yet when the war is over and the immigration comes that many people expect, these speculators, many of whom are foreigners, will pocket their profits at the expense of the people of Canada. Here is an opportunity for taxation that the government is overlooking.

While the record of the government is such that they are not justified in conscripting the bodies and practically the lives of 100,000 young men, we do not believe that the situation would have been greatly, if any, improved by changing the government. The whole Canadian viewpoint seems to be wrong. Human life is held very lightly, while wealth is sacred. Our governments have always placed money on a higher plane than human life. They will lightly step in and demand a huge sacrifice of life before they will demand even a moderate sacrifice of wealth. The present government does not represent the people of Canada. It was elected to power six years ago, and if an election were held tomorrow it would undoubtedly be over-whelmingly defeated; but such a defeat would be a catastrophe at the present time. The government ought to be big enough to take in members of the opposition and some men outside of parliament, to constitute a real representative government. We should have a national government in a national crisis, and before conscription goes into effect the people of Canada should have a voice in it through a referendum, as they did in Australia.

Another editorial on conscription appeared in the Grain Growers' Guide of Wednesday, June 27th, 1917, and is as follows:—

The Conscription Question.

Canada entered the war of her own free will and accord as an ally of Great Britain and the other enemies of Germany. The crisis which now faces the Allies is as much a Canadian crisis as it is British, French or Russian. In the face of this crisis, which is national and vitally affects every citizen of our country, the government is fully justified in demanding that all the resources of our nation, the men, the money, the food, and everything else be utilized in the prosecution of the war. In such a crisis, the conscription of money and the conscription of wealth in all forms is not out of harmony with the true principles of democracy. It is the same principle that has been adopted in Great Britain, in New Zealand and the United States, three democratic countries. But it should not be overlooked that in all these three countries mentioned, the governments conscripted the wealth of the country, either before or at the same time that they conscripted the man power. In England the taxation is enormous. No one is exempt. The wealthy are being compelled to pour out their wealth for the nation's defence. The same is true in New Zealand, and the taxation proposals before the American Congress will make it true in that country also. If men were the only requirement in the prosecution of the war, there would be some justification in conscripting men alone, but the men to fight are of no use unless they are provided with munitions and food which can only be supplied by the payment of money. Money, therefore, is just as essential as men and this has been recognized by all the other English speaking countries. Great Britain is paying a larger portion of the war expense as she goes than any other nation now in the war and the United States proposes to pay half the expense as the war progresses. In Canada, we are paying about ten per cent. of the cost and loading up the rest of the debt for the future, while millionaires are blossoming like mushrooms all over the land, fattening on the war.

It would have been easily possible to secure 500,000 soldiers in Canada by voluntary enlistment if our government had exercised even decent judgment. But conditions in Winnipeg, with the patronage and the scandals,

have been such as to discourage voluntary enlistment. And it is reported that conditions in other centres are fully as bad or even worse. Even yet under proper conditions voluntary enlistment would produce a large number of recruits.

Many of those who are demanding conscription of men, including a number of the cabinet ministers at Ottawa and private members of the House, are millionaires. They will do no fighting and many of them have increased their wealth very considerably since the war began. These men should be forced to pay and pay handsomely towards the cost of the war. It would be impossible to compel them to make any sacrifice that would be at all equal to the sacrifice of men who are going to the front.

In the fight over the conscription bill at Ottawa at present, neither party officially proposes anything approaching the conscription of wealth. They are debating the conscription of man power. It is impossible to understand how our representatives in the House of Commons can be so long silent on the wealth question. All around them they see men who possess their millions and live in luxury. These representatives all declare that our war is a war for democracy. If democracy means anything, it means equality of opportunity. There is no equality in demanding that young men give up their lives for the defence of the nation while the older men who cannot fight are allowed to plunder their country in its hour of agony.

It will be noted in the above editorial that the Grain Growers' Guide states:

"Neither party officially proposes anything approaching conscription of wealth."

We would respectfully direct the attention of the Grain Growers' Guide and also the electorate of Canada to the proposed motion of the Hon. Geo. P. Graham in regard to conscription of wealth, of which notice was given on the evening of June 13th, 1917, in the following language:

"Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM: I wish to notify the Government that at an appropriate time I will move the following or a similar resolution:

"That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that "steps should be taken forthwith by the Government to "provide that accumulated wealth should contribute "immediately and effectively to the cost of the war, "and that all agricultural, industrial, transportation "and natural resources of Canada should be organized "forthwith so as to ensure the greatest possible assistance to the Empire in the war and to reduce the cost "of living to the Canadian people."

(See Hansard p. 2417.)

TIMES HAVE CHANGED.

THE first official act of the Hon. W. J. Hanna as Food Controller for Canada was to go to the United States and consult the authorities at Washington. What a change from 1911 when Mr. Hanna was leading a band of orators to the tune of "No Truck or Trade with the Yankees". Now, there are not enough brains in Canada to take one step in the direction of controlling the price of food, without first consulting the Washington authorities?

DID "BOB" SUGGEST IT?

SIR Robert Borden has told the House on more than one occasion that the British authorities did not suggest conscription when on his recent visit to England.

The Premier however has not said that the Honourable "Bob" did not whisper it to him on the boat on his way home? Recruiting stopped in 1916 yet it took just 12 months for the government to act.

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
 S. 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 Exchequer 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.
 Geo. 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.

