OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SEVENTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

7-8 GEORGE V, 1917

IN SIX VOLUMES

Vol. I—Pages	. .	1-1124	Vol. IV—Pages	. .	3187-4242
II "	. .	1125-2138	V "	. .	4243-5270
III "	. .	2139-3186	VI "	. .	5271-6094

VOLUME CXXVIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE TWENTIETH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1917, INCLUSIVE.



OTTAWA
J. DE LABROQUERIE TACHÉ
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1918

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Friday, June 8, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 70, for the relief of Colin Darrach Poole.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill No. 71, for the relief of Thomas Edwin Jory.—Mr. Nickle.

Bill No. 72, for the relief of Florence Evaline Snyder Lockwood.—Mr. Kay.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 47, to facilitate certain financial arrangements between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.—Sir Thomas White.

Bill No. 57, to amend The Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916.—Sir Thomas White.

Bill No. 69, to repeal the Ocean Telegraph Act.—Mr. Hazen.

Bill No. 67, to amend the Customs Act.—Mr. Reid.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION BILL.

On motion of Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 42, to amend the Chinese Immigration Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Blain in the Chair.

On Section 1, Clergymen and students to be exempt from tax.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the Minister of the Interior received from the government of the province of British Columbia protest against this Bill?

Mr. ROCHE: No, there have been no protests.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There has been no correspondence?

Mr. ROCHE: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. MACDONALD: Can the minister tell us the language of the original statute in reference to this matter?

Mr. ROCHE: I have not the statute before me.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has the minister received from the coal mine proprietors of British Columbia, or any other employers of labour in British Columbia, any request for permission to bring in oriental labour?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, there have been several requests made on behalf of certain employers of labour, in British Columbia, in the central provinces, and I think in the eastern provinces, asking that Chinese labour should be brought in, but the Government has not seen its way clear to adopt a policy of that kind under existing circumstances.

Mr. MACDONALD: What do these people say?

Mr. ROCHE: Some of the requests were to the effect that we should bring them in practically under an arrangement by which a guarantee was to be given that after the war was over they should be returned to their own country, but we did not think it was wise at the present time to adopt such a policy.

Mr. MACDONALD: Have there been many requests of that nature?

Mr. ROCHE: Not very many, possibly four or five, and certainly not in excess of half a dozen.

Mr. PUGSLEY: By whom were these requests made, and for what purpose?

Mr. ROCHE: There may have been some request made from the miners, I am not certain as to that. There was a deputation here about a week ago, consisting of members of the Board of Trade of Vancouver, who made a suggestion of that nature. Then one or two parties sent communications to the department; I cannot recollect their names, but I think some of this correspondence emanated from those who are not employers of labour, and not particularly interested, but making a suggestion

17733

that it would be wise to adopt such a policy in view of the scarcity of labour.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister tell us the provisions of the present legislation, and what changes are made by this measure? I understood students were admitted free heretofore?

Mr. ROCHE: No. I explained the matter when the Bill was read the first time. At present students are admitted into Canada by paying a head tax of $500, but upon producing proof of having attended an educational institute recognized in Canada, they are refunded the head tax when leaving the country.

Considerable objection to the payment of the head tax has been made on behalf of Chinese students entering Canada. Chinese students are allowed free entry into the United States for the purpose of attending educational institutions. Many of these students, having had the benefit of the educational institutions of the United States, become missioneries for that country in the commercial world. At the earnest request made by quite a number of persons in Canada during the last few years, we have decided to include Chinese students in the class exempted from the head tax. In the existing Act, clergymen are not specifically included in the class exempted; this, I believe, was an oversight, because clergymen's families have been admitted free of head tax. We are now, therefore, specifically mentioning clergymen, as well as students, as exempt. Our practice in the past has been to collect a head tax upon the entry of Chinese students into Canada, the amount of the tax being refunded upon the production of satisfactory evidence of attendance at Canadian educational institutions.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the department now admit the sons of resident Chinese without the payment of head tax?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: I understand that sons of Chinese restaurant keepers have to pay the head tax, while sons of Chinese merchants are admitted free.

Mr. ROCHE: If they come in for any purpose other than that of attending educational institutions, the head tax is imposed.

Mr. KNOWLES: I believe that a distinction is drawn between the sons of restaurant keepers and the sons of merchants.

Mr. ROCHE: The Act provides:

[Mr. Roche.]

Every person of Chinese origin, irrespective of allegiance, shall pay into the consolidated revenue fund of Canada, on entering Canada, at the port or place of entry, a tax of five hundred dollars, except the following persons, who shall be exempt from such payment, that is to say:

(a) The members of the diplomatic corps, or other government representatives, their suites and their servants, and consuls and consular agents;

(b) The children born in Canada of parents of Chinese origin and who have left Canada for educational or other purposes, on substantiating their identity to the satisfaction of the controller at the port or place where they seek to enter on their return;

(c) Merchants, their wives and children, the wives and children of clergymen—

It will be observed that the Act does not mention clergymen, and that is why I am making provision for that in the present Act. The section continues:

—tourists, men of science and students, who shall substantiate their status to the satisfaction of the controller, subject to the approval of the minister, or who are bearers of certificates of identity, or other similar documents issued by the Government or by a recognized official or representative of the Government whose subjects they are, specifying their occupation and their object in coming into Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the provisions relating to clergymen include those Chinese clergymen who teach the religion of Confucius?

Mr. ROCHE: I am not confident as to that. I should think that it includes all recognized clergymen.

Mr. OLIVER: The purpose of the existing Act is to keep out of Canada people of Chinese origin. I have not heard the minister give any good reason why the proposed amendment with regard to Chinese students should be made. Such a suggestion was made when the original Bill was before the House, but it was then considered, in view of the difficulty which would probably arise in enforcing the Act according to its intent, that it was better not to leave such a loophole. Accordingly it was provided that Chinese persons who desired to avail themselves of the advantages of education in Canada should comply with the law respecting the admission of Chinese, and that, upon satisfactory proof of their having availed themselves of those advantages, their money would be returned. While under present circumstances this question is not as pressing as it was when the original Act was passed, I submit that this is not the time to make alterations in the letter, spirit or principle of the Act without good and sufficient cause, which, I submit, in this case has not been shown. As

to the admission of clergymen, the member for Rouville asked a simple and appropriate question which the minister was not in a position to answer. I submit that the minister should not bring forward legislation in regard to which he is not able to give clear and direct information, especially in a matter so important as this.

Mr. ROCHE: I understand that all clergymen are admitted under the existing Act.

Mr. OLIVER: The question was asked if the priests of the sect of Confucius would, under this provision, be admitted into Canada without the payment of head tax.

Mr. ROCHE: That particular point has not been brought to my attention. I assume that the word "clergyman" covers all clergymen.

Mr. OLIVER: Then the committee is to understand that priests of the sect of Confucius are entitled to free entry into Canada?

Mr. ROCHE: I have no information to the contrary.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister should not bring forward this Bill unless he is in a position to answer a very obvious question which has an important bearing upon the sufficiency and efficiency of the proposed legislation.

Mr. ROCHE: I am not sure that the matter is of such vital importance, but if the hon. member considers that the passage of the whole Bill depends upon that point, I am quite willing to allow the Bill to stand until we get the information. I can supply the information before the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is not a question as to the passing of the Bill: we are in committee now, and this is the time for the furnishing of such details. A great deal depends on what proportion of the Chinese population comes under the heading of priests. For all we know, half the laundrymen and cooks in China may be priests. It is important that we know, therefore, what is the numerical extent of this class of the Chinese people to whom we are opening our doors without requiring from them the payment of head tax. The words "Confucian clergyman" should be defined before we say that every person of that class should be admitted free.

Mr. ROCHE: Under the existing Act the families of clergymen are admitted and in practice clergymen have been admitted, but owing to the fact, as I have pointed out, that in the exempting clause the word "clergymen" is not used, but only the words "clergyman's family," it has been decided to insert the word "clergyman" so that there will be no danger of any broader meaning being attached to the term than there is in practice under the existing Act. That point, therefore, need not delay the passage of this Bill through the committee stage.

Mr. KNOWLES: So far as we know, Chinese clergymen may indulge in celibacy just as the Roman Catholic priests, and it might be better to have some further information with regard to these gentlemen.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the minister is wrong in saying that this will not give a wider opportunity of admitting Chinamen. At the present time, if a clergyman comes into Canada, he pays the head tax of $500, but after he is here, his family can be admitted free. It is now proposed to broaden this provision so as to allow the clergymen to come in free. That is quite a serious departure from the provisions of the present Bill.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Is my hon. friend afraid of being proselytized by these clergymen?

Mr. PUGSLEY: For many years, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been persistent in the laudable effort of sending missionaries to China. Now I suppose he is anxious to bring Chinese missionaries to Canada. Is that the reason for this change? I think some stronger reason should be given than has yet been given by the minister for making this change as to:

> Students coming to Canada for the purpose of securing a higher education in any Canadian college or university or other educational institution approved by the minister.

Is that not going to create a good deal of trouble and dissatisfaction? When do students cease to be exempt? Is it when they attend common schools? Supposing a student absents himself from school or college in order to engage in mercantile work, saying, that when he gets a little older and makes some money he will return to college will he cease to be exempt? Many hardship might arise. Just at the present moment I am not prepared to say whether it is desirable to admit students without the payment of head tax. The present law is good; the payment of the

head tax is exacted, but after a student has engaged in his studies and has received proper certificates, that head tax is refunded, I suppose, when he is prepared to return to China. The idea is to admit students for the purpose of receiving a higher education; they are not to settle in this country, but are to return to China. I am afraid there would be a good deal of trouble working out paragraph 7 in reference to students.

Mr. ROCHE: In the working out of this legislation, I do not think there will be any more trouble than in working out the existing Act. We are simply allowing the students who come in under the existing Act to come in without paying the head tax. We are not broadening the meaning attached to the word "student." The interpretation placed upon that word will be exactly the interpretation placed upon it in the operation of the existing Act. One reason why I thought it was right to introduce this change was because of the large number of requests I have been receiving for several years past to have students admitted free. Those requests have come from members of the hon. gentleman's party as well as from hon. members on this side; they have come from leagues that have been established in Canada, and I have received requests and petitions from different public bodies in Canada. At the present time I do not remember a single protest from any public body or any private individual that we should not enact such a law, and I think I can call to my aid the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who, at an earlier part of the session, strongly urged some action of this nature to be taken, and I assured him that it was my intention to introduce legislation of this character. He instanced the case of a Chinese student who had to pay a head tax, and I told him that in order to correct such instances in the future, it was my intention to bring in legislation at this session. Although this Bill has been on the Order Paper for quite a long time, no protests have been made against it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Under paragraph 7 when would a student, or a person coming to Canada for the purpose of being a student, be liable to paying the head tax, and under what circumstances? This paragraph does not say that he shall actually continue in seeking an education. It says:

> Students coming to Canada for the purpose of securing a higher education.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

A student might come to Canada intending to enter college two or three years after his arrival. There is no provision that he must actually begin his studies within a reasonable time.

Mr. ROCHE: The situation in that respect is exactly as it is at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The difference is this, that at present he pays his head tax at the start, and after that he must have pursued his studies regularly in order to obtain a refund. Under this legislation, you let him into the country free, and the question is: How are you going to get him out again, or how are you going to make him pay the head tax if he ceases to be a student? You exempt him if he comes into Canada for the purpose of securing a higher education.

Mr. ROCHE: If the hon. gentleman will read section 2, subsection 7 (a), he will see that the person ceasing to belong to one of the exempt classes is liable to the head tax. The subsection reads:

> Any person admitted as exempt from the tax and who ceases to belong to one of the exempt classes shall be required to pay into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada the tax of $500.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A young man would not cease to be exempt as long as he had the intention of becoming a student.

Mr. ROCHE: If he goes into a trade or occupation, a person engaging in which is liable to the imposition of the head tax, then he becomes liable to that head tax, and under subsection 7 (a):

> If the person refuses or fails to pay the tax, he shall be deported, at his own expense if able to pay, and if not, at the expense of His Majesty.

Therefore, any of these men coming in under the existing Act for the purpose of attending an educational institution of Canada that is recognized by the department shall not be called upon to pay the head tax. In that respect he is in exactly the same position as he is in under the present Act, with the exception of paying the head tax, and should he cease to be in one of the exempt classes, for instance, should he engage in laundry business, or anything of that nature, he would become liable to the head tax.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is there any machinery for keeping track of these Chinese students?

Mr. ROCHE: There is no trouble in keeping track of them. We have our immigration officials.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister is optimistic.

Mr. MARCIL: Are these people required to report to the department as to their residence and the institutions they attend?

Mr. ROCHE: Certainly.

Mr. MARCIL: Do they report to the department periodically?

Mr. ROCHE: We have a record of what institutions they attend.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister mentioned my having brought up a matter with regard to this legislation at an earlier stage in the session. The minister will recall the case that I brought to his attention at that time, namely the case of a young man who was the son of Mr. Corsbie, who had originally been born in China, but who had been educated in Canada and had gone to Trinidad. This gentleman was a British subject; his son had come to Canada for the purpose of getting an education, and his case was not that of a Chinese person in the sense in which the term is used in this legislation. When this Bill came up a few minutes ago I asked the minister if he had the statute before him, so that we might know exactly what was the legislation on this subject. Confusion and difficulty arose in the case of this young man, who was a British subject, and the circumstances of his treatment were unfortunate. Complaint was made by many clergymen interested in the matter, and the case attracted special attention by reason of the fact that the father of the young man was a commissioner to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. I mentioned at the time that it would be well for the Government to deal with this question. I would like to know what the minister says on the point raised by the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. ROCHE: The case to which the hon. member refers was that of a young man who was subject to the head tax under the statute which I read a few moments ago. The statute applies to "every person of Chinese origin," and as this young man was of Chinese origin he was properly subjected to the head tax.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As I recollect the case, while the young man had been a resident of China he was a native of Trinidad and a British subject, both his father and mother being British subjects, but it happened that his grandfather on one side, was a Chinaman. For this reason the absurd contention was made by the department that he was "of Chinese origin." It would be as reasonable to say that a Canadian one of whose grandfathers was born in Ireland was of Irish origin.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What is the meaning of "origin"?

Mr. PUGSLEY: It depends on how far you go back.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Would it be the same as "descent"?

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, clearly not. This young man was a British subject and born in a British country, and therefore was of British origin. If the boy's father and mother had been Chinese it might be said that he was of Chinese origin. But this section does not profess to deal with the special case of one who may have had a Chinese ancestor, yet it opens the door wide to young men from China to come into Canada without paying the head tax by saying that they are coming to this country for the purpose of securing a higher education. Under any fair or reasonable interpretation of this section, a boy from China coming to Canada, attending a common school and then afterwards getting employment on a farm or in a shop in order to earn money to put him through college would be complying with this law. He would have the intention of entering a university—he comes to Canada "for the purpose of securing a higher education." There may be great trouble and dissatisfaction unless you surround this provision with safeguards. The person concerned should satisfy some official as to his position, or otherwise we may have a great deal of trouble. I think it better, on the whole, to leave the section as it is.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. gentleman seems to be conjuring up imaginary difficulties that, up to the present, have not been met with. The existing Act has no safeguard as to the time within which one affected by this section shall attend college. The only safeguard is the head tax of $500. Under the operation of the Act, the party concerned would be expected to enter college within a reasonable time—almost immediately upon coming to Canada; otherwise, he would not be allowed to remain in Canada unless by payment of the head tax. The effect of this change is only to

waive the head tax under certain conditions, and I do not anticipate any trouble.

Mr. KNOWLES: The difference between the existing condition of affairs and what the minister proposes is so great that it looks as if he were opening the gates very wide. He says that at present there is no safeguard other than that which will exist in the future. There is the safeguard of the $400 having been deposited. At present, the onus of proof is on the alleged student, but under the change proposed by the minister the department will have to make the case against the man who enters with an expectation which he does not fulfill. This affects more particularly the province of British Columbia. I see in his place an hon. member who has made rather a specialty of "A White British Columbia." I would ask my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) whether this legislation is such as will be considered desirable by those who wish to perpetuate a white British Columbia. He has, no doubt, full information as to the local circumstances and as to what is desired by the people of his province.

Mr. BARNARD: So far as I understand the situation, I do not think this matter has been very much considered in British Columbia. Certainly, there has been no protest against it that I have heard of. I do not think the proposed change will do much harm, but, on the other hand, I do not think it will do much good—it is rather innocuous.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. member (Mr. Barnard) is taking a very safe line. I can remember the day when he was more outspoken. I am glad to see him here, and also to see the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), though both are silent to-day. When the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfred Laurier) was at the head of the Government, he increased the head tax from $100 to $500 in response to the sentiment created in British Columbia against oriental immigration. Some months or years afterwards the whole of the Conservative party in that province declared for a policy of exclusion of oriental immigration. I remember that my hon. and genial friend from Victoria was elected on the strength of a certain telegram, which afterwards proved to be a forgery, and he was too much of a gentleman to have benefited by that telegram. But it is a well known fact that the whole of the Conservative party in British Columbia was apparently deadly opposed to oriental immigration.

If in those days any one had made the loophole that is being made to-day in the law, we would have heard my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) and my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) blaming the Government for their action. This is the second time that a question like this has come up in this House within a few days. I regret not to see the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) in his seat. He was very outspoken about the question of Japanese immigration. I remember that in the House he censured me because I had negotiated an arrangement, or a treaty, with the Japanese Government concerning a restricted number of immigrants to Canada. Yet, a few years afterwards, the treaty was renewed and it was renewed with a feather in the cap of the Japanese Consul at Ottawa. I forget the terms of the letters which were exchanged between the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the Japanese Consul, but it is a fact that the Japanese Consul got the better of the Prime Minister and got better terms than the Japanese Government had obtained before that time.

The other day we were told by the Prime Minister that the question of Hindu immigration was a live one at the Imperial Conference, and that some way or other, Hindu immigration would become the problem of to-morrow as between the various portions of the Empire. What does that mean? It means that if we do not look after our own business primarily and chiefly, we are going to have very serious problems introduced into our national life. I do not blame the right hon. gentleman for having taken part in the proceedings of the Imperial Conference but as a result of that conference, and as a result of the presence of Hindu representatives, Canada, before many months, surely before many years, will have to face a policy of oriental immigration from India. I would like to know where the party of a white British Columbia will be then. We do not hear from the representatives of British Columbia and I think I voice the sentiments of British Columbia to-day when I protest against any loophole being put in the restrictions which have been embalmed in the statute-book. Nobody complains to-day of the restrictions which were imposed upon the Japanese labour immigration, although we were taunted and taken to task by hon. gentlemen opposite, when we

brought that agreement from Japan. It was a wise arrangement, it was a good one; yet we were blamed by the hon. member for Victoria, the hon. member for New Westminster and the gentlemen who today represent the province of British Columbia. They were elected on a platform of an exclusive white British Columbia and yet to-day they stand for the policy which is being initiated by the present Government. They stand for Hindu immigration in the near future. They stand for a more liberal treaty with Japan and for a more liberal interpretation of the statute which restricts Chinese immigration. I now speak for British Columbia and I ask hon. gentlemen to stand by their policy and principles of a few years ago.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster): I have great pleasure in answering the challenge of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux). The Conservative party of British Columbia stand to-day where they have always stood on the subject of Oriental immigration. As to the remarks of the hon. gentleman about the lack of discussion the other day on the subject of the participation in the Imperial Conference of our Indian fellow-subjects, one would think that the reason for that would appeal to the hon. gentleman, the same as the reason for abstention from harsh discussion of Japanese ambitions might also appeal to the hon. gentleman and some of his friends. It seems to me that it would be well that we should try to cement our alliance with the friends of the Empire and secure from some of these Allies the assistance in fighting the battles of the Empire, which is refused to us in other quarters where we have a right to expect it. So far as I am concerned, I welcome the presence of our Indian soldiers on the fields of Flanders and of France. I welcome the presence of the Japanese fleet on the Pacific ocean to supply the deficiencies which the lack of a naval policy on the part of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues produced on the Pacific ocean.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What about those submarines?

Mr. TAYLOR: I ask the hon. gentleman: What about those submarines?

Mr. PUGSLEY: They were bought under the Canadian Naval Act.

Mr. TAYLOR: Is there any other meaning to the hon. gentleman's question?

Mr. PUGSLEY: They were bought under the Canadian Naval Act.

Mr. TAYLOR: Is that all there is to the question?

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is all.

Mr. TAYLOR: I will very willingly discuss the submarines with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KNOWLES: You may know something about them that we do not.

Mr. TAYLOR: If hon. gentlemen are finished, although I do not blame them for being a little bit uneasy at what they have invited, I would like to tell them the difference between the condition of affairs with respect to the Chinese Exclusion Act at the time they were in power and the present. We found that when hon. gentlemen were in power the exemptions under the Act were made the instruments, not of keeping Chinese out of Canada, but of bringing them into Canada under the pretence of a right of exemption when they had no such right, upon paying a toll of $100 secretly instead of the $500 to be paid openly, four-fifths of which $100 went, as shown by the evidence before the commissioner, to the campaign fund of the Liberal party. We have confidence that under the present Administration the use of the Chinese exemption clause to provide funds for party purposes has become a thing of the past. I know of no reason why Chinese who desire to be educated in the universities of Canada should not have the privilege of being educated in those institutions, and it is because of my belief that that is the honest intention of this amendment, and not that it is opening the door to the surreptitious entry of Chinese for the benefit of some grafters in British Columbia that I am content to accept the Bill.

Whenever I find that this exemption is being used as the exemptions were used during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, then they may depend upon it that I shall be quite as vigorous in calling attention to it as I ever was in calling attention to the abuse of Chinese or other oriental immigration. In the meantime, the Chinese, like the Japanese and Hindoos, are very valuable Allies of the British cause, the Canadian cause. They are, in very large numbers, coming forward for the purpose of serving as labourers in France, and the Chinese Government is showing every disposition to assist in every possible way the cause of the Allies in contributing of the labour of their country. It does seem to me that with respect to the

Chinese in a smaller degree as with respect to the Japanese and Hindoos in a larger degree, all those people are entitled during these times of the stress of war to a little more consideration than we owed to them in times of peace.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have been expecting some hon. gentleman opposite to rise in his place and express the fact that he was terribly shocked and horror stricken at the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), at this time of stress introducing petty, party politics.

The hon. gentleman speaks of graft and makes charges against the Liberal party—and the hon. gentleman is a colonel too, and one of the political colonels of whom we in this Parliament are so proud.

Mr. TAYLOR: I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman says, in what I would not call a sneering manner, because it is not parliamentary to use that term, but I cannot find the proper word to express it—but the hon. gentleman challenges my being a member of His Majesty's army. I wish to know if that is the position of the loyal Opposition in this House, that it has become a crime to become a member of His Majesty's army?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would not suggest that for a single moment. What I rose especially to do was to express my profound astonishment that gentlemen on the other side of the House had not risen in their places and protested against the hon. gentleman introducing petty, party politics during this time when the attention of Parliament should be directed to greater issues. If gentlemen on this side were to follow that hon. gentleman, we might get into a discussion which would be exceedingly unpleasant and exceedingly out of place. I should think that a member of this House, and particularly one who wears His Majesty's uniform, should be rather above that sort of thing at the present time.

4 p.m.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I wish to understand my hon. friend's position. My understanding of what he said was this, that he rose to express his profound astonishment that no one on this side protested against my hon. friend from New Westminster introducing petty, party politics.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend from New Westminster was on his feet for the first time in making the remarks to which we have just listened. He had not sat down before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley), instead of allowing anybody on this side to make a protest, got up to draw a red herring across the trail.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) knows well enough that if he, as acting leader of the House, had risen and asked his hon. friend to refrain from the unseemly conduct in which he was indulging, it would have at once produced a proper result. My hon. friend from New Westminster says that the Japanese are giving great aid in this war, that the people of China are also giving aid to the Allies, that our Indian fellow subjects are giving great aid to the Empire. That is all true, but they are giving it under the present law which contains restrictions against which there has been no very strong complaint so far, and what I think is that the minister should leave the law with regard to China just as it is. If, by reason of the present condition of affairs, the door is opened wider and young men from China are induced to come in, and then if it is thought they are not as steadily pursuing their studies as assiduously as it might be expected, they are deported from this country, it will provoke ill feeling which would be of very great disadvantage in the future. We ought not to go too far. A few years ago, a great many people were coming from China and from Japan and from India, and a great deal of feeling was created particularly among people who said that British Columbia should be kept as a country of white people.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the hon. gentleman object to their entrance into this country if they really did come as bona fide students?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The present law does not inflict any special hardship. It provides that Chinese youths coming to Canada for the purpose of obtaining an education, attending a university or other educational institution approved by the minister, after their studies have been concluded can make an application and get back a refund of the $500 head tax which they paid on entering the country. No strong complaint has been raised against that.

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, there has.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And it is well not to open the door too widely. If you do, there is likely to result very considerable dissatisfaction in the future.

Mr. ROCHE: Can my hon. friend tell the House whether the United States has been injured or benefited by the free entry of Chinese students to attend the educational institutions of the United States?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not prepared to speak as to that. I do know that along the Pacific coast of the United States there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction by reason of oriental immigration, so much so that the Legislature of California has passed laws which have provoked very great irritation and have caused the greatest possible friction between the Legislature and the people of California and the Government and Congress of the United States. I know that much, but what has caused it I do not know beyond the fact that it has been felt that there has been too much oriental immigration into the western coast states of the United States of America. Just a word with regard to the remark of my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) as to the criticism which was levelled at the late Government when a rather liberal arrangement, but at the same time a fair arrangement, was made between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government of Japan. This Government was very bitterly criticised by Conservative members from British Columbia by reason of that arrangement. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) speaks of what has happened to-day, that Japanese cruisers have helped to protect the Pacific coast. Well, that shows how foresighted was my right hon. friend who was then the leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), because I well remember that in this House, when he was seeking to defend the action of the Government in making this arrangement with the Japanese Government, he said that the time might come when the ships of Japan would be riding side by side with the ships of Canada in defence of the cities and coasts of British Columbia.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Who said that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: My right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition and then the leader of the Liberal Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He was laughed at by hon. gentlemen opposite when he made that prophecy. That prophecy came true, because there is no doubt that a Japanese cruiser was in the Pacific ocean prepared to co-operate with the ships of Great Britain and the smaller ships of Canada which were available, and this probably prevented an attack being made upon the coast cities. The important question, after all, is whether we shall broaden and extend the opportunities for oriental immigration into Canada. I do not think we ought to do so, but I think, by this paragraph, the minister is opening a very wide door, which is likely to lead to extreme dissatisfaction in the future

Mr. BURNHAM: I do not intend to be captious or facetious, but I would like to know if that is protection or free trade?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman can judge for himself.

Mr. BURNHAM: I judge for myself, but I was not quite sure.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the Minister of the Interior say what the policy of the United States is in regard to Chinese immigration?

Mr. ROCHE: The United States have no head tax, but they prohibit entirely the entry of Chinese labour. In the case of students and others they have an exemption, but it is somewhat wider than our exemption, and those who go to their country for the purpose of getting educational instruction are allowed to enter free of tax. They are not prohibited from entering the country, as the Chinese labourers are. The hon. gentleman has stated that the present Act has been working smoothly and harmoniously, and that there has been no objection to it. It is just because of the numerous objections that I have introduced this legislation. The requests have been quite numerous, and have been coming in for the last few years, and, indeed, had I been able to have done this by Order in Council, I should have felt like doing it a couple of years ago. The universities have asked for it. They point out that the universities in the United States have a great advantage over the universities in Canada because the Chinese students are admitted into the United States free of tax, whereas they are not admitted into Canada, to any extent, on account of the imposition of the head tax. It is a hardship to impose the head tax on students coming into the country. Many young men have not the $500 to spare and require all the money they have for their educational course. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) says it is no hardship at all to impose the head tax, because it will be refunded, but it is a hardship because these immigrants have not the money to spare. Furthermore, the educated class of Chinese rather resent the idea of imposing a head tax on their sons, who come here for educational purposes.

If they were admitted free of tax there would be additional advantages to Canada by reason of trade and commerce. I have come in contact with missionaries and clergymen from Canada who have visited China and have associated with the people, and they say that the United States derives a great advantage by reason of the fact that Chinese students are admitted into United States universities without the restrictions imposed by us, and that by reason of this, trade between the United States and China is encouraged. Each young man going back to China from the United States is possessed of far more knowledge about that country than he would were students not admitted to the United States universities free of tax. I wish again to emphasize the fact that it is on account of the numerous requests year after year for this legislation that I have introduced this Bill. If the hon. gentlemen opposite take a decided stand and decide to hold up the passage of this Bill on the ground that it enlarges the scope of immigration from China, I say that that is not a valid ground, and I doubt if the leader of the Opposition would take a stand similar to that taken by the hon. gentleman from St. John. If the leader of the Opposition expressed his views this afternoon, I do not think they would harmonize with the views of the hon. member from St. John. I do not imagine that he is at all opposed to allowing Chinese students to enter Canada for the purpose of attending an educational institution.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We are not opposing this as a party matter. Each member is speaking for himself. I do not profess to speak for any of my hon. friends. Each member has a right to express his views in criticising any measure which comes before the House.

Mr. OLIVER: It will be obvious that there is a great difference between the law of the United States and the law of Canada in regard to Chinese immigration, and when the minister draws the parallel, it is not a fair one. Those who are in favour of the exclusion of the Chinese from Canada would be very glad to accept the law of the United States, if it were applied to Canada. But that is not the situation. The United States absolutely excludes the Chinese of the working class, and allows the entry of those who are seeking education. We do not exclude the working classes. We simply impose a head tax upon them, but we make special provision in regard to those who desire an education. If the hon. minister desires to introduce the United States system into Canada I will be glad to support the proposition to absolutely exclude the Chinese labourer, and simply allow the entry of the Chinaman who desires to secure an education. But to take that part of the United States law which leaves practically an open door to the entrance of Chinese, and add that to our more liberal policy in regard to Chinese immigration, is entirely objectionable, from my point of view.

Mr. ROCHE: Does the hon. gentleman know what the United States immigration authorities claim?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know. I asked the minister what the law was and he told me.

Mr. ROCHE: They say that Canada gets the head tax and the United States gets the Chinese immigrant.

Mr. OLIVER: That is a different story. We are discussing the statute as it is, and as it is proposed to frame it, and having had something to do with the statute as it stands, I may be pardoned for intruding upon the House to the extent I am doing. Having had some responsibility for the present statute, and for the administration under that statute, with due regard to the compliments of my hon. friend from Westminster, I wish to say that, for my own part I desire in this House to promote the idea of a white Canada, and the exclusion, so far as it is reasonably possible, of those races, who, by a policy of peaceful penetration permitted to be carried on, would change the condition of this Canada of ours, from being a white Canada to being a Canada of some other character, and I will have to ask the minister and the House to bear with me while I express my opposition to any legislation calculated to facilitate that change of condition. It is quite clear that this proposed amendment is deliberately intended to let down the bars, and, in so far as that is its purpose, it is objectionable. The minister has said that he has had protests against the law as it stands, and that these protests are the foundation of the amendment he proposes to make. With regard to the instance which he mentioned with reference to the clergy spoken of by the hon. member for Pictou, I may say that in my judgment there is no foundation whatever for a change in the law in any such instance. There is no possibility

of a law regarding immigration being placed on the statute book that can be administered according to rule and line. The officers of the department must administer that law according to its spirit and intent, using the letter where that is necessary to enforce the spirit and intent. But to apply the letter of the law in such a case as was mentioned by the member for Pictou and by the minister is to disregard the responsibilities of administration.

Mr. ROCHE: Such action was taken on the advice of the Justice Department.

Mr. OLIVER: When the Justice Department is asked to do so, it states, of course, the interpretation of the law. But my hon. friend must know that, in many cases, common sense and public policy demand that the law shall be administered according to its import rather than according to its letter. There is no evidence, therefore, either of the necessity or of the desirability of any change in the law. The proposed change rests, then, simply upon the desire or intention of the minister to let down the bars with regard to Chinese immigration to the extent provided in this section. To that I am compelled to offer my most strenuous opposition. It is suggested that because we are in a state of war, and because we have the assistance of certain allies, we are debarred from dealing with our own affairs according to our own requirements and the dictates of our own interest. But let it be thoroughly understood that that is not the purpose for which our soldiers are fighting in this war. The soldiers of Canada are fighting in this war so that Canada shall be mistress in her own house.

As to the amendment respecting clergymen, the existing Act was framed with regard to the fact that white men had gone to China as missionaries, and had there married women of that country. These men, being required in the course of their duties to come back to Canada, found themselves faced with the necessity of paying head tax upon their families. It was to provide for such cases that the law was made as it is. It did not contemplate the admission into Canada of clergymen of the Chinese race, whatever might be their religion. It contemplated simply the free admission of families of Chinese origin which were the families of white clergymen whose duties called them back to Canada. It is not desirable that any amendment to the law should go further than that, especially in view of the fact that the minister is not able to explain how far-reaching this section is. I wish to go on record, therefore, as protesting with all the strength of which I am capable against the proposals contained in the first section of the Bill.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce), Bill No. 73, to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir George Foster, Bill No. 74, to amend the Fisheries Act, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), Bill No. 65, to amend the Bank Act, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, Bill No. 68, to amend the Civil Service Act, was read the second time.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Fisheries—Building fishways and clearing rivers, $30,000.

Mr. HAZEN: When I was in committee before with my estimates I told the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that when my estimates came up again I would give him a statement of the number of appointments made in the Department of Marine and Fisheries under section 21 of the Civil Service Act. This is the statement:—

Captain Louis Arthur Demers, wreck commissioner, aged 55, was appointed on the 2nd of May, 1916, at a salary of $3,300 per annum. His present salary is $3,400 per annum. He entered the outside service of the department on the 11th of October, 1904, after having served some twelve years with fishery cruisers; he was transferred to the inside service on 1st September, 1908,

and appointed wreck commissioner on the 1st August, 1910. He resigned to become harbour master at Montreal on the 1st June, 1912. When Captain Lindsay, his successor as wreck commissioner, was placed in charge of the Montreal and Quebec pilotage the office of wreck commissioner became vacant, and in view of Captain Demers' special qualifications for the position he was reappointed thereto.

Mr. Thomas Robert Ferguson, chairman of the Board of Steamship Inspection, entered the outside service of the department in May, 1889. On the superannuation of Chairman Edward Adams, the officer who, by length of service, efficiency and technical qualifications, was entitled to succeed him, was Mr. Ferguson, who was at that time inspector of Government steamships at Quebec, and the department so recommended. Mr. Ferguson is 51 years of age. The date of his appointment as chairman of the board is 8th May, 1913; salary on appointment, $2,800 per annum; present salary, $3,200 per annum.

Mr. George Herbert Flood, aged 56, was appointed purchasing and contract agent 1st December, 1915, at a salary of $3,300 per annum. His present salary is $3,500 per annum. Prior to his appointment as purchasing and contract agent Mr. Flood had been the agent of the department at St. John, N.B., since November, 1909. On the resignation of Mr. Cecil Doutre as purchasing and contract agent, the department considered Mr. Flood's experience as agent at St. John, and also as a former business man, specially fitted him for the vacant position, and, after the issue of a certificate of qualification by the Civil Service Commission, the department recommended him for the position of purchasing and contract agent.

Mr. Hope Vere Anderson, aged 27, was transferred from the Department of Mines to the Department of Marine by Order in Council on the 5th September, 1913; salary on appointment $1,600 per annum, present salary $1,750. The services of a mechanical engineer were required in the chief engineer's branch of the department, and the Civil Service Commissioners recommended Mr. Anderson for the position; he was accordingly appointed.

Mr. Arnt Christian Andrésen, aged 32, was appointed by Order in Council of the 18th May, 1914, to the chief engineer's branch of the department at a salary of $1,200 per annum; he now receives $1,250 per annum. He is at present in a Canadian Battalion on overseas service in France.

[Mr. Hazen.]

His appointment was recommended by the Civil Service Commissioners in response to an application for a clerk with the special qualifications above mentioned.

Mr. Joseph Henry Vaughan, aged 39, has been in the service of the department since June, 1908. His salary on appointment to his present position was $1,600 per annum. He has not yet received any increase. On the superannuation of Mr. M. D. Kelly, a clerk in the office of the purchasing and contract branch, the department requested the Civil Service Commissioners to advertise the vacancy. Having regard to the special qualifications required for the duties of the position, they recommended Mr. Vaughan, and his appointment was authorized by Order in Council.

Those are the only appointments in the Marine and Fisheries Department made under section 21 since I became minister of that department. I have not here a list of the appointments in the Department of Naval service, but when the Naval Service Estimates are up, I will make a statement to the House covering those appointments.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have a very strong complaint from Mr. Kendall at Port Alberni, B.C. Section 5 of the special Fishery Regulations for British Columbia provides that:

> The Chief Inspector of Fisheries for the province is hereby empowered to cancel a fishery license forthwith for a violation of the regulations or conditions of the license by the licensee or by his representative who may be operating under such license for him.