MONEY LOANS IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

WE reproduce herewith a letter which appeared in the Ottawa Morning Citizen of June 6th, 1917, comparing the method of Sir Thos. White in raising loans with that of the United States Government. The letter is as follows:

Patriotism and Economy.

Editor, Citizen:—When in United States a few weeks ago I noticed with pleasure the great interest the public was taking in the "Liberty Loan" and asked why this was and was told that was the American way of showing their patriotism. 'We have four days to sell our \$2,000,000,000.00 worth of 3½ per cent. Liberty

Bonds at par and we must hustle to do it," I was told; and they did it as the results show.

We are hearing a great amount of talk here from our leading politicians about patriotism and economy and my experience there has caused me to make a comparison of the results here with this Liberty Loan and if our political leaders were sincere and would put these virtues into practice their advice would ring more truly and the following comparison would be more favorable to Canada.

We are told that our country offers us the best security for the investment of our surplus cash and apparently our finance minister is anxious to see that those who have any will be

firm friends of his, or he would never have had such a report to make on the war loans as that made in the house of commons a few days ago as follows:

(Special to the Star from our own Correspondent.)

Ottawa, June 29.—The cost of floating the war loans in Canada, and the amount received in connection with them, are detailed in a statement by the minister of finance produced at the request of E. B. Devlin, M.P.

There have been three bond issues as war loans. The five per cent. 1915-1925 war loan, \$100,000,000 at 97½; five per cent. 1916-31 war loan, \$100,000,000 at 97½, and the five per cent. 1917-37 war loan, \$150,000,000 at 96.

The actual amounts received by the government were: From the first loan, \$97,003,600.27; from the second, \$97,789,580.17, and from the third to date \$139,832,508.04 (incomplete).

The amount paid for clerical assistance in placing the loans was \$60,876.98, and for advertising \$110,027.72.

For selling the bonds of the first two loans, brokers get a commission of one-quarter of one per cent. and for the last loan three-eighths of one per cent. On the first loan the banks received a commission of one-quarter of one percent.; on the second one-half of one per cent. and on the third nine-twentieths of one per cent.

The banks agreed, in consideration of these commissions, to take subscriptions and receive payments, deliver provisional receipts, interim certificates and bonds keep necessary accounts and cash coupons of issues free of exchange. They also agreed, if necessary, to take \$50,000,000 of the second loan, and \$60,000,000 of the third loan.

From this it will be seen that Canada as a result of the clever financing of our hon. minister received \$334,625,688.14 and for same will have to pay:

1st loan.....	\$100,000,000.00
Interest at 5% for 10 years.....	50,000,000.00
2nd loan.....	100,000,000.00
Interest at 5% for 15 years.....	75,000,000.00
3rd loan.....	150,000,000.00
Interest at 5% for 20 years.....	150,000,000.00

Total— \$625,000,000.00

Thus we have to pay \$290,374,311.52 for the use of \$334,625,688.14.

We are all patriotic enough to believe that Canada is in no way inferior to the United States and yet when they want money for war purposes they get it by selling 3½ per cent Liberty Loan bonds at par and in such a way that every \$100.00 bond nets the state \$100.00 in cash as is shown by the letter I received, a copy of which is as follows:

Treasury Department, Washington, June 26, 1917.

Dear Mr. Travers:—By direction of the secretary and in reply to your letter of the 18th inst. addressed to the secretary of state and by him referred to this department, you are advised that no fees or commissions of any sort were allowed or paid any one on account of subscriptions to the LIBERTY LOAN.

The Act of April 24, 1917, under which the Liberty Loan was issued specifically prohibits any commissions. Advertising and the services of the banks were wholly voluntary and extended to the government as a patriotic service.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR T. CROSBY,

Assistant Secretary.

Mr. F. J. Travers, Travers and Co.
347 Sparks Street, Ottawa.

It will be seen then that corresponding amounts obtained by the United States cost

Fresh — Fragrant and Delicious

'SALADA'

is laden with the invigorating and refreshing qualities that are only to be found in perfect tea, fresh from the mountain gardens of Ceylon.

them as follows:

10 year loan.....	\$100,000,000.00
3½% for 10 years.....	35,000,000.00
15 year loan.....	100,000,000.00
3½% for 15 years.....	52,500,000.00
20 year loan.....	150,000,000.00
3½% for 20 years.....	105,000,000.00

Total— \$542,500,000.00

Total amount of loan..... \$350,000,000.00

Cost of loan..... \$192,500,000.00

Thus it will be seen that Canada paid \$290,374,311.52 for the use of \$334,625,688.14 while the United States pay \$192,500,000.00 for the use of \$350,000,000.00 for the same period

This looks like economy in high places or is it an effort on the part of the finance minister to look after his friends? However that may be, the result is, that Canada, while her politicians are talking economy and patriotism has been loaded with an unnecessary debt of nearly \$100,000,000.00 more than United States are paying for the same service.

A little less of such patriotism and economy and more practice of real economy and business talents will be more acceptable to this already heavily burdened country.—F. J. Travers.

With the appointment of an ex-Conservative member of Parliament, Mr. C. A. Magrath, as Fuel Controller, an ex-Conservative Cabinet Minister, Hon. W. J. Hanna, as Food Controller, and a son of Sir John Willison, one of the strongest Tories in Toronto, as Chief Executive Officer of the Food Controller, the Borden Government are dealing with the Food and Fuel questions in such a manner as to at least inspire the confidence of their party friends.