That is a very drastic provision; it places the licensee entirely in the hands of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries for the province. I am informed that there is no such provision in the Nova Scotia Fishery Regulations. I recognize that the chief inspector should have pretty large powers, but there ought to be some provision whereby proceedings might be stayed so that an appeal could be taken to the deputy minister at Ottawa. I am told that the chief inspector in British Columbia in the district in which Mr. Kendall's operations are carried on seems to have a spite against that gentleman and is acting very arbitrarily, and Mr. Kendall complains very bitterly. The most I can do is to ask the minister to look into the matter, and also if he does not think there should be some provision for staying proceedings so that an appeal may be made, if it is thought desirable to make one. Otherwise, an inspector who might be so disposed, might ruin a licensee.

Mr. HAZEN: This case has been before me off and on for a number of years, it has been reported on not only by Mr. Cunningham, our chief fishery officer in British Columbia, who is an old and experienced official, but by our fishery officers here. I shall be glad to show the hon. member the whole correspondence, and perhaps he will then be satisfied that it was impossible to take any other action than has been taken by the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the minister show the papers to Senator Bostock who is familiar with this matter?

Mr. HAZEN: I have asked Mr. Found to make a note of the matter, and I shall be glad to send the file of papers to Senator Bostock so that he may look into it himself.

Mr. KYTE: Has there been any increase in the number of fishery officers in Nova Scotia during the last year?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. KYTE: Has the minister the list of fishery guardians for the county of Richmond, N.S?

Mr. HAZEN: The number in the county of Richmond is twenty-six, but I have not their names here.

Mr. KYTE: That is a very large increase—

Mr. HAZEN: It is the same number as last year.

Mr. KYTE: Perhaps—but a very considerable increase over the number of a few years ago. I would like a list of them. The department have been good enough to furnish me with a list in the past.

Mr. HAZEN: Certainly. I have asked Mr. Found to have a list prepared and sent to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SINCLAIR: And may I have a similar list for the counties of Guysborough and Antigonish?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. COPP: Who compose the Advisory Board?

Mr. HAZEN: There are four members from Nova Scotia, Mr. Hemon; Mr. Short, of Digby; Captain W. C. Smith, of Lunenburg; and Mr. King, who was appointed on the recommendation of the Halifax Board of Trade. From New Brunswick, there are Mr. F. E. B. Young, of Caraquet; Mr. Carson, of Kent County; and Mr. John Jackson, of St. John. There is also a gentleman from the Gulf District, Mr. Arsenault; and from Prince Edward Island, Mr. Longworth, of Charlottetown.

Mr. COPP: Do they meet here?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, together with the officials of the department. Once they met in Nova Scotia, and once in Prince Edward Island. These gentlemen act without pay; all they receive is their actual expenses.

Mr. McKENZIE: What are their functions?

Mr. HAZEN: They are purely advisory. They meet with the deputy minister, the Commissioner of Fisheries, and other officials, and discuss such matters as close seasons, fish hatcheries and other subjects relating to the fisheries, and make recommendations. The Bill which I introduced yesterday, and which was read the second time to-day and referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, was prepared largely as a result of their deliberations with the officials of the department.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Does not the minister realize that he has left a very large part of Nova Scotia unrepresented on the Advisory Board, in that there is no representative from Cape Breton? I regard the functions of this board as very important. It is the medium through which the fishermen can place their case before the Government. I notice that three of the Nova Scotia members of the board are from the western portion of the province, while Cape Breton, which is surrounded by the most important fishing waters of Canada, has no member on the board. I think that is a mistake, and I have called the attention of the minister to it more than once. I regret that he has not seen fit to appoint a representative from that portion of the country.

Mr. HAZEN: We have requests from time to time to appoint on the board representatives from different sections. For instance, there is no member of the board representing the county of Charlotte, N.B., though its fisheries are very important, including extensive sardine weirs and important lobster and other fisheries. There was a representative from this section for the original board, but at his death the place was filled by the appointment of Mr. Jackson of St. John. There are other important fishing centres which are not represented on the board. We do not wish to make the board so large as to be un-

wieldy. My experience is that you get better work from a committee if it is of reasonable size. From Nova Scotia, originally, we had only three members. Strong representations were made that, as Halifax was really the centre of the fishing trade of the Maritime Provinces, a very much larger fish trade being done there than anywhere else it was desirable that there should be a representative on the board from Halifax who understood the fishing trade generally. So Mr. King, who was recommended by the Halifax board of trade, was appointed. I appreciate what the hon. member (Mr. Chisholm) says, but at the same time I think the different interests are fairly represented by those on the board. I am sure that they will see that no injustice is done to Cape Breton, and that they deal with fishery questions from the standpoint of general interest rather than from the standpoint of locality. When the hon. gentleman made his suggestion, I said I would consider it, and so I have, and have had considerable doubt about it; but I think it better not to have the committee too large.

Mr. KYTE: What the minister (Mr. Hazen) says, concerning the county of Charlotte, applies to the locality referred to by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Chisholm). As the minister knows, a very large proportion of the population of Cape Breton are engaged in the fisheries. With respect to the provisions for the open and closed season for lobsters, the island of Cape Breton is to a large extent a separate district. Great difficulties have been met with by the officers of the department in their efforts to work out a scheme of open seasons for the province of Nova Scotia suitable to the conditions and exigencies of all sections. In the spring, the fishermen of Cape Breton are handicapped by the presence of large quantities of drift ice on the coast. In some seasons the ice remains until a very late date, and the consequence is that the lobster fisheries are very much hampered as compared with other places in Nova Scotia. From time to time the fishermen of the island of Cape Breton have made special representations in favour of an extension of the open season to compensate them for the time of which they can not fish on account of the drift ice. The conditions in Cape Breton would thus seem to call for special attention on the part of the advisory board. Antigonish and Guysborough also have large fishing interests. It does seem to me that there should be at least one member of the board from Cape Breton and eastern Nova Scotia. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Inverness is eminently reasonable. If there was any way by which the minister could eliminate one of the present members of the Advisory Board and substitute for him a representative particularly of the island of Cape Breton, I think it would be in the public interest to do so.

Inasmuch as the minister has intimated that the members of the board do not receive any salary, and are only paid their actual expenses, it is not a position that is so remunerative that any gentleman would be loath to part with. That would make it much easier for the minister to make some change in the personnel of the board, in order that it might more directly represent the island of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia.

Mr. HAZEN: The appointments are yearly. There is a certain element of fairness in saying that the members of the board should be changed from time to time. We get fresh ideas and fresh blood and there is much force in my hon. friend's contention. What he says about Cape Breton Island and eastern Nova Scotia is very true. The season there is later and that condition was recognized when the season in which lobsters may be caught was fixed at a later time in Cape Breton than in any other part of Nova Scotia.

Mr. KYTE: That is quite true but the presence of ice on the coast makes changes necessary from time to time.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has the Advisory Board given any advice to the minister on the urgent questions that are before him at the present time in regard to the fisheries? Members are receiving letters regarding the great scarcity of salt in order to preserve fish in the districts where they are not doing a fresh fish business. Another question is that of the extension of the lobster season. At this season of the year members of parliament are apt to receive a good many requests of that kind and it would be interesting to know if these matters are being dealt with by the Advisory Board and if they are giving the minister advice in regard to them.

Mr. HAZEN: By the 15th of this month we will have advice from the members of the board, and also from our officers all over the country, in regard to the desirability of making an extension if the lobster season. As the hon. gentleman knows,

I have been very loath to extend the season and I have declined to do so from year to year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Never.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think that during the last three years there has been a single exception. But this year there seems to be a very persistent attempt made to secure an extension. The request comes not only from the districts which are affected but from members of the House and I have a letter from the hon. member for Guysboro pointing out reasons why he thinks there should be an extension in certain parts of Nova Scotia. I have had representations made to me by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) who has been a persistent advocate of not extending the season. But owing to the fact that conditions are of a most unusual character he says that for the first time he thinks that possibly it would be in the public interest that an extension should be made. We have sometimes found that when conditions have been unfavourable at the commencement of the lobster season and fish have not been caught for a considerable time after the season opened the conditions have been so favourable during the latter part of the season that the catch has been just as good as in normal years. In view of the very strong representations that have been made to the department we have asked our fishery officers in the different districts all over the country to carefully observe and note what the catch and conditions are and to make reports to us which we will receive by the fifteenth of this month so that we will be in a position to come to an intelligent conclusion in regard to the matter. I dislike extending the seasons. They were made for the purpose of preserving the fish and preventing the destruction of the fisheries and it seems to me to be almost better, taking one year with another, that there should be no extension, because, while the catch might be smaller one year, perhaps as a result of the enforcement of the regulations and the preventing of the taking of a large number of lobsters, an increased catch is the result and the fishing is better in the future. However, there are other considerations which will have to be taken into account. The fishermen go to considerable expense to get their gear and supply themselves with boats and lobster traps. Some of them make it their principal source of livelihood and if they are not allowed to pursue their calling, and they get a smaller quantity of fish, it makes the conditions very difficult for them and that is especially the case this year when there is such a demand for food products. We have taken steps to get preliminary information to enable us to come to a wise and sound conclusion in regard to the matter.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Could the minister tell me what the dates are when the season closes on the different sections of the coast?

Mr. HAZEN: It closes in different districts at different times. In the district in which the hon. member for Northumberland is interested, it closes on June 25, and in the district in which my hon. friend from Guysborough is interested, it closes on June 20. I think it is five days earlier in that part of Nova Scotia than it is along the gulf of St. Lawrence and the Northumberland Straits. It opens earlier and closes earlier in the districts on the south shore of Nova Scotia, on the bay of Fundy and in the counties of St. John and Charlotte. These dates, of course, were fixed in consequence of the reports of commissions. There have been from time to time lobster commissions. There was one about 1897, or 1898, and in 1912 there was another to consider altered conditions. The close seasons were fixed very largely on the reports of these commissions which have been made after taking evidence and getting the views of the men who are interested in the lobster fishery on different parts of the coast of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I want to point out the importance of arriving at a decision as early as possible, because, if it is left until the 15th of the present month and the season closes on the 20th, there will scarcely be time enough for the fishermen to get the news on the coast. It takes several days to have them notified in regard to an extension, and if an extension is going to be made, a decision should be arrived at as soon as possible, and the fishermen given notice at least a week ahead so as to permit them to make their plans as to the date at which they will take up their traps. With reference to the district in which I am particularly interested, from Halifax Harbour to Point Michaud, I would ask the minister to instruct the officers to telegraph the information so that the fishermen will have sufficient notice.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend's point is well taken, and we will wire if it has not already been done. When I was speaking about getting these reports on the 15th I

had mostly reference to the district where the season closes on the 25th. The commissioner tells me that we will have the report from the district in which my hon. friend is particularly interested by the 10th or 12th, and as there is very nearly a week before the close season, we will be prepared to make an announcement as to whether we shall make an extension or not.

Mr. TURGEON: Has the minister given any attention to the remarks I made the other day?

Mr. HAZEN: In regard to fishing in October?

Mr. TURGEON: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: I have not been able to give much attention to that question since my hon. friend made the suggestion, although it has been made before. I intend to give attention to it and to get a report on the subject. But I think the best opinion of our fishery officers is that such a course, if it were adopted, would result in the destruction of the lobsters and cause great injury to the fishery in the future. I will get all the information I can on the subject.

Mr. TURGEON: I hope the minister will, because I am not of opinion that fishing in the fall would be more disastrous to the lobster industry than in the spring. I believe that this opinion will be supported by the fishermen on the coast. I see that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) has been coming to my way of thinking during the past year or two, and that alone says something.

Mr. HAZEN: It is hard not to come your way.

Mr. MARCIL: This question would not be complete if I did not put in a word for the coast of Quebec. The season is very late there always, starting from the mouth of the Restigouche river, they cannot place lobster traps until the end of May. So the early part of the season is lost, and they have to stop fishing when they have only properly started to work. This spring the season is much later than usual. The spring is fully a month later in Quebec, and so I hope the minister will consider that district when he is considering these points in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. HAZEN: The district to which my hon. friend refers, I presume, is up at the head of the Baie de Chaleur.

Mr. MARCIL: The whole coast of Quebec.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. HAZEN: There is not a very large catch. The season is late and the result is that the fishermen do not have a very long time in which to catch lobsters. But the information we have is that if you extend the season there beyond the present date the lobsters are getting in a condition when they are not fit to catch. If you catch them then you destroy them without getting very much in food value in return.

Mr. MARCIL: Why not give a season in the fall, as has been suggested by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon)? This is an unusual year, food supplies are very scarce, and a trial might be made this year to see the effect of a fall fishing season.

Mr. LOGGIE: How does the minister square his statement that lobsters would not be in good condition after the 25th of June with the fact that in another district he starts the season on the 24th of May and allows it to run until the 10th of August? Does he mean that the lobsters canned in that district are not suitable for food?

Mr. HAZEN: I can only see that it is a bad season, but under the conditions in that district if you did not let them fish at that season you could not let them fish at all. The whole subject is a most difficult one and it is hard to get fishermen to agree among themselves upon it. It is just the same with the lobster hatcheries, some of which were established before I came into office. We had been hoping that the lobster hatcheries would increase the supply of lobsters, but, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) the other evening, Professor Knight, after carrying out experiments in connection with the lobster industry, is of opinion that the lobster hatcheries are not only not assisting in increasing the number of lobsters but are a detriment, because you take the female lobster and take the berries from it to send to the hatchery and then the female lobster is sent to the cannery. He has a theory that you could replenish the lobster fishing much more quickly by passing a regulation to the effect that if any female lobsters in the berry stage are caught they should at once be returned to the sea so that the increase would come about in the natural way. Dr. Knight is carrying on a very extensive inquiry in regard to this matter, and among the other subjects he has to consider is the question raised by the hon. member for Gloucester as to whether it

5 p.m.

would not be better to prohibit entirely the catching of lobsters during the months of June, July and August, and allow fishing to take place at a later date. That is absolutely contrary to the views that have prevailed among fishery experts and officers in the past.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Where is Dr. Knight making his observations?

Mr. HAZEN: Dr. Knight is a professor at Queen's college, Kingston. He has been making observations at the biological station at St. Andrews, New Brunswick, at Digby, where lobsters are impounded for observation, and at points along the Nova Scotia coast and Northumberland straits. Last year he was on the Digby coast.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It should not be difficult for scientific men to be certain whether or not the lobster hatcheries are doing good work. We all know what they do. The berries are put in the jars in the hatchery and after they are hatched the little lobster is syphoned out into the sea about three miles from the coast, and we know nothing more about it. The theory we used to get from the scientists was that the little lobster drifted on the surface of the water for several days until his claws formed, and then he sank to the bottom and grew up to be a lobster. That is what we were told. I do not see that there can be any great trouble in ascertaining whether that is true or not It could be done by actual experiment. It should not be difficult to follow these fry up after they are placed in the water and to ascertain from day to day whether they are still floating on the surface, or are living, or what becomes of them. It is only by actual contact with the lobster hatcheries and fisheries that the scientists can obtain proper knowledge. I think that the scientists should go to the hatchery and stay there and see how these fry get along whether they really do grow up or not. This is a matter of very great importance, as we are spending a great deal of money in the hatching of lobsters, and if there are no results, it is better to know it. We were always of the opinion that, on the coast of Pictou county, with which district my hon. friend from Pictou is more familiar than I, that the hatchery at Caribou was doing good work. There was no part of Nova Scotia, so far as I know, where the catch of lobster was kept up better than on the northern shore served by the hatchery at Cariboo. It was one of the earliest hatcheries on the coast of Nova Scotia, and we always had the idea that in that region the supply was being maintained. I think the hon. gentleman from Pictou will agree with me in that statement. There is no reason why there should not be similar results in other places. If the minister has a really good officer to investigate, I trust he will ascertain for certain whether the lobster fry that we put in at the sea lives, grows up and keeps the fisheries going, as we expected them to do, when we spent all this money in establishing these hatcheries.

Mr. MACDONALD: Last summer I met Professor Knight, the gentleman who was conducting the investigation in my county, where there has been a hatchery for a number of years. I was very much impressed with his anxiety to make the investigations as effective as possible. He succeeded in interesting the fishermen of the county in the problem as to how the industry could be served to a greater degree than any man I have seen representing the department in connection with that problem in the past. At various meetings held in the district he explained the process of observation which he was carrying on, that he had been at Digby, or somewhere in that vicinity, where there had been a pond, and he was comparing the results in both places, and, in addition to watching the development of the lobster in the hatcheries, he was experimenting with the production of lobsters in an artificial pond, which he built in the vicinity. One could not help being impressed with the capacity of Dr. Knight. I think he is carrying on good work. He has very strong views in reference to certain matters in connection with lobster propagation and development, which, no doubt, he communicated to the department, and the balance of his judgment, as I understand, was against the continuance of the hatcheries, and rather in favour of the establishment of ponds. I think, as between the two conditions under which he experimented side by side at Caribou, that better results were obtained in one than the other. That is my recollection, but I am not speaking from definite data in the matter. The idea of a fall season was urged by a great many of the fishermen in my district. I do not pretend to speak with any particular knowledge, but this view has been entertained by the fishermen in my county.

Mr. LOGGIE: I do not think it would be in the interests of the fishermen to do away

with the spring fishing, and substitute the autumn fishing for it. The district referred to by the hon. gentleman from Bonaventure, I thought, was unfairly treated by the shortening of the time. The committee who had charge of it took a certain number of days off the district, and added a recommendation that the season for the district in question should be further cut, a certain number of days after the first or second year. I think the district was unfairly treated in the circumstances, this year we have only some three or four weeks' fishing and our product will be short, and it is possible the minister may be willing, under the present circumstances, to consider that, but to my mind the season in the district should extend to the end of June instead of the 25th. Then the same number of days would be taken off as has been taken off in the other districts. Regarding the hatcheries, I suppose hon. gentlemen know that fish devour one another. On one occasion I was at a hatchery near Shippigan, and these little lobsters, about the size of mosquitoes, were coming out of the shell, and the small fish that had been pumped up from the channel were devouring these little lobsters. There is a general impression that these lobsters are emptied, as it were, into the sea, and remain on the surface, and are devoured by other fish. I am quite sure that, at certain seasons of the year, other fish, say mackerel or herring, do school very largely on the surface of the water, and, of course, they are cannibals, if I may so express myself, and they devour one another, and I am under the impression that large numbers of those little lobsters thus cast upon the sea are devoured by other fish. I have heard as a suggested remedy that the department should place these lobsters in shallow water in the seaweed. If they put them down at low water, the tide would rise and cover them, and in that way they would be on the bottom. I mention that, because there are not many fish in the bays in the summer season. Some smelts and tommy cod frequent them but not to any great extent. I have heard it suggested that much better results would be obtained if these lobsters were deposited in shallow water, in the eel grass, so that they could get to the bottom, and have time to grow and take care of themselves up to a certain time. I do not pretend to have a deep scientific knowledge along these lines, and I do not know whether that is practical or not, but I do believe it would be wise to do away with the spring fishing season, because pilfering would go on after the close season, as it goes on after the 25th of June. The season in that district is five days too short to be fair with the other districts. If we take up our traps on the 25th June, and keep them on shore until the lobster has shed its shell, got the new shell, and got into a hardy condition so that it moves around, as it does in the course of a few weeks, perhaps it would not be unfair to let the fishermen have, say two or three weeks in the month of September: give them the month of September, or whatever time the department find the lobster is in a wholesome condition for food, and then let everybody, small and large, try to obey the law, and avoid this charge that is so rampant, that he law is not recognized, which is quite true. There is no question whatever about the infringement of the law. Parties will get a few cans, put these lobsters in the cans at their homes, and market them. The quality is not what it ought to be, but nevertheless the lobsters are put on the market, and they find a ready sale, especially if the supply is short. I had a telegram from home yesterday saying that at present fishing is good. In a telegram that I received to-day it was suggested that an offer which had been received for the purchase of goods should be declined, because of the probability of the supply being short. I think that for this year the minister ought to extend until July 5 the fishing season which closes on June 25. We used to have until July 10, but subsequently ten days were taken off the time. When ten days is taken off the fishing season in one district, not more should be taken off in another. I think that in the interests of all concerned, the minister ought to give these matters consideration.

Mr. KYTE: The fishermen are suffering serious handicaps in respect of the cost of the necessary supplies, the cost of living and the general scarcity of food. I think, therefore, that we would not be asking too much if we requested that the close season should be entirely abolished for the present year. In the part of Nova Scotia which I represent, the fishermen are not getting as much for their catch this year as formerly, the canneries stating that the transportation of lobsters is restricted by reason of the shortage of merchant shipping. Under present war conditions, it is only fair that the fishermen should be relieved to some extent from the difficulties under which they are working, and much would be accom-

plished in this direction by allowing them a full season's fishing of lobsters until the fall.

Mr. HAZEN: I am afraid that if we allowed the lobster fishing to go on without provision for a close season, the result would be prejudicial to lobster fishing in future years. To be honest with my hon. friend, I do not think that his suggestion can be complied with.

Mr. KYTE: In what respect would it have a bad effect?

Mr. HAZEN: For one thing, it would reduce the market price. The quantity of lobsters obtained would be so great that they would be a drug on the market. I do not think that it is in anybody's interest that my hon. friend's suggestion should be carried out.

Mr. COPP: One of the fishery overseers in my county, Mr. Prescott, died about a year ago. Who was appointed in his place?

Mr. HAZEN: My recollection is that, as about 18 miles intervened between the different points which had to be especially watched by the guardian, the district was considered too large. Accordingly, the district was divided and one guardian appointed for each district, the salary being divided between them. I do not recollect the names; I shall be glad to send them to my hon. friend later.

Mr. COPP: Mr. Prescott's salary was only $100, and the dividing of the district would result in the men getting $50 each, which is a very small salary. My impression is that the chief duty of an officer of this kind is to see that no refuse from the mills gets into the fishing streams. It is a fact that the sawmills dump sawdust and other refuse into the streams which flow into fishing waters. This is not prevented by a visit from the fishery officer or by the writing of a letter. If in the opinion of my hon. friend's officials, the dumping of refuse into these waters is detrimental to fishing interests, I would suggest that he pay the officers who attend to that matter a sufficient salary and clothe them with sufficient power to enable them to prevent the practice, which has not been prevented up to the present time.

Mr. KYTE: I am surprised to observe the difference in the salaries paid to various fishery officers in Nova Scotia. For instance, Mr. Aylmer, of Meteghan, gets a salary of $500, in addition to travelling allowance. Mr. Burke, of Albert Bridge, gets $155. Mr. J. M. Campbell, of Halifax, gets only $15. I see in the Auditor General's Report the name of another officer whose salary is $500, and another who receives as small an amount as $60.

Mr. HAZEN: The man who gets $500 is allowed $150 for horse hire, but he gets no mileage, as some other inspectors do. His hotel bills also are paid.

Mr. KYTE: His travelling allowance is larger than a good many others, and he receives also a salary of $500.

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps he has a larger district.

Mr. KYTE: Edward Chute gets $500, in addition to travel and outlay, $278.91. J. A. Donovan, of Ingonish, receives the princely salary of $60, but he has the consolation of having drawn $389.32 for travel and outlay, making altogether $449.32. It seems to me that the system is antiquated, and that the salaries ought to be revised. The fact that a man draws a salary of $60 a year and receives an amount by way of travel and outlay of $389.32, indicates either that he is not getting a sufficient salary, or that he is drawing too much for travel and outlay, having regard to the work that he is doing. A few years ago all fishery officers throughout Nova Scotia were getting practically the same salary. In the last few years, however, I find that the salaries of some of these officials have advanced in a very marked degree. I do not understand that that is altogether because of any special difference in the character of the work they are doing. If the work of Mr. Donovan, for instance, of Ingonish, is such that the necessary travel and outlay should amount to $389.32, then he is entitled to a salary of more than $60 per year. The whole thing appears to be wrong; there ought to be a scale of salaries prevailing throughout Nova Scotia for all officers of that particular class. I cannot see why one fishery overseer should receive a salary of $500 and travelling expenses of $248.58, whereas another gentleman occupying the same position and doing the same work receives a salary of only $60. I do not know whether this inequality is due to influence that certain officers may have with the department as against others, but it is almost scandalous to have it appear in the public records of this country that men occupying the same positions and discharging the same duties should be compensated so unfairly and with such a great inequality.

Mr. HAZEN: I am not disposed to differ very much from my hon. friend. There is need for a very great reorganization in connection with the salaries paid to these fishery officers. We have been able to effect that reorganization up to the present time in the western part of Nova Scotia, where we have fewer officers than we have in other parts of that province, with the result that we give them larger territory to look after and greater recompense for their services. The same question will have to be grappled with in the other parts of Nova Scotia, but at the present time and in the past there has been such a large number of offices that the officers have been receiving small salaries. It would be better to have fewer officers and to give them larger salaries. I hope, if we live long enough, we shall have a reorganization throughout the whole province. Some of these officers are paid small amounts such as $20 or $25, and in this day and generation you cannot expect any service of value for remuneration of that sort.

Mr. COPP: I see by the Auditor General's Report that Mr. Robert Prescott, an overseer at Baie Verte, in New Brunswick, is receiving a salary of $150, with travelling expenses of $718.29.

Mr. McKENZIE: The $150 is put at the wrong end.

Mr. COPP: I understand that the area is a large one, and as Mr. Prescott lives inland at some distance from the shore where the factories are, he receives so much per mile for travelling expenses. I am making only the same criticism as my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte). From the Auditor General's Report I find that the expenditure in connection with the fishery overseers in the province of New Brunswick amounts to $7,195.69, but under the heading of special guardians there is an expenditure for wages and disbursements up to March 31, 1916, of $34,429.81. There are no items or explanations with regard to this, and I would like to know what it means.

Mr. HAZEN: That is all published in the official report, and I will get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any scale of disbursements? Is so much allowed for every mile travelled? Is any provision made for horse hire, or anything like that? I regret that the geographical knowledge of the minister is so limited that he does not know where Ingonish is, and I doubt the right of any gentleman to be in the Government who does not know where that great place is situated. I know the inspector there, and I would like to know where he travels abroad so extensively, because he seems to be provided so amply with funds. Perhaps when these estimates come up again the minister will be able to tell me the number of miles this officer travels, where he goes and the extent of his district. If his district is Ingonish alone that is a magnificent spot in the summer time on the beautiful shores of the Atlantic, and a man ought to be willing to travel around there for nothing, as it is such a lovely spot.

Mr. HAZEN: You think he ought to be able to live on the sea breezes?

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to know what Mr. Donovan is doing for his country for the money he is receiving.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be very glad to get all the details for my hon. friend. As regards the question asked by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp), Mr. Prescott is one of the regular fishery overseers and, like all the rest, where he owns a horse himself, he is allowed ten cents a mile for the distance he travels on business connected with his position. With regard to salaries and disbursements of fishery officers, if my hon. friend will look at page 363 of the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Naval Service, he will see the way in which the different items are made up. If, after looking at that, he desires further information, we shall be glad to furnish it.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to a matter of hardship that is taking place under the administration of the department in connection with the fisheries at Lac la Biche, north of Edmonton. The minister is, of course, aware that in northern Alberta there are a number of important lakes which furnish white fish in large quantities, and that since the recent construction of railroads, those fish are available for the world market. The question of fishing in this lake has become a commercial matter and means the investment of considerable capital. Since the railroad was constructed to Lac la Biche, there was commercial fishing for export last year. This commercial fishing is done in this way. Certain companies establish the necessary plants of houses, ice-storing, box-making and so on, and either they provide small boats and rig-outs for actual fishermen, or fishermen come in and supply their own and sell their fish to these com-

mercial establishments which box, cool and ship the fish to the market. The buildings must be erected; the ice must be put up in the winter time, and every preparation made in advance of the actual fishing season. During the season the company depends on the fishing operations for the realization on the capital invested.

The spring fishing season opened on 5th May this year. On the day before, after all preparations had been made, all licenses issued, buildings erected, boats and nets provided, and everything else made ready, the Department of Fisheries at Ottawa wired restricting the total catch from the lake to 240,000 pounds for the season. Already the department had issued licenses for commercial fishing in the lake to the number of 125, which was 55 more than last year. By the issue of these licenses they have attracted to the lake poor men—these fishermen are generally poor—and have been the means of causing them to spend their time and invest in boats and other fishing gear, and, by issuing one-third more licenses this year than last, have led everyone to suppose that there would be no limit on the fishing; and then a wire is sent out the day before the season opens telling the licensees that they are limited to a quantity which, if divided equally among them, would not give any of them a summer's earnings.

Now, we are quite agreeable that the department should decide that not more than so many pounds of fish shall be taken out of the lake during the season, if they make the decision upon information and knowledge. But when they make that decision, they should not issue an unlimited number of fishing licenses, thereby inducing the investment of time and money in an enterprise that, by reason of the restriction of the department itself, cannot possibly result in advantage to the parties concerned. It may be that the Government think it does not make any difference, that it does not concern them; that they are protecting the fish and it does not matter about the people. In my judgment, it matters a great deal more about the people than about the fish. The Government has no right to deal with the people, even if they are poor people, in that way. They should exercise reasonable judgment in issuing licenses for fishing in any lake in which they intend to restrict the catch. Last year, there was no restriction on the catch, and all the fishing companies were allowed to catch as much as they could. People had no reason to believe that there would be any restriction this year, until after every investment had been made, and every preparation completed. If I speak strongly on this matter, it is because what took place in this case this year took place in the case of Lesser Slave lake last year. In the previous season, there was unrestricted fishing in that lake, and when the next season came, after licenses had been issued, a restriction was announced. It was an unjustifiable hardship, both upon the people who are investing their money as fish exporters and upon the unfortunate fishermen who gather there. I have not heard from Lesser Slave lake this year, and I do not know the conditions there, but I do know that last year there was an unjustifiable hardship. Representations were made to the department on the subject last year, and I am astonished to know that exactly the same course has been followed in the case of Lac la Biche this year. I cannot imagine that the minister could have had knowledge of the facts in time or it would not have occurred. I may say that the equipment of the individual fishermen costs $60 or $70, exclusive of boats, licenses, and incidentals, and the total catch allowed, if divided equally among the licenses, will not afford a return for the investment made and the time employed.

Mr. HAZEN: This matter was brought to my attention on several occasions last year. Lac la Biche, which is not a very large lake, was, until the last few years, so far removed from settlement that there was very little desire to fish in it. But, in consequence of the opening up of communication by the building of railways in that district and by other means, the fishing attracts many people who previously could not take advantage of it. Last year, 33 people applied for and obtained licenses to fish in the lake. As a result, we received petitions from the locality pointing out that as the lake was not a large one, if fishing were allowed without restriction as to the quantity taken, the result would be that in a short time no fish would be left in the lake, and the people in the vicinity would not have the advantage of living in the neighbourhood of water in which fish could be caught. We communicated with our inspector on the subject. The inspector visited the lake and reported that in his opinion it was not safe to allow more than 234,000 pounds of fish to be taken out each year during the summer fishing. The same representations were made to us this year by settlers in the neighbourhood who are interested in the fishing. At the same time

representations were made on behalf of the fishing companies and others, that they should be allowed to fish without restrictions, and their statements as to the capacity of the lake and its resources in fish were different from those made by the fisheries officers. At that time 150 licenses had been applied for and taken out.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister now is dealing with Lesser Slave lake.

Mr. HAZEN: No, my present remarks are confined entirely to Lac la Biche. Professor Prince has been at Lesser Slave lake and he also inquired about the condition at Lac la Biche. He reported that in his judgment 400,000 pounds of fish could be taken out without destroying the usefulness of the lake as a fishing lake, and his report was concurred in by the fishery officers of the district. We therefore placed a limit of 400,000 pounds, and that is the limit to-day. The point was raised—and I understand that to a certain extent that is the complaint of the hon. member for Edmonton—that if only a limited quantity of fish were allowed to be taken from the lake the department should issue only a limited number of licenses.

Mr. OLIVER: Commercial licenses.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes. But I ask the hon. gentleman, how are you going to draw the line? If people, bona fide engaged in the fishing business, make application for licenses, are you going to say to some: "You shall not have licenses," and to others "You shall have licenses."? My hon. friend will see how very difficult it would be for the department to give a privilege, or a preference, to some people who are no more bona fide engaged in the fishing business than others who are applicants for licenses. Therefore, we have thought it better to grant licenses to all who are bona fide engaged in the fishing business and to limit the catch than to attempt to discriminate between the people who make application. That is the rule that prevails with regard to the lobster canneries; a close season is provided, regulations are made and the people, under those conditions, apply for the licenses and get them, taking their chance on getting a satisfactory catch. The department fixed 400,000 pounds as the quantity that could be safely taken from the lake during the summer season without depleting it. Having fixed that limit, its policy is to grant licenses to people who want them and as soon as the inspectors find that that quantity has been taken from the lake, the fishing is stopped. That is a fairer course than would be that which has been suggested of giving licenses to the first half dozen who apply, and saying to the others: "As you did not apply in time you cannot have a license."

Mr. OLIVER: I quite agree as to the propriety of restricting the amount of fish which may be taken out of any of these lakes in accordance with the best information the department has. My information is that the limit is 240,000 pounds on Lac la Biche for the summer fishing.

Mr. HAZEN: The first report we had from our officers was that 240,000 pounds was the amount that we could safely allow to be taken out, but subsequent reports have led us to the conclusion that 400,000 pounds might be taken out in a season without injury and 400,000 is the amount now fixed.

Mr. OLIVER: There are two seasons for fishing?

Mr. HAZEN: Just the summer season.

Mr. OLIVER: For this season the amount is 400,000 and not 240,000 pounds?

Mr. HAZEN: 400,000 pounds.

Mr. OLIVER: That is perfectly satisfactory. I do not wish to unduly press the department about restricting the amount of fish that may be taken from the lake and I appreciate that there may be some difficulties in adjusting the issuing of licenses. The department might take the view that it has information before it as to whether people could make a living out of fishing or not. If they choose to put it that way, that is a matter for their consideration, but what I desire to emphasize is that if they are going to restrict the amount that may be taken, and if they are not going to restrict the number of licenses to be issued, the public should have notice before they apply, that the licenses are issued subject to a restriction upon the taking of fish. With regard to Lac La Biche, my information is that licenses were issued without restriction and that preparation was made, both by the fishermen and the fish companies, for taking an unrestricted amount of fish, but that on the 4th day of May, just before the fishing opened, they were notified not that 400,000 pounds, but that only 240,000 pounds, might be taken. I am sure that the minister must appreciate the unfortunate position that resulted from that lack of notice. The people who had obtained licenses had no means

of protecting themselves. If they had had information when they applied for licenses that the limit had to be placed on the amount of fish to be taken they could have used their own judgment with regard to the matter. My information is that the people were given to understand, by reason of the action during the previous year, that they had an unrestricted right to take fish as there was no restriction on the number of licenses and it was not until every preparation was made that they were notified of this limitation and then apparently they were notified as to an amount below the mark that has finally been conceded by the department. They were notified that the amount was 240,000 pounds which was a very severe blow to their expectations. These expectations were justified in view of the policy of the department with regard to lac la Biche last year. If a change was going to be made they should have had due notice. They did not have notice. That is exactly what occurred with regard to Slave lake a year ago. I am consuming the time of the House now for the purpose of impressing upon the minister the absolute injustice of withholding this notice until such a late date, and whatever decision the department arrives at as to the amount of fish that may be taken ought to be made known from year to year before the licenses are issued, if the department does not see fit to restrict the number of licenses.

Mr. HAZEN: I recognize my hon. friend's desire to put this before the committee properly. I am informed that when the application for licenses were made a limit had not been fixed, but that before they were issued the limit had been fixed and that the department had no knowledge of the applications until a few days before the limitation was adopted. That is the information I get from the Superintendent of Fisheries. However, a limit has been adopted now and in future years it will be known what the limit is. If a change takes place, if it is found that the taking out of 400,000 pounds is more than the lake can stand, we will endeavour to see that notice is given so that people, before they take out their licenses will know what the limit is.

Mr. OLIVER: There are other lakes that will come in and I am anxious that the minister should be aware of the hardship that might occur in such cases so that he will take the proper measures in the future.

Mr. KYTE: I intended to make some remarks on this item and perhaps, Mr. chairman, you would call it six o'clock.

Mr. HAZEN: The item is No. 249.

Mr. KYTE: I was under a misapprehension as to the item; I thought we were discussing No. 248, and I have some observations to make on that item.

Mr. HAZEN: Well, we will wait at eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill No. 48, respecting The British Columbia and White River Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

SECOND READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 60, respecting The Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Wilcox.

Bill No. 61, for the relief of Charles Frederick Reuben Jones.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 62, for the relief of Florence Amelia Kennedy.—Mr. Edwards.

Bill No. 63, for the relief of John Bassnett Parker.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill No. 64, for the relief of Amy Beatrice Mathews Hilton.—Sir Herbert Ames.

SUPPLY.

House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Fisheries—Legal and incidental expenses, $4,000.

Mr. KYTE: Since the House rose at six o'clock, I have been making some further investigations as to the differences in salaries of fishery overseers in the province of Nova Scotia, and these investigations confirm me in the belief that the increases that have been accorded to certain fishery overseers must have more relation to the activities of certain hon. members in this House who have the ear of the minister, than to the circumstances in which these overseers are situated or the amount of work they do. Take the salary of William Aymar, of Meteghan, in the constituency of Digby, who receives $500 a year; while Sylvester Boudrot, of Petit de Grat, in the constituency of Richmond, has to be content with a salary of $100. Edward Chute,

of Canada Creek, in the county of Annapolis, enjoys $500; while M. J. Coady, of Southwest Margaree, in the constituency represented by my hon. friend from Inverness, has a salary of $60 only. Mr. J. G. D'Entremont, of Middle West Pubnico, fishery officer in Digby county, enjoys $800, while J. A. Donovan, of Ingonish, in the constituency of Cape Breton North and Victoria, has to be content with $60. Mr. J. A. Evans, of Chester, in the constituency of Lunenburg, enjoys $700; while N. Ferguson, of Port Moren, South Cape Breton, receives only $55. W. E. Fraser, of Liverpool, in the county of Queens, enjoys $750; while Ed. Hall, Main-a-Dieu, South Cape Breton, has a salary of only $55. D. L. McDonald, Bailey's Brook, in the county of Pictou, is paid for his services $75; Walter Purdy, Deep Brook, $700; J. J. Ross, North East Margaree, $60; C. F. Rathbun, Hortonville, $400 (that is in King's County, Nova Scotia, I think); T. Sullivan, Little Bras d'Or, $55; George Walls, Shelburne, $750; E. J. Thibeau, Thibeauville, in the county of Richmond, $100; R. Sutherland, River John, $150.

Hon. members of this committee will observe that in every case the fishery officers enjoying large salaries happen to reside in the counties of Nova Scotia represented by Conservative members, whereas in nearly every case the fishery overseers who must be content with a smaller salary happen to be discharging their duties in the counties of Nova Scotia represented by Liberal members.

Mr. DUGALD STEWART: What is the salary of the fishery officer in the county of Yarmouth?

Mr. KYTE: Mr. D'Entremont gets a salary of $800.

Mr. DUGALD STEWART: The hon. gentleman said he was in the county of Digby?

Mr. KYTE: It should be Yarmouth.

Mr. DUGALD STEWART: Represented by a Liberal?

Mr. KYTE: Unfortunately not represented at the present time, but it was represented by a Liberal. I scarcely imagine that the fishery officers who are residing in the counties represented by Conservatives have any more important duties to perform than the fishery officers in other parts of Nova Scotia. It is well known that Guysborough, Richmond, Inverness, Cape Breton are fishing counties, having a large portion of the population engaged in the fishing industry. The duties of inspectors in these counties are as important and the districts quite as large and as difficult to get over as in the other counties. I am not going to say at the present time that any of these gentlemen who enjoy the larger salaries are paid too much for their services, but if they are not paid too much, then the other fishery overseers whose names I have mentioned are not receiving a sufficient salary. I am aware that before the late Government went out of office the Fisheries Department and the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries had in contemplation the readjustment of the salaries of the officers I have mentioned. Nothing effective was done in that direction, and I regret very much that during the past five years the present minister has been unable to devise some plan whereby a more equitable adjustment of the salaries could be made and the grounds of complaint—and there are substantial grounds of complaint made by the fishery officers who are paid small salaries —removed. The salaries of fishery officers in the county of Richmond are: Mr. S. Boudrot, Petit de Grat, $100; Mr. Anthony Sampson, L'Ardoise, $125; Mr. Thibeau, $100. Probably a larger portion of the population of Richmond is engaged in fishing than in any other county in Nova Scotia. The work that is expected of the fishery officers of the county of Richmond, whose names I have just mentioned, is quite as important and exacting as the work that pertains to the offices of gentlemen occupying similar positions throughout Nova Scotia. If those who are enjoying a salary of $600, $700 or $800 are not paid too much for their services, then certainly the officers in my county are not paid sufficient salary. The discrepancy is entirely too great. I have to congratulate my hon. friends representing Lunenberg, Shelburn, Queens, Digby and Annapolis upon their ability to impress upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the necessity for securing larger salaries for the men discharging those duties in their respective constituencies. I find no fault with them whatever. I regret that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not been able, during the five years that he has been head of the department, to readjust the salaries so that the other fishery officers, whose names I have mentioned, would enjoy a salary adequate to the services which they perform. I am very glad to hear from the minister that the Government is contemplating a readjustment of the scale of salar-

ies, and I trust he will find himself able, during the present session of Parliament, to give some increase to the fishery officers to whom I have referred, who are in receipt of small salaries. No possible defence can be made that will adequately explain the discrepancies in the salaries which I have quoted to this committee, and if a more equitable adjustment of the salaries were made, I am sure it would give satisfaction to all those who are interested in the fishing industry.

Mr. HAZEN: As I stated this afternoon, I am disposed very largely to agree with what my hon. friend says, and I have no hesitation in saying that there should be a reorganization and a readjustment of these salaries in a very considerable portion of Nova Scotia. We have been able to get that organization effected at the present time in the western counties of Nova Scotia. The result is that the number of fishery officers has been very greatly reduced in the western counties, and those who remain are given larger districts, and paid better salaries than previously. In Annapolis county there is one fishery officer, in Digby county, two, Kings county, two; Lunenburg county, two; Queen county, two; Shelburne, two; and Yarmouth, one. Those gentlemen are all receiving salaries that are fairly reasonable. They are not too large, and in addition to their salaries, instead of being allowed a mileage rate for the number of miles they travel in making their tours of inspection, they are allowed $150 for horse hire, where they keep horses themselves. Coming down to the other end of Nova Scotia, in which my hon. friend is specially interested, I find there are in Cape Breton, eight fishery officers, and these fishery officers receive small salaries, running from $55 to $155, but in addition to that they are allowed ten cents a mile travelling allowance going from one place to another. Henry A. King, Little Bras d'Or, Edward Hall, Main-à-dieu, Angus McLean, Clarks Roads, Cape Breton; J. M. Gillis, Grand Mira, Allan McDonald, Gabarus Lake; Murdoch McLean, Leitches' Creek, Norman Ferguson, Port Morien; William Burke, Mira Ferry. In Inverness county there are six fishery officers; in Victoria county, seven.

Mr. KYTE: Will the hon. minister give me the names?

Mr. HAZEN: J. T. Donovan, Ingonish; Angus M. McDonald, Plaster, North Shore; J. M. Campbell, care of Marine Agent, Halifax; Allan McAulay, Big Baddeck; William Hellen, Cape North; Daniel J. Grant, Boulardarie East; A. F. McKenzie, Middle River.

Mr. McKENZIE: The name of the officer at Middle River is McDonald, not McKenzie.

Mr. HAZEN: The name is given here as A. J. McKenzie. While the salaries in Cape Breton are lower, many more fishery officers are employed there than in the western part of Nova Scotia, where we have effected a reorganization. I believe it is much better to have a few officers adequately paid and allowed a fixed amount of $150 for horse hire than to have a large number of officers who are paid small salaries and who receive a travelling allowance of 10 cents a mile. I hope to be able to effect a reorganization in Cape Breton and other parts of Nova Scotia in line with the reorganization which has been worked out during the last few years in the western part of Nova Scotia. There would not be much difference between the amount paid the officers in the island of Cape Breton by way of salaries, expenses and charges for mileage and the amount paid the officers in western Nova Scotia.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many officers are there in the county of Lunenburg?

Mr. HAZEN: Two, Austin J. Evans and L. J. Hebb. Mr. Evans has enlisted for overseas service. His salary, $700, is paid, less $1.10 a day, the amount of his pay from the Militia Department.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How much do the two officers in Guysborough receive?

Mr. HAZEN: $200 each.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In Lunenburg the two officers receive $1,450, against $400 received by the officers in Guysborough.

Mr. HAZEN: The fishery officers in Guysborough receive a travelling allowance of 10 cents a mile, which would amount to a considerably larger sum than the amount paid the fishery officers in Lunenburg for horse hire.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The travel and outlay of Mr. Hebb last year was $309.50, and that of Mr. Evans was $247.20.

Mr. HAZEN: Under the reorganization effected in western Nova Scotia, the fishery officers are allowed $150 for the keep of their horses. In Cape Breton and the other counties the officers get a mileage allowance of 10 cents a mile.

Mr. KYTE: The travelling expenses of the fishery officers in the island of Cape

Breton who are receiving salaries of from $50 to $100 are no greater than those of the fishery officers in western Nova Scotia who receive salaries as high as $500 and $700. Mr. Aymer, of Meteghan, whose salary is $500, received $248.58 for travel and outlay, whereas Mr. Thibeau of Richmond county, who gets a salary of $100, expended for travel and outlay only $212.21. Edward Chute, of Canada Creek, whose salary is $500, expended for travel and outlay $278.91, while Anthony Sampson, of L'Ardoise, whose salary is $125, expended for travel and outlay $239.45. The minister must be mistaken when he says that the fishery officers of Cape Breton are getting more for travel and outlay than the fishery officers of western Nova Scotia.

Mr. HAZEN: In the county of Cape Breton, where there are eight officers, the travelling allowances are about equal to those of the two officers in any one of the counties in western Nova Scotia. I do not think that the services in the former case are as effective, because if a man gets a fair salary he devotes his attention largely to the duties of the position, but he gets only a trifling salary of from $50 to $150 he regards the work as a kind of side-line and does not give it the attention that he otherwise would. I think it would be far better to reduce the number of officers in Cape Breton and pay adequate salaries to those who do perform the duties, as we do in western Nova Scotia. I do not say that the condition of affairs in Cape Breton is satisfactory; there must be a reorganization there as well.

Mr. KYTE: The county of Cape Breton has a much larger area and a much longer coast line than any of the counties in western Nova Scotia. It necessarily follows that more officers are required there. But the gross amount paid to the eight officers in the county of Cape Breton by way of salaries is very much less than the amount paid the two officers in the county of Digby. The same applies to all the counties in the island of Cape Breton. The total amount paid for salaries and allowances of officers in the county of Cape Breton is less than that paid the smaller number of officers in any of the counties in western Nova Scotia. Either the officers in western Nova Scotia are too well paid, or those in eastern Nova Scotia are not sufficiently paid.

Mr. COPP: The hon. member for Digby the other day made a proper statement of the present business methods of the Fisheries Department. This afternoon I cited a case where a fishery overseer or warden in New Brunswick, whose salary is $150 a year, received last year for travel and outlay, $718.20. The minister accounted for the amount of the travel and outlay by the fact that the overseers are given a travelling allowance of 10 cents a mile. The fishery overseer to whom I referred has certain duties in connection with the lobster fisheries, the open season for the district affected being from May 24 or 25 to August 10. I am not finding fault with this man or the amount that he is paid, but I contend that it is unbusinesslike to allow a man to be his own judge in the matter of the amount of travelling that he does, for which he receives 10 cents a mile.

I contend that Mr. Morrison, the inspector of the district which comprises five counties, who is paid a salary of $2,000 a year and who has received six or seven hundred dollars for travelling expenses, should organize those counties on a business basis, finding out what would be a reasonable remuneration for the overseers and paying them that amount. This is a matter of vital importance to the people. The same thing is true throughout the whole of New Brunswick, and I presume that the same thing exists in other provinces where fishery regulations require to be enforced. I find in the same county, within twenty miles of where Fishery Overseer Prescott lives, another overseer, Mr. Vinneau, of Barachois, who has a salary of $140 a year, and whose travel and outlay amounted to $1,008.54. Such a charge for travel and outlay is absolutely unjustifiable. I know the man and the district he has to work in. This matter should not be left in its present condition, because it is not conducive to good business or an honest expenditure of public money. I understood the minister to say that he had made a change in some portions of Nova Scotia, and I hope he will do the same in New Brunswick. I am not offering any criticism as to the amounts these men are paid; they should be paid a reasonable remuneration for their work, but they should be paid in such a way that the chief inspector will have a check on this expenditure, so that he can see that they are not paid for what they do not do or for any expenses not connected with their district. I find another man in Barachois in exactly the same district, with a salary of $140 and travelling expenses of $549. This man must have practically the same area to look after. When I was at home a few days ago, a gentleman from Prince Edward Island happened to call at

my office, and he asked me to bring a certain matter to the attention of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes), who I see is not in his seat. This gentleman told me that fishermen on that island started fishing for smelts without licenses for the reason that the officers had no licenses to grant them. They did not fish before the season opened, but they fished before they received licenses; they went on fishing without licenses, and they were fined for doing so. I do not say that my information is correct, but if it be so, it only goes to prove that the business of the department is not being looked after as it should be. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) said the other day that the department was getting into a rut and that it was time it got out of it. I do not criticise the minister for finding the rut because the department was in that state when he took office, but there is no excuse for the minister, after five years, not getting out of that rut and placing his department on a business-like basis.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend is quite correct in saying that the system which he is condemning so forcibly to-night—and I do not say without some justification—is the same system that I found in force when I came into office, and which has been in force since Confederation; but if he says that I should have got that system out of the rut in five years, I would like to know what my hon. friend has to say about his own party who were in power for fifteen years and never got that system out of the rut. I have got it out of the rut so far as western Nova Scotia is concerned, where we have made a reorganization that is working satisfactorily. We have a reorganization effected in all the western provinces and in British Columbia, and we hope to effect a reorganization along similar lines in other parts of Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, in Prince Edward Island, and in a section of Quebec. With regard to Prince Edward Island it is claimed that the habit has been for the fishermen to go on fishing and take out their licenses in the middle of the fishing season or after the season is over. That is a very bad and improper system, and notices were issued by the department—with the desire to get out of the rut that the hon. member refers to—that these licenses would have to be taken out before the season commenced, and these notices were distributed throughout the district where the fishing takes place. In view of that, if fishermen are allowed to continue fishing without taking out licenses, and if no attention is paid to such notices, how is one ever going to get business methods introduced or get out of the rut? In consequence of fishermen having disregarded those instructions, and having violated the law, they were in some cases brought before the Court, and where offences were proved against them, they were fined. I have been informed that the old habit had prevailed so long that people did not think we were in earnest when we said we intended to have a better system, and in view of that, that perhaps it would be a proper act this year, when we were for the first time enforcing the conditions, to have the fines refunded, and this matter is being considered by the department. My hon. friend, however, will see how unwise it would be to allow that system to continue, instead of to put it on more businesslike lines as he himself is advocating in this House to-night. It is represented to me that the statement made by my hon. friend that these licenses could not be procured is not the case. The licenses were there.

Mr. COPP: My information was that these men could not obtain their licenses in time for the opening of the season. As my hon. friend says, they had been in the habit of starting fishing without a license, and they fished for two or three days, not with any idea of evading or infringing upon the law or regulations with regard to the fishing of smelts, but because of the licenses not being procurable. They got the licenses two or three days later on, but informations were laid against them, and fines were imposed of $5 or $10 apiece and costs.

Mr. HAZEN: It was nothing of the kind; the amount they were fined was the amount of the license fee they would have had to pay in any case. Of course, there would be a certain small amount of costs.

Mr. BOULAY (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, since the committee is now considering the salaries of certain employees of the Marine Department, I shall take upon myself to offer a few remarks as to the electoral district of Rimouski-Matane. I have just heard my hon. friends on the other side of the House intimating that in their own constituencies the employees of the department are not as well paid as others in different parts of Nova Scotia, owing to political considerations. I shall point out to the hon. Minister of Marine that in the county of Rimouski, although

we are represented by a Conservative member, there are also public servants who are poorly paid, the more so during the present emergency brought on by the high cost of living. For instance, there is at Matane a lighthouse keeper who only gets $400 a year. He is not one of my political friend, but I think that in all fairness his salary is not high enough. A salary of $400 is hardly sufficient to support a family at the present juncture, and that man has to attend to the lighthouse day and night. Beside the salary I have just mentioned he gets $50 a year as telegraph operator, forming a total amount of $450. Now, I will point out to the hon minister that there is in the county of Rimouski another man who is not by any means a Government employee, Mr. McWilliams, who gets $500 either from the Marine Department or the Public Works Department. It is a bonus which has been granted to him by the former Administration. That man is a telegraph operator and reports each vessel the same as the operator at Matane. He gets $500 from the Government merely for reporting vessels, while the other who attends to the lighthouse day in and day out and who moreover acts as telegraph operator gets only $450.

It seems to me that this is a case of discrimination and that it would be an act of justice on the part of the Marine Department to adjust the salary of the operator at Matane. I shall go further and ask that the operator at Father Point be dispensed with.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Rouville): Has not Mr. McWilliam been dismissed?

Mr. BOULAY: He has been dismissed as lighthouse keeper.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: What was his salary as lighthouse keeper?

Mr. BOULAY: He gets $1,400 I think. In the course of May last I put the following question on the Order Paper:

Q. Has J. McWilliams, G.N.W. telegraph agent at Father Point, any position in the Government telegraph service? If so, what are his duties?

A. The Government telegraph has no wires on the south shore of the St. Lawrence. The work in connection with the shipping and signal service, which is mainly on that side of the river, is performed on the lines of the G.N.W. Telegraph Company, and the Government, to secure efficient service, makes an allowance towards the maintenance of the Father Point telegraph station, which is the most important one on the river. This allowance is $500 a year and has been paid since 1902 to the company's agent, Mr. J. McWilliams.

I am going to continue in English, so that my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) can understand better. There is another matter about the county of Rimouski to which, while I am on my feet, I desire to call the attention of the minister, and that is the rate allowed for the pay of the board of the pilots. That rate is only twenty-five cents a meal, the same rate that has been allowed for many years past. But for the last two years at any rate, that rate is much too low. The poor hotel-keepers ought not to be called upon to board these men at less than they pay for their provisions, even if they get nothing for their trouble. I think the Government should look into this matter and do justice not only to the public but also to the hotel-keepers.

Mr. CURRIE: Does the Government employ the pilots?

Mr. BOULAY: There is an agreement between the Government and the Pilot Board that the boards of the pilots while at Father Point shall be paid by the Government.

Mr. CURRIE: They draw large sums of money from private corporations do they not? They serve steamer lines and get so much a day, and the Government implement it by a grant of so much for each meal.

Mr. BOULAY: As I understand it, the arrangement was made some years ago between the Government and the Pilot Board. The question of their salaries did not enter into it, but, owing to special circumstances, the Government agreed to allow them 25 cents a meal for their board. With the present prices of food, unless this rate is increased, the situation will be intolerable.

Mr. HAZEN: I understood the hon. member (Mr. Boulay), in the first place, to complain of the salaries paid to guardians on the river at Matane. That is a matter he would have to bring to the attention of the Government of the province of Quebec, because the guardians who protect the river at Matane are appointed by the provincial government and paid by them, or under arrangement with the local government, by the lessees of the river. Regarding the matter at Father Point, to which he refers, this, of course, affects the Marine Department. The Estimates of that department were passed the other evening. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman did not bring this matter forward then,

because the Deputy Minister of Marine was present, and more definite information could have been given than I am able to give at this time. I understand that an arrangement was made by which Mr. McWilliams, telegraph operator, is paid $400 a year for supplying certain information of value to the signal service and for information of the boats going up and down the river of value to the agents of those boats. I understand the hon. gentleman to complain, that the amount paid to Mr. McWilliams is in excess of the amount paid to an officer elsewhere. I will look into the matter to see if there is any discrepancy and whether the allowance made to the operator at the other point should be brought up to that paid to Mr. McWilliams. The hon. gentleman also referred to the allowance made for board of the pilots. My attention was called to this matter for the first time few days ago. It was represented to me that years ago an agreement was made that the pilots that go to Father Point, and wait there to take vessels up the St. Lawrence from the sea, were allowed 25 cents a meal. It was represented that, in view of the high cost of living, this rate was not sufficient, and that it ought to be increased to 40 cents a meal. I instructed the officials to look up the file and get the facts, so that I could look into the matter and see just what the liability of Parliament was. As soon as I get the facts I shall be prepared to deal with the case.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have listened to the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) with some regret. I thought he had forgotten his recent quarrels with Mr. McWilliams. I regret that Mr. McWilliams was dismissed as lighthouse keeper some years ago, but, of course, the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) had to yield to the pressure which was put upon him. I do not know whether it may have been Mr. McWilliams' sins of omission or commission, but let it be said that the Shipping Federation has stood by Mr. McWilliams from the very beginning. He is a man of great ability and one who thoroughly knows his business. He has fortunately been kept as the telegraph operator. It is admitted amongst those who know him in the province, and particularly amongst the business men, that he is one of the ablest operators in Canada. It is really a pity that Mr. McWilliams was dismissed and that he lost such a good income as the one he had when he was lighthouse keeper. He is highly respected by the business community. He was one of the few English-speaking employees of the Government in the whole district of Quebec. I repeat that it is a pity

9 p.m.

that such a man was dismissed from office but fortunately the minister did not yield to the pressure put upon him to dismiss him as telegraph operator. If my hon. friend from Rimouski will accept the opinion of such men as Lord Shaughnessy, or the president of the Shipping Federation in Montreal, he will know that Mr. McWilliams is one of the safest, one of the ablest, men they had in the service. I think my hon. friend ought now to insist that Mr. McWilliams be restored to his former position. I know that he had some petty quarrels with him but after all a man is a man and in times like the present we ought to forget these old feuds. I regret exceedingly that Mr. McWilliams' salary has been curtailed to the extent that it has and my hon. friend should do an act of justice, be a man, and have him restored to his former position.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): I am rather surprised that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) should attempt to vindicate the worst case of political partisanship extant in the county of Rimouski and Matane. If ever public officer was rightfully dismissed, Mr. McWilliams is the man. He was for a period of thirty-six years in the service of the Government and he acknowledged to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he had been an active political worker against the Conservative party during that period. I believe the Liberal party would not have been slow in dismissing him had he worked against them.

Hon. Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure) (Translation): A fault confessed is half pardoned.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): The Liberal party has never been very much in the habit of pardoning, and I do not think he would have been pardoned under such conditions.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Translation): It is never too late to reform.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): I may say to the hon.member for Rouville that should he wish to vindicate political partisanship, he might surely select a better case; Mr. McWilliams' case is the worst to be found not only in the county of Rimouski, but throughout the province of Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): Please speak French.

The Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Translation): Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): Certainly.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Translation): Apart from politics, is it not a fact that Mr. McWilliams was a first rate man, perfectly well posted and known as such to the shippers?

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): I cannot say anything as to his qualifications and his standing with the shippers; all I know is that Mr. McWilliams apparently performed his work fairly well, though he ignored the regulations of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in reference to political partisanship. To my knowledge he even went so far as to start a riot against a Conservative candidate in 1904. As to his qualifications, the hon. member for Rouville has just stated that he was a first rate man and that he should never have been dismissed. To that, I may reply, that his successor is vastly superior to him, as he knows a great deal more about machinery. When that newly appointed man reached the lighthouse after Mr. McWilliams' departure, he found the signalling apparatus utterly out of order. I noticed the fact myself when I went to Father Point.

I have no hesitation in saying that as a telegraph operator he was perfectly qualified, but I do not see why he should receive $500 for that work, while Mr. Banville, of Matane, who is quite as capable, is allowed only $50 for the same work.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX (Translation): Is not the station at Father Point of greater importance than that at Matane?

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): The Father Point station receives and sends out more telegrams than the one at Matane, but most of these telegrams are sent out by travellers on board the vessels, and the agent is paid a commission on them, over and above the salary he gets from the Government. As regards the signalling of ships, the Father Point operator has no more to do than the one at Matane.

In justice to Mr. Banville who, by the way, is not a political friend of mine, I think the Department of Marine and Fisheries should grant him an increase such as to enable him to live comfortably; and that increase will be well merited, while Mr McWilliams gets $500 which he does not earn, though it was granted to him by the previous Administration.

I happen to know something of the inner story of those representations made by the shipping federation in favour of Mr. McWilliams; and the hon. member for Rouville is also well posted in that regard. He knows that Mr. McWilliams speaks both languages perfectly, and is universally known, besides being an expert at self-advertising.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: (Translation) Is he not an honest man?

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): He managed to ingratiate himself with the Shipping Federation and many of the shippers, and obtained from them letters of approval when dismissal was staring him in the face; he even succeeded in inducing our respected bishop of Rimouski to write on his behalf. That is some evidence of the wiliness of that gentleman, but not proof of any superiority of his over the man who has been appointed in his stead. I, for one, knowing both men personally, I may say, without prejudice, that the newly appointed man is greatly superior to his predecessor.

Mr. LOGGIE: I wish to ask the minister if he considers $120 a fair salary for a man who travels 10,000 miles, as I see in one case in the Auditor General's Report?

Mr. HAZEN: He gets ten cents a mile for travelling.

Mr. LOGGIE: He gets $1,008 for travelling expenses. Is $120 a reasonable remuneration for a man who will give sufficient time to travel with a horse and waggon from Sydney to Vancouver and back again?

Mr. HAZEN: That includes ten cents a mile for the distance he travels, and in addition to that his living expenses while he is travelling, the baiting of his horse, etc. That method of payment was adopted many years ago, and has been continued. I do not say it is a desirable system, but it has long been in existence. I have no doubt that when that plan was first adopted the idea in mind was that the payment of the ten cents a mile would be an inducement to the man appointed to keep moving, and so to cover the greatest possible distance in his district, which would tend to make his inspection more useful.

Mr. LOGGIE: This seems an unreasonable proportion. In the same district

another man received $509 for travelling expenses, which would mean another 5,000 miles. So in that district, which I know to some extent, these two men seem to have travelled 15,000 miles, and between them they received in salary $260.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What duties are performed by Mr. Ward Fisher?

Mr. HAZEN: He is the assistant in the department to Mr. Founds, the Superintendent of Fisheries.

Mr. McKENZIE: And where does he travel?

Mr. HAZEN: He does not do very much travelling nowadays, but he has been sent on several trips to investigate matters that have arisen in the Maritime Provinces. He was sent down to look into certain breaches of the legislation that were alleged in Prince Edward Island and to report on them.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I see his travelling expenses for the year were $438. How many trips did he make to the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. HAZEN: Whatever expenses there are charged are subject to be audited by the accountant of the department.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is his salary?

Mr. HAZEN: $2,100.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister kindly give me the regulations as to the minimum size of lobsters in the Maritime Provinces? I am anxious to have them placed on Hansard.

Mr. HAZEN: We shall allow one item to stand and I shall place on record the regulations showing the size limit, close seasons, etc.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Some time ago a dealer in St. John showed me samples of lobsters that were allowed to be caught in Nova Scotia. They were about three or four inches in length. It seemed a sin to destroy these very small lobsters, long before they were capable of reproduction. Several years ago I asked a question in regard to a condition which was being inserted in licenses for catching fish in the waters of Charlotte county. These regulations were inserted by the minister before the provincial election of 1912.

Mr. HAZEN: After that, I think.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister provided by regulation that fishermen should be obliged to give the Canadian canners the preference; even although an American buyer might be alongside his boat, if a Canadian canner made an equal offer to the fisherman he would be obliged to give the preference to the Canadian. There was quite a rumpus about it in Charlotte, and just before the provincial election my hon. friend suspend the order.

Mr. HAZEN: That clause was put in at the time on the recommendation of Mr. Calder, who for a good many years past has been inspector in the counties of Charlotte and St. John. A large sum was being invested in a sardine factory at St. Annes and it was Mr. Calder's view, which was confirmed by the department, that it was desirable with a view of getting fish from our waters manufactured in Canada, that some preference should be given in order that this factory might be able to get plenty of material to manufacture the sardines. Unfortunately, however, the factory did not prove a financial success. It hardly got under way before it got into difficulties, and the result was that, after reconsideration of the matter, that clause was taken out of the license.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Its operation was suspended before the factory ceased operations; it was suspended just prior to the provincial elections of 1912.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not remember the date.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I wonder that it would not impress itself on the minister.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think there was anything that, in the language of the Minister of Finance, would synchronize.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Oh, they synchronized, because there was a great deal of dissatisfaction among the men and an order went out from the department suspending the operation of this regulation until further orders. I was curious as to what happened afterwards.

Mr. HAZEN: It has never been restored.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am sorry that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Hartt) is not present, but he will have an opportunity of seeing my remarks in Hansard. My hon. friend will find among the correspondence in his department and in a return which he brought down upon my motion, a letter from the deputy minister asking Mr. Hartt's opinion upon this regulation, whether it would be advisable to put it into force, showing that the opinion of the member was being taken; and the minister will also find in that correspondence a letter

of a very extraordinary character from Mr. Hartt, the member for Charlotte, in which the hon. member approves of its being done, but recommends that new licenses be issued and that this restriction be printed instead of being written in so that it would not attract the special attention of the fisherman getting a license. That is a curious letter to come from an hon. member. I ask if my hon. friend's attention was ever called to it and if he ever took any steps with regard to the matter.

Mr. HAZEN: My attention was never called to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. minister would not approve of that extraordinary position. I trust he will, at a later date, refer to the letter, and ask the hon. member from Charlotte to explain to the House, if he can, why he should have written such a letter. If it meant anything at all it was intended to deceive—perhaps not to deceive, but to shut the eyes of people—

Mr. HAZEN: When was it sent?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Either two or three sessions ago. That evidently was written with a knowledge on the part of the hon. gentleman that the regulation would be likely to provoke hostility among the fishermen, and the department was advised to have new licenses issued with this restriction in print, so that it would not attract the attention of the fishermen, as it would if it were written in the license. I intended last session to bring it to the attention of my hon. friend and the hon. gentleman from Charlotte.

Mr. McKENZIE: Referring to Ward Fisher, I find his name figuring in the Auditor General's Report, as a fishery inspector. Is that the same Ward Fisher, of Shelburne?

Mr. HAZEN: He was inspector in Nova Scotia before he was brought to the department here.

Mr. McKENZIE: How did he get transferred from the position of inspector to the hon. minister's department? Did he go through the hands of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Passed his examination?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: How old was he when he passed the examination?

Mr. HAZEN: Forty-three.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there an age limit in the Civil Service?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, thirty-five.

Mr. HAZEN: He came in as an expert.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Under section 21.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand he is a God-fearing man, who knows theology well. Is that the extent of his expert knowledge?

Mr. HAZEN: I have always considered it an admirable thing to have a thorough knowledge of Holy Writ, and a man who is a good fisher of men should also become a good official in the Fisheries Department.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is authority for saying that those who preach the gospel should live by the gospel, and that the servant is worthy of his hire, and I suppose he made a failure of preaching and thought he was fit for the department of my hon. friend.

Mr. HAZEN: That would not be a natural conclusion.

Mr. MARCIL: Merely an inference.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is the same man?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: And he came in under section 21?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes. My recollection is that we asked the Civil Service Commission for an officer. They advertised for applicants; he was an applicant and the commission stated that he possessed the necessary qualifications and gave him the certificate.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that when you appoint a man under section 21 it is largely a matter for the minister, apart from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. HAZEN: Oh, no.

Mr. McKENZIE: If he passes as an expert, he does not require to pass an examination.

Mr. HAZEN: They have to endorse him. They consider whether he has the technical knowledge requisite; they endorse him and he passes through the Civil Service examination, as many others do.

Mr. McKENZIE: Section 21 of the Civil Service Act reads:

If the deputy head reports that the knowledge and ability requisite for the position are wholly or in part professional, technical or otherwise peculiar, the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the head of the

department based on the report in writing of the deputy head, may appoint a person to the position without competitive examination and without reference to the age limit, provided the said person obtains from the Commission a certificate, to be given with or without examination, as is determined by the regulations of the Commission, that he possesses the requisite knowledge and ability and is duly qualified as to health, character and habits.

What was the technical knowledge which was required in the department, and which this man possessed?

Mr. HAZEN: That was the knowledge which would be obtained by practical experience in connection with fishery work. Mr. Fisher had that practical knowledge through his experience as inspector in Nova Scotia. To appoint a man who had no knowledge of fisheries to assist the Fisheries Commission would be an absurdity. We wanted a capable man and applied to the Civil Service Commission for him. They advertised for such a man and there were a number of applicants. The view of the Civil Service Commission was that Mr. Fisher possessed the qualifications necessary for the position to a greater degree than any of the other applicants, and, therefore, on the report of the deputy minister, Mr. Desbarats, being made, as required by the Act the appointment was made.

Mr. McKENZIE: Can the minister tell us how long it was between the time this man gave up his calling as a preacher and the time he qualified as an expert in fisheries?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not that knowledge.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am told that he distinguished himself, not so much as a preacher, but as a politician, and as a political preacher and ward heeler, he brought himself conspicuously to the notice of the Conservative party, and that that was his recommendation and he required very little else. His expert knowledge of fisheries, which he gained perhaps in a year as inspector, was very slight indeed, perhaps they rubbed him over a codfish and he smelt of fish, and that is about all the knowledge that he possessed. I find in the Auditor General's Report a name which attracts my attention, W. E. Fraser, of Liverpool, Nova Scotia. It is the wandering official of my hon. friend's department that I met down at Cape Smoky in the county of Victoria, in the midwinter of 1912, in the midst of a local election?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know, I am sure.

Mr. McKENZIE: I asked this question before, and the hon. minister told me yes, this was the same man, and I am curious to know whether, in his travelling expenses, he has been dividing and adding so much each year to make up for what it cost him to go down to Cape Smoky.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not know if he was our officer then.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think it is strong evidence that he was the officer of the department both before and after that.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What did he do at Smoky?

Mr. McKENZIE: He told them that he had been sent there as a special officer of the Militia Department. I assume that he was the expert whom the Minister of Marine lent to the Department of Militia to go down there and talk about the $100 that each man was to get as his share of the Fenian Raid bounty. He made a specialty during that campaign of telling the old men on that shore that he had the authority and the money to pay them a share of the Fenian Raid bounty, the only condition being their signing a declaration that they would vote for the candidate of the Tory party. That was sworn to in the Supreme Court at Baddeck by one man to whom he offered the money. I have brought this matter to the attention of the minister on previous occasions, but he still thinks the gentleman in question to be a very deserving official. I should not be surprised if his salary should be raised as compensation for the excellent service which he rendered.

I should like to get some idea from the minister as to the duties of the fishery overseers. I find that Mr. Hellen, of the district of Cape North, whose salary is $120, gets a travelling allowance of $262.49. Cape North is a very small district, and unless the overseer is busy all the time, I do not think he could earn that much money. As the member for Westmorland has said, these men should be paid on a more businesslike basis. Ingonish is also a comparatively small district. The overseer, Mr. Donovan, receives a salary of $60, but he travels quite a distance to earn it, for his allowance for travel and outlay last year was $389.32. Mr. McDonald, of Plaster, North Shore, gets a salary of $60, and last year his travel and outlay was $187.51. I think I was in error in saying that the officer for Middle River was Mr. McDonald. The member for Inverness informs me that Mr. McDonald has been replaced by a Mr.

McKenzie. I should like to know whether Mr. McDonald resigned or was dismissed; I know that he is still living in the district and that he was appointed by this Government. Another man whose district is near the others that I have mentioned gets a salary of $60 and received $220.92 last year for travelling expenses. These districts are all quite small. It is possible that the fishery officers have much travelling to do; if they are earning the money, it is all right, but if they are not, they should not be getting it. How is this mileage made up? Is there any check on it?

Mr. HAZEN: Formerly there were two fishery officers did the work now performed by Mr. Hellen, but the districts were amalgamated, and given to Mr. Hellen. The other inspectors received $60 each; he receives $120. The officers are allowed 10 cents a mile for their actual travelling expenses in addition to whatever expenses they may incur by way of board and the keeping of their horses. They are under the direction of the inspector for the district, by whom their accounts are checked before they are sent forward for payment. The fishery officer himself certifies to the correctness of the account before it goes to the inspector. The inspector goes over it, and if he thinks an improper charge is made, he cuts it down. It is then passed on to the accountant of the department. That is the system that has prevailed for a great many years.

Mr. McKENZIE: What travelling had to be done in Ingonish last year?

Mr. HAZEN: I shall be very glad, if the hon. gentleman is interested, to produce the accounts of the inspector showing the returns made from month to month, so that the hon. gentleman may examine them for himself.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are these inspectors expected to look after the lobster factories only?

Mr. HAZEN: They are appointed in connection with all fisheries.

Mr. McKENZIE: What other fisheries would they have to attend to in a district like Ingonish?

Mr. HAZEN: A lot of trap fishing is done about Ingonish under license.

Mr. McKENZIE: What has the inspector to do after the licenses have been issued?

Mr. HAZEN: From month to month he has to make returns of the fish that are caught. It is his duty to see that no illegal fishing takes place.

Mr. McKENZIE: That would not require any travelling as far as Ingonish is concerned, because all the fishermen land at the same place.

Mr. HAZEN: I cannot speak of my own knowledge about that.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In regard to the men in western Nova Scotia who get $150 for the expense of keeping a horse, as well as certain travelling expenses, I may point out that the salary of Mr. W. E. Fraser is $750 and that his travelling expenses last year were $665.78. Deducting $150 for the keeping of his horse, there remains $515.78, or about $1.50 a day, for expenses not including his salary and the keep of his horse.

Mr. HAZEN: That would be for his board, such railway fare as he might have to incur, and everything of that sort.

Mr. SINCLAIR: He is not supposed to use his own horse except when it would suit him to do so.

Mr. HAZEN: He is supposed to use it in places where it is more suitable to use a horse than the railway. In some places it would be cheaper to use the railway.

Mr. SINCLAIR: As we know something about this man's career, and as we would like to have the details, at the same time as the minister furnishes the details for my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie), would he give us the information in regard to Mr. W. E. Fraser?

Mr. BOULAY: I would like to have an explanation from the minister in regard to the lighthouse keeper at Matane. I understood the minister to say that he was an officer of the Quebec Government.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend was, of course, speaking in a language with which I am not very familiar, but I understood him to complain about the salary paid to the guardian on the Matane river.

Mr. BOULAY: No, the lighthouse keeper. The man of whom I was speaking was Mr. Banville, the lighthouse keeper at Matane.

Mr. HAZEN: I misunderstood my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The man is a good Liberal.

Mr. HAZEN: What does my hon. friend say about him?

Mr. BOULAY: His salary is only $400 a year, and he has to attend to that lighthouse during the summer season night and day. He receives far too small a salary for the work he is doing in comparison with the salaries paid to other lighthouse keepers.

Mr. HAZEN: The lighthouses are divided into classes, and each man is paid the salary of the class in which his lighthouse is placed. That class depends upon the importance and character of the light, the work that is to be performed and the qualifications necessary. In lights of a very high order, you need a man of much higher technical knowledge and skill than you do in a case where the light is not in the same class. This gentleman is getting the salary of the class in which his light is placed. It may be that there is an improper classification; that he ought to be in a higher class. I will have inquiry made into the matter, but I think inquiry will show that the light is properly classified, and that the man is receiving the salary for that class, no matter in what part of the country he is situated.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some days ago I received a letter from a citizen of Matane complaining about the department having changed the range lights. I think white lights were replaced by red lights, much to the disadvantage of the mariners. I am informed that the entrance at the mouth of the river Matane is very difficult, and that the old lights, which were provided by the department, were quite acceptable and much better for the mariners. Letters have been sent to the department inquiring why the change was made, and no one has been able to give a reason.

Mr. HAZEN: I answered that question in this House the other day. Letters came from people in the neighbourhood of the Matane who were interested; the question was referred to the department by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay). In the ordinary course of routine the matter was referred to the Lighthouse Board for investigation and report, and having investigated the matter, the Lighthouse Board recommended a change which has been carried into effect. Since the change has been made some complaints have been made by people who think it would be better to return to the old system. My hon. friend spoke as though a red light was a better light than a white light. A white light is seen better at a distance than a red light, and the mariners prefer a white light. There are places where for certain reasons you cannot put a white light, and you have to put a red light.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I quite agree with the minister that a white light is much better than a red light, but I am making no complaint personally. I have received correspondence upon the subject, and if the Lighthouse Board has passed judgment in the matter I have nothing more to say, but as fresh complaints have been made I would be glad if my hon. friend would ask the board to look into the matter again and see if the complaints are warranted.

Mr. BOULAY: I know all the particulars. When the red lights were put in, we believed they would be a great improvement to navigation. Recently I was speaking to some sailors that frequent the port of Matane, and they told me that they would not, on any consideration, have those lights removed. Those two range lights have been put in to improve the navigation of the harbour. Before they were put in there was a white light at one end of the wharves. I understand that this white light has been removed, and Doctor Bouillon, for one, wants it replaced. I never requested that this white light be taken away, but I insisted strongly upon the two red range lights being put on, and all the sailors think that it is a great improvement.

Mr. MARCIL: I would not like this interesting discussion on fishery inspectors to close without having a word with the minister, because he told the committee some time ago that this reorganization had also been extended to a part of Quebec.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend misunderstood me. I said that a reorganization had been made effective in western Nova Scotia and that we hoped soon to get it extended to other places.

Mr. MARCIL: I wish to point out that the officers in Quebec are not so well treated as those in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I find that Mr. Bouillon received for travel and outlay $5.88. I know him very well; he is connected with a large fishing firm down there. I do not know what he could have done for $5.88. I pass on to Mr. William Henry of Bonaventure East, who received for travel and outlay $64.40, and Mr. James Poirier of Shigawake, who received for travel and outlay $87.20. Does this comprise salary as well as travel and outlay?

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Bouillon has practically no travelling to do at all. He is employed for the purpose of sending us statistics of fisheries in his immediate district.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to know whether these men are paid a fixed salary.

Mr. HAZEN: I fancy that the cases referred to are those of men employed in connection with the fishing bounties who are appointed according to the number of bounty claims that they take.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that the hon. minister will furnish me with a copy of the recommendations to council on the appointment of Mr. Ward Fisher, and the Order in Council.

Mr. HAZEN: I shall lay them on the Table.

Mr. KYTE: With regard to the bounty claim work, is that done by the fishery officer?

Mr. HAZEN: In nearly all districts.

Mr. KYTE: I think it has been taken away from Mr. Boudreault, the fishery officer at Petit de Grat.

Mr. HAZEN: I think there were complaints as to the manner in which Mr. Boudreau discharged the duty, and it was thought undesirable to place the work in his hands again, and my recollection is that he has ceased to be an officer of the department. I believe that his successor also is named Boudreau.

Mr. MARCIL: Has an appointment been made in the case of Mr. Jos. Riendeau of the Montreal district, who died?

Mr. HAZEN: No appointment has been made.

Mr. MARCIL: Who does the work formerly done by the late Commander Wakeham?

Mr. HAZEN: Dr. Bernier.

Mr. MARCIL: I see here the name of Captain Chalifour of L'Islet who was paid $300 as an inspector. What is that for?

Mr. HAZEN: Captain Chalifour in addition to his other duties, acted as inspector after the death of Commander Wakeham, and before the appointment of Dr. Bernier.

Mr. MARCIL: Does his salary remain what it was at his appointment?

[Mr. Marcil.]

Mr. HAZEN: It has not been increased.

Oyster culture, $6,000.

Mr. KYTE: Will the minister say what is being done in this service?

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend will find a full report of the work done last year at page 300 of the Fisheries Report.

Mr. MACDONALD: An oyster bed was established at Cariboo in my county. What has been the result?

Mr. HAZEN: I understand that an experimental bed was planted there, under the direction of Mr. Kemp, six or seven years ago. My attention has not been called to it. Some years ago, as my hon. friend will remember, the provincial government, under agreement with the Dominion Government, took control over the barren bottoms, some of which are now leased to private parties for the planting of oyster beds. I fancy that the bed to which the hon. gentleman refers passed to the provincial government at the same time.

Mr. COPP: Has the Dominion Government supervision of the oyster beds recently planted along the shores of New Brunswick?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. COPP: They are managed by private companies?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, under lease from the government of New Brunswick. There was a question of jurisdiction as to these barren bottoms, and five years ago we made an arrangement by which we gave over to the provinces authority to deal with them. It is under arrangement with the provincial government that these are now taken over and cultivated by private companies.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then, what has the Dominion Government to do with oyster culture now?

Mr. HAZEN: We control the public beds.

Mr. MACDONALD: How do you distinguish the public beds from the others? The particular place to which I refer is in a public harbour.

Mr. HAZEN: The public beds are those in which the oysters grown naturally, and which are resorted to by the fishermen to rake oysters; private beds are those where the oysters are planted on barren bottoms under arrangement with the government of the province. The oysters in these latter beds cannot be taken by parties other than those who own the rights, but access to the

public beds in Price Edward Island, New Brunswick or Nova Scotia is open to those who have licenses from the Dominion Government to rake oysters. These public beds are being looked after and kept in order, and as far as possible improved, by Mr. Kemp, the advisor of the department in regard to oysters.

Mr. MACDONALD: By permission of the minister and the committee, I desire to call attention to another matter, as I was not here the other night when, perhaps, it might more properly have been brought up. I have a letter from a gentleman in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, who is interested in an account for food material supplied to Mr. Byrnes, steward of the Minto, on 24th November, 1913. The amount of the account is $74.91, and the food supplies were procured to serve the passengers on the D.G.S. Minto. He was an official of the department, and it is stated in the correspondence that he gave bonds to the department that all these accounts would be paid. It is said that the bondsmen were John Messerny and Maurice Blake, of Charlottetown. I do not know what became of Mr. Burns, but he did not pay all the accounts, and they are still owing. The department said to those who supplied these goods: "You will have to go and collect the accounts yourselves." Subsequently, it appears that they said that they had so much money in their hands and they were making a pro rata division. These are the facts as they have been presented to me. It is hardly fair to people who supply goods to the Government steamers, in the belief that they are being supplied to the Government, and, therefore, that they have the Government to look to for payment should be told afterwards that the persons who purchased these goods, and who had all the ear-marks of purchasing for the Government, was purchasing for his own account, and when it turned out that he was financially embarrassed the Government would not see that the accounts were paid where the goods were actually furnished. I have read the correspondence and I think I am fairly stating the case. I would not ask the minister to give me an answer to-night, but if he has another item relating to marine matters I would like him to get the facts and let me know why it is that the parties who supplied goods to Government steamers are not able to get their money.

Mr. HAZEN: I think my hon. friend has stated the facts of the case correctly. This man, however, was not an official of the Government. The Government made a contract with him to supply food to the officers and crew on board this Government boat. For a great many years a system prevailed by which the Government appointed a steward on a Government boat and the steward purchased for it, charging the accounts to the Government. It was found that that system resulted in a great deal of extravagance and a number of years ago a different system was entered into under which the Government made a contract with the steward who undertook to supply, according to a bill of fare that had been laid down, the officers and men at so much a meal. The Government, every year now, gives notice in the newspapers in the localities that the boat will visit that the Government will not be responsible for the bills contracted by this steward. In the first year or two of this new system these notices were not given and it was represented to us on a number of occasions that stewards got credit through representing that they were acting on behalf of the Government, and that they went away, or disappeared, or did not pay their bills and the people came and claimed these bills from the Government. I remember that when the first of these items was claimed, and before public notice was given in the newspapers, I got authority by an estimate in Parliament to pay to these people seventy-five per cent of their claims, it being felt that was a fair amount to pay and that they would have to forego any profit that they would have made. We then undertook to get bonds for these stewards. We found it impossible to get any guarantee company to guarantee them. However, they gave individual bonds. Mr. Burns gave the bond of two gentlemen resident in Charlottetown and when we demanded payment of the bills left unpaid there was objection made. Then we placed the matter in the hands of the Department of Justice and I understand that an arrangement has been come to by which the amount has been paid and it was distributed pro rata among the creditors of the steward. That is my recollection of the circumstances but I will endeavour to look into the case and see whether my recollection is absolutely correct or not. I have no doubt that in some cases people may have been deceived and may have thought that this Government was at the back of these people and was responsible. But in none of the cases where they claimed that, we found on investigation that the charges

10 p.m.

on the books were not to the Government or to the ship but to the individual and the evidence was very clear that they knew that the individual was simply a contractor of the Government and was himself responsible and that the Government was not responsible. I have stated the facts as I remember them but we have a marine item standing and I will give them more accurately to my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD: As to the Justice Department, the gentleman who writes me says that Mr. Macdonald, who was the agent of the Department of Justice, told him that after he had issued the papers he received a wire from Ottawa instructing him to discontinue the proceedings. Then he states that this spring the agent of the department offered fifty cents on the dollar to certain creditors and that quite a number of creditors were in favour of agreeing to the settlement rather than waiting. In the case of J. P. Crockett & Co. of Charlottetown, they had a bill of $450 and attached certain moneys of the Government and were paid in full. Messrs. Drake & Co. also should be paid in full.

Mr. HAZEN: I will be very glad to look into it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I see in the Auditor General's Report that this item, No. 253, covers the services of Dr. Hjort who was employed, I understand, by the department for some months in 1915. I was very glad to know that the minister was able to secure the services of Dr. Hjort as he is one of the most eminent men in Europe on questions relating to the fisheries. I believe he has been deputy minister of fisheries in Norway and he has written some scientific works which are greatly valued by fishing interests. Incidentally, there is no country in Europe that has done more to give practical information to the fishermen than Norway. I find in the Canadian Fisherman a very interesting item in this connection which I would like to read to the minister:

Fishing By Telephone.

A strange way of discovering the whereabouts of fish is practised in some parts of Norway, and the method was discovered by a clever Norwegian. A microphone, which is an instrument that will transmit the slightest sound, is lowered into the water from a fishing-boat and a wire from the microphone is attached to a telephone fixed in the boat. The operator takes the receiver of the telephone and places it to his ear, ready to signal to the fishermen when he hears the least sound beneath the waters, and the fishing-boat is then immediately steered in the direction whence the sounds come. The result is—a splendid haul.

As cod, herrings, and mackerel swim in enormous schools, their passage through the water causes a rushing sound which is clearly heard by the fishermen, who immediately steer in the required direction and let down their nets.

Has the minister heard of this very interesting invention and has he made any experiments, and with what results?

Mr. HAZEN: I never heard of it until my attention was called a short time ago to the article which has just been read. It is certainly a most interesting subject.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister take some interest in the question?

Mr. HAZEN: I will ask my fishery officers to look into the matter.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Have the services of Dr. Hjort been dispensed with?

Mr. HAZEN: He is no longer with us, he would not stay any longer.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has he made his final report?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, and the report is, I think, in the printer's hands now, and will soon be ready for distribution.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the minister doing anything for cold storage for bait this year?

Mr. HAZEN: Nothing more than in previous years. We are following on the same lines, but we have no new projects.

Fisheries—To provide for the reduction of dogfish by means of experimental works or otherwise, $60,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: What does the minister propose to do with this dogfish since he has adopted him into the family and christened him with a new name?

Mr. HAZEN: I fancy it will be a few years before we can convert all the dogfish into food. We will continue the operation of the reduction plants.

Mr. TURGEON: What about the dogfish reduction works at Shippegan? Last year the minister advertised it for sale.

Mr. HAZEN: It was sold by public tender to the highest bidder and handed over to him.

Mr. TURGEON: On the condition that it be operated?

Mr. HAZEN: No, it is to be discontinued.

Mr. KYTE: Has the dogfish reduction plant at Canso been able to take care of all dogfish offered each season?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, and it could have taken care of many more.

Mr. KYTE: What is the price now paid for dogfish?

Mr. HAZEN: It is $4 a ton.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: The minister says that the plant at Canso was able to take care of all dogfish available. How far along the coast does the minister go for the dogfish?

Mr. HAZEN: It is brought in to us by the fishermen and we collect it at different places. We go across as far as Arichat and down along the coast. The works took in last year 1,092 tons, 1,680 pounds. From that was produced 134½ tons of fish scrap and 8,876 gallons of oil. The Clark's harbour plant took in of raw material 164 tons, 774 pounds and produced from that of offal 111 tons and livers 228¾ buckets. These works produced 34 tons, 450 pounds of fish scrap and 693½ gallons of dogfish oil and 131½ gallons of cod oil.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: My information is that the department sent a boat down the coast of Inverness as far as Port Hood to gather dogfish twice during the whole season. It must be apparent to the minister that he cannot expect to get much dogfish by taking two trips in three months. It is difficult to keep any quantity of fish for two or three weeks in the hot season, particularly fish of this kind without a proper cold storage protection.

Mr. HAZEN: My understanding is that they keep in touch from the factory with the buyer down in that locality and when there is enough accumulated to make it worth while they send down a boat to get it. Some seasons two trips are made, and some seasons more.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: The fact is that there is no inducement offered to the fishermen there to catch any quantity of the fish. When the minister says that the plant at Canso is capable of taking care of all fish available, I think he is not quite correct in his statement or acquainted with the industry. The capacity of the plant at Canso is 50 tons a day. If it is a good thing to continue this industry, my idea is that it should be extended a little. If there is any justification for keeping it going there is three times the justification for establishing plants along the coast of Inverness county where there is abundance of fish available. To say that a plant with a capacity of 50 tons a day would take care of all fish caught along the coast of Inverness is an extreme exaggeration saying the least. There are thousands of tons of fish available if reasonable prices are paid and proper means of transportation facilities provided.

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps I did not use a very fortunate word. I meant to say that we were able to take care of all the dogfish offered that was available to us during this year. I do not mean to say that it could take care of all the dogfish that could possibly be got together. I perhaps used a word that conveyed a wrong meaning.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: If the minister had a system of collecting these dogfish—

Mr. McKENZIE: Grayfish, since yesterday.

Mr. HAZEN: The Act has not passed yet.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I think the change is a good one. I think if the minister proposes to continue the operation of the plant at Canso, it would be necessary for him to send boats along the coast of Inverness to gather fish and also along the shores of Richmond county. I have made that suggestion to the minister several times. I would suggest that he establish a plant along the coast of Inverness county for two reasons: From the standpoint of the fishermen it would be really a great relief. I had the promise of the late Government that this would be done in the winter of 1911 had the change come in the fall of that year and my hon. friend took charge of the Department. Our fishermen suffer for about two and one-half months from the ravages of these fish. It is impossible for them to carry on their fishing from the time the dogfish strike the shores of Inverness until they leave. We cannot keep our nets in the water, nor can we fish with lines. That is the in-shore fishermen from the straits of Canso to Cape North. It would be an important thing for them during the period when they cannot fish, to catch these dogfish and get a market for them. There is an abundance to keep two or three plants going, and there are plenty of fishermen along the shores who, in the season when they are doing nothing on account of the destruction of their gear by these fish, could devote their energies to catching them. I am also approaching this question from the angle of the farmer. We are told that the products of the dogfish plants is very valuable just now; that fertilizer is very scarce and difficult to get. This is proving to be a first-class article as a fertilizer, and if these plants were multiplied there would be no difficulty in getting a market for the product. In fact the far-

mers through that country are looking for fertilizer, and have found great difficulty this year and last year in getting it.

The minister might look into this matter, and find what it costs to put up a plant, and, if a plant can be erected fairly economically, I think it would be a first class idea to start the plant somewhere else. I am not selfish enough to say that it should be along the coast of Inverness. The reason I mentioned Inverness was because we are suffering from dogfish, and we need the fertilizer and another reason why I now renew my application for a reduction plant in my county is that I had made arrangements with the Laurier Government to have such a plant built in my county and it would have been built in 1912 had the election of 1911 not taken place a year and a half before the usual time. The demand was not then as great as now from the standpoint of more farm production, as the country had a liberal supply of fertilizer. I desire to emphasize as strongly as possible the necessity of establishing these plants all along the shore. I refer to the counties of Inverness, Victoria and Richmond. The minister last year gave us the reason why he could not see his way clear to establish any more of these plants. He said it was because the plant at Canso cost a great deal. I am of the opinion—and my opinion is based on information I have been gathering from time to time—that these plants can be erected for a much smaller figure than the amount paid for the Canso plant, and I may point out that, when this Canso plant was erected, the proposition was in the experimental stage, and, since then, a great deal of information has been gathered with regard to the construction of the plant, and it is generally supposed by those who know something about it that a plant can be erected for much less any place along the coast. I claim, on that account, that the minister could very well appropriate an amount sufficient to erect a couple of those plants, and, in doing this, he would be rendering great assistance to the fishermen and farmers along the coast. I have addressed a few observations of this kind to the minister on several occasions. I do not think my efforts have produced very great results, but I believe in persisting, and I think the cause a sufficiently good one to warrant me in continuing my efforts, and probably in the end the minister will see that there is a great necessity for these plants. I hope he will take the matter into consideration and give it a little more thought than evidently he has given it in the past, and I will expect better results. If there is any great reason why this should not be done, I would like to hear it. So far, I have heard no good reason.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not want the hon. gentleman to think for a moment that I do not pay respect to suggestions made by him or by any other member, because I do, but I am sorry I cannot hold out much hope to my hon. friend that there will be any increase in the number of these factories. The policy of building these factories was inaugurated in 1904, when Mr. Prefontaine was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the expectation then was that the operation of these factories would prove so successful that private individuals would be glad to follow the example of the Government, and establish factories at different points for the purpose of manufacturing fertilizers, to be sold to the farmers throughout the country. This has not occurred. It may be that individuals could manage these plants perhaps more economically than governments are able to do, but the result of the enterprise and of what has taken place—and it was regarded largely in the light of an experiment at the time—has not been such as to justify any private individuals placing their money in enterprises of this sort, from the standpoint of a commercial undertaking, although it was stated to the House in 1904, I believe, that it was expected that that would be the case. The fertilizer produced is of a very valuable character, and very useful to the farmer, but it is found very difficult to get a sufficient supply of fish to keep the factory working to its capacity; in fact, the factory in my own province has been shut down altogether, the results have been so absolutely unsatisfactory. The result at Clarke's Harbour and Canso were more satisfactory, but at the same time every year there is a considerable deficit, and the number of dogfish procured would not have any appreciable effect upon the great number of dogfish that frequent the Atlantic all the way from Florida up almost to the waters of the arctic region. In the United States, although the establishment of factories of this sort has been advocated time and again, the authorities have always refused to establish them, and have taken the ground that it would be impossible to exterminate the dogfish by any means of that sort. All they are doing in the United States to-day is to encourage, as far as they are able, the manufacture of the fish for food under the name of grayfish, which is the name applied to them there. I assure

my hon. friend that I realize that he is making these suggestions in the best of good faith. Any suggestion of that sort is always considered by myself and the officials of the department, but at the present time we do not feel justified in acting upon my hon. friend's recommendation.

Mr. KYTE: I am inclined to think this work has not been carried on with that degree of vigour with which it should be carried on, and, if it were, I think probably better results would have been obtained. I suppose one of the largest fishing communities in Nova Scotia is situated in my county, at L'Ardoise, along the southern shore of the coast. There are probably 1,500 people engaged in the industry there. They are net fishermen, and they suffer grievously from the depredations of the dogfish. I have never heard of a case where the steamer from the reduction plant came to L'Ardoise to gather dogfish. It is possible she comes, but if so, her trips are very irregular. I know the fishermen in that district complain very bitterly that they are not getting the opportunity for furnishing dogfish to the reduction plant at Canso that they would like. Another point is that probably the fishermen are not paid sufficiently for the work of catching those dogfish for the reduction plant. If the plant is not getting a sufficient quantity each year to make its operation profitable, perhaps if they were able to handle a larger supply each year the profits would, in the aggregate, amount to considerably more than at the present time. I should like, for my part, as I said, to see the work carried on with more vigour, and in a way to reach the fishing districts in southern Cape Breton better than in the past. I know that there are large quantities of dogfish to be had there, but the fishermen do not sell them to the plant. I do not know just why it is, but such is the fact.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister please state the names of the officers employed in the Canso reduction work and the salaries paid to them?

Mr. HAZEN: The officer in charge is Charles Lhonnes, I think.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the salary being paid to him?

Mr. HAZEN: I will get that information.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is Mr. White now in the employ at the Canso plant?

Mr. HAZEN: When the work is going on he is employed as bookkeeper.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not see his name in the list of employees in the Auditor General's Report. I know he formerly was in the employ.

Mr. HAZEN: As a matter of fact, while they are manufacturing, he gets $50 a month.

Mr. SINCLAIR: His name does not appear in this blue book at all.

Mr. HAZEN: He must be there somewhere.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Who was the buyer of dogfish whom you had at Port Hood?

Mr. HAZEN: The officer in charge of the factory goes along the coast each year and makes the necessary arrangements. I do not know who was the buyer at Port Hood, though I assume that the information is in the department.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: When the fishermen go out in the morning looking for codfish or mackerel or any other fish, often the first difficulty they meet is a shoal of dogfish. They then have to give up fishing, and if they had any fixed market or any regular visits from the Government boat they would obtain large quantities of dogfish and thus help to supply the plant at Canso with material for its work. If the Government boat could go down the coast more regularly, say once a week, there is no doubt that she would be well supplied with dogfish provided a reasonable price were paid for them.

Mr. HAZEN: I am told that the boat goes as often as there is sufficient fish to justify a trip. On some occasions when the boat has made the trip, it has not obtained enough fish to pay for the coal used. If we could be sure of getting twenty tons a day, we should be very glad to send the boat along the coast every day. I shall be glad to ask the officers of my department if any scheme can be devised by which more of these fish can be got, along the lines suggested by the member for Inverness.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Could not the minister have this boat sent along the coast of Inverness as far as Cheticamp? If he should do that, I assure him that he would get at least a boatload every third day at this season provided reasonable prices were paid.

Mr. HAZEN: How far is Cheticamp from Port Hood?

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: About forty miles.

Mr. HAZEN: It is 100 miles from the factory to Port Hood. To go to Cheticamp would involve an additional forty miles, making the trip a long and expensive one.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I realize that, but the Government have established the plant at Canso for the purpose of carrying on the industry, and if they hope to make it successful they must make sacrifices. I think it is a small sacrifice to send that boat along the coast twice a week and I surely believe that if the Government had the interests of fishermen at heart they would not hesitate one moment to come to their aid to this extent. The Government spends immense sums of money aiding other industries which are not half as important as the fishing industry, but when I suggest that the boat should go 40 miles further north I am told this is expensive. Poor encouragement indeed for our fishermen.

Mr. HAZEN: I am told that if the boat were sent to Cheticamp, by the time it got back to the works the dogfish would not be fit to be manufactured into fertilizer.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I think I know as much about dogfish as the officials from whom my hon. friend gets his information. Dogfish can lie on the shore for two or three days without getting in very bad state. If the minister would establish some system under which the fishermen would be assured of a market for their fish, I am confident that they would take the trouble of covering the fish on the wharves so that the rays of the sun would not get at them. Certainly, if the boat makes only two trips a season, practically no results can be accomplished, but could not the Government furnish cold sheds for keeping these fish at each port?

Mr. HAZEN: In order to carry out my hon. friend's idea, we should have to have three boats, as we should have to go in three different directions from the factory. However, I will have the matter looked into. If my hon. friend will write to us giving us his ideas—because he is familiar with the whole locality—we might be aided in arriving at a decision.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I shall be glad to do that. But I have brought this matter to the attention of the minister on previous occasions; I should not like it to go out to my constituency that this is the first time I have made these representations.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman has already brought the matter up in the House; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: It is true that the boat would have to go in three different directions. But under ordinary conditions, the boat, leaving Canso in the morning, should be able to go down to Cheticamp and get back the next day. At least they can make one trip a week to all the places and call at all the ports where dogfish could be fished.

Mr. HAZEN: I am prepared to say now that I will do that this year, if we can get any guarantee that the fish will be there for us. We do not want to send the boat over that long route, at the expense which is necessarily involved, to get only a few tons of fish. If we had a guarantee that we should get at least twenty tons of fish each trip, I should not hesitate to do at once what my hon. friend asks.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: All I expect of the officials is that they make the fishermen acquainted with the fact that the boat is going there and that the Government is anxious to buy the fish and pay a proper price for them. If the do that, I will do what I can to see that the fishermen are made acquainted with the way in which they can sell their fish. If the minister takes this step, I will admit that he has done all that one can reasonably expect in this regard without a reduction plant on our shore.

Mr. KYTE: The district of L'Ardoise, one of the largest fishing communities in eastern Nova Scotia, is only twelve miles from Canso. But I never heard of officials of the department or any persons connected with the reduction plant at Canso going to L'Ardoise and giving information as to what the Government are prepared to do in the matter of handling these fish. The difficulty that the minister suggested with regard to reaching the district of Cheticamp, which is forty miles from Canso, would not apply to the district in Richmond county that I have mentioned.

Mr. HAZEN: The Superintendent of Fisheries informs me that before the factory opened last fall, Mr. Lhonnes went to that district, saw the people there, told them that the Government were willing to buy whatever fish they could get, and urged on them the desirability of catching the fish.

He offered to send the boat across every day if they would furnish a certain amount of dogfish, but there was no response.

Mr. KYTE: L'Ardoise is an unprotected harbour and no fishing operations are carried on in the fall. The boats are hauled up in September, but in the months of May, June, July and August, fishing operations are carried on. If the Government would supply tanks in various places in which the dogfish might be placed, in order that they should not be exposed to the sun, the fish would last much longer and the necessity of making more frequent trips would not be imperative. The piling of dogfish on a wharf under the hot sun is apt to reduce them to a very undesirable condition.

Mr. HAZEN: My information is that the dogfish are found in largest quantities in the month of September. My hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Chisholm) shakes his head, but that is my information. At one time, when they attempted to operate these factories during June, July and August, the loss was simply tremendous, because it was found impossible to get any supply of dogfish. If that be the case—and my information comes from my official here—then no good point would be served by trying to have a factory running during the summer months.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: It is quite possible that a few dogfish may be found in July, although I have never heard of that being the case. August and September are the months when you have dogfish in shoals, in thousands of tons.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister lay on the Table at a convenient time Professor Prince's report with regard to those lakes to which I referred?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: I still think the minister was in error in regard to the statement he made to the House, and in order to have the facts, I would be glad if he would lay the report on the Table.

Mr. HAZEN: I may be in error. I know that Professor Prince was instructed to inquire into conditions both at Lesser Slave lake and at Lac la Biche, and he reported with regard to both lakes. I will have the papers to which the hon. member refers laid on the table of the House.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the limit of catch for the winter fishing season at Lac la Biche?

Mr. HAZEN: 400,000 pounds.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the limit of catch at Lesser Slave lake for this summer season and for the winter season?

Mr. HAZEN: In the summer season it is 500,000 pounds of whitefish, although the fishermen can take the other coarser fish with that.

Mr. OLIVER: Jackfish is not included?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. OLIVER: There are whitefish, pickerel and jackfish in Lac la Biche. Does the 400,000 pounds limit apply to whitefish or does it include pickerel and jackfish?

Mr. HAZEN: It includes all fish in Lac la Biche.

Mr. OLIVER: But in Lesser Slave lake it includes only whitefish?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Pickerel are not considered?

Mr. HAZEN: Nothing but whitefish.

Mr. OLIVER: The fishermen can catch as many pickerel and jackfish as they like?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the catch for Lesser Slave lake for the coming winter? I am anxious to have these facts so that these people will have notice before hand.

Mr. HAZEN: 760,000 pounds.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there any limit to the fishing on White Whale or Wabamun lake?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think so.

Mr. OLIVER: Or Pigeon lake?

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think so. Those lakes have never come under my notice.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to object to the principle of establishing a limit of catch because that must be within the judgment of the experts of the department, but I may point out that in the case of Wabamun and Pigeon lakes, which are both located about fifty miles from Edmonton, those lakes to my knowledge, have been fished continuously for twenty years, both commercially and for other purposes.

Mr. HAZEN: Probably it would have been better if a limit had been placed on them years ago.

Mr. OLIVER: No, the fish are quite plentiful yet.

Mr. HAZEN: Are those lakes as large as Lac la Biche?

Mr. OLIVER: No, none of them is as large as Lac la Biche. One of them is immediately adjoining the railroad track.

Mr. HAZEN: My attention has never been drawn to the matter before, but I will consider whether a limit should be imposed.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not suggesting that there should be a limit; I am simply pointing out the facts. Two lakes, Lake Winnifred and Lake Christina were opened last winter. Are they to be subject to a limit?

Mr. HAZEN: My attention has never been drawn to them. Where are they?

Mr. OLIVER: On the Great Waterways railroad, north of Lac la Biche. Is there any limit to the catch on Calling lake?

Mr. HAZEN: No, the only lakes I am aware of on which there is a limit are Lac la Biche and Lesser Slave lake.

To pay customs officers for services in connection with issuing modus vivendi licenses.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister state what his policy is with regard to these modus vivendi licenses?

Mr. HAZEN: This matter is now the subject of negotiation with the United States Government. There is no harm in saying that I trust a conference will be entered into, by which arrangements will be made that will be satisfactory to the United States, and that at the same time will remove the disabilities under which our fishing vessels are placed at the present time in taking their catch into the United States and in clearing again from United States ports for the fishing grounds, and that the conference will also include the question of the prohibition of the well-smacks the Americans are sending over now, and which lie right outside the three mile limit in the close season and capture our lobsters, that is, lobsters that we are helping to preserve, although they are not ours legally, and taking them back to the United States.

Mr. SINCLAIR: You will not permit them to come within the three mile limit?

Mr. HAZEN: That is not what I say. At the present moment they are coming over, and when we have our close season, they are lying outside the three mile limit, catching the lobsters there and putting them into those wells that they have in their smacks and taking them to the United States. We want to prevent that. That is one of the subjects in which we think there ought to be a quid pro quo. There are matters on the Atlantic and on the Pacific in which both our fishermen and the United States fishermen are interested, and negotiations are being conducted now with a view to get such settlement of all those outstanding difficulties as will be satisfactory to the people of both countries.

Mr. KYTE: Will those negotiations include a change in the license fee charged?

Mr. HAZEN: That is one of the matters in view.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does it include the admission of American vessels that are propelled by steam?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes. At the present time the modus vivendi applies only to vessels propelled by sail. The contention on the part of the United States is that it should apply to vessels propelled by steam or by gasolene. The argument always advanced in the Parliament of Canada was that this concession was given at a time when vessels were not propelled by steam, and that the modus vivendi applied only to fishing vessels propelled by sail.

There are a number of these outstanding difficulties. The United States would like to have the modus vivendi license reduced from $1.50 a ton to a merely nominal rate, and they would like to have the right for their vessels to come into our ports for the purposes mentioned, whether those vessels are propelled by sail or otherwise. On the other hand, while our fish are admitted free into the United States, we labour under the disadvantage that our fishermen, who take their catch direct to an American port, after selling their catch, cannot clear again for the fishing banks. There is a good deal to be said on both sides. We are endeavouring to have an arrangement come to which will be fair to both, by which the disabilities will be removed as regards our Canadian fishermen, and at the same time we are willing to give advantages in the directions suggested to American fishermen. I hope that this will prove the psychological moment for the arrangement of these matters.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It would be very satisfactory if the minister could bring about a settlement. A great deal of interest is taken in these matters by the people along the coast. For several years back I have held the view that it would be better to admit vessels propelled by gasolene or steam to the same privileges as are given to sailing

vessels. They purchase bait and supplies from our fishermen and dealers; they are good customers and pay well for what they get. If we permit them to tranship their catch on our railways to the United States it will give traffic to our railways. In every way I think it would be an advantage to have the matter dealt with. I am glad the minister also bears in mind the question of our vessels clearing from American ports. Our fishermen arrive at Boston, the great distributing point, with a cargo of fish, and after selling their catch they wish to clear again for the banks. But, as I understand it, under the present law, they must clear for a Canadian port and call at that port before they clear for the banks. I trust the minister will stick to this point until he carries it, for there is no reason that I can see why it should not be conceded by the United States. There are other questions, no so important, perhaps, which it would be wise not to mix up with these others, and so delay a settlement.

Mr. KYTE: Have American vessels free access to the ports of British Columbia?

Mr. HAZEN: If they ship their catch over Canadian railways in bond to the United States.

Mr. KYTE: That is where the ports of British Columbia have the advantage over the ports of Nova Scotia.

Mr. HAZEN: What was done in British Columbia was really a concession to the United States, but the effect of it has been to help Prince Rupert very materially.

Fisheries patrol service, $190,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the minister tell us something about the patrol service in connection with naval matters.

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) will allow that discussion to wait until the Naval Estimates are before the Committee.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes. And then the minister will be prepared, I suppose, to give us the names of the different craft, the owners, and so on.

Mr. HAZEN: I would be prepared to give such information as it is desirable should be given. I am doubtful as to the advisability of making public many of these facts. I should not have the slightest objection, if my hon. friend would come to my department, to giving him privately full information with regard to all the boats we have charted for patrol in connection with the Naval Service, the amounts we are paying, and all details of that sort.

Mr. McKENZIE: I intend to bring some facts to the notice of the minister, rather in the way of criticism. There are many of these boats, and some of them may be of service. I am as careful as any member could be that no information should be given in this House that can be made of advantage to the enemy; but, many of these boats are of no good to the enemy or anybody else,—like a chip in porridge, they are neither good nor harm, except that they draw money from the public treasury, and draw it because they are owned by partisans and wire-pullers—

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. McKENZIE: And when it is discovered that they belong to a Liberal, they are dropped.

Mr. HAZEN: That is not the case. If the hon. gentleman will come to my department—

Mr. McKENZIE: I can give him the name of one man, Mr. William Scott of North Sydney, who had two or three boats in the service, but when it was discovered that he was not an orthodox Tory he and his boats were thrown on the shore.

Mr. HAZEN: That is news to me and I think that investigation would show that it is not correct. However, this is a matter to be discussed when the Naval Estimates come up.

To provide for a fishery exhibit at the Canadian National Exhibition at Toronto, $10,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the minister continuing that exhibit?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, and the restaurant. It has been a very great success in other years.

Mr. KYTE: The next two items, Nos. 259 and 260, I desire to discuss, I would suggest that they be allowed to stand.

Mr. HAZEN: Then, when we pass 261, in compliance with the request of my hon. friend we will let the items to which he has referred stand until some other occasion.

Progress reported.

LABOUR STRIKES IN WESTERN COAL MINES.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Hazen for the adjournment of the House·

Mr. GEORGE E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the Government a telegram that I am in receipt of this evening from Saskatoon in regard to the coal situation. I think this telegram should be in the possession of the House. It is as follows:

Saskatoon, Sask., June 8, 1917.

Geo. E. McCraney, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Resolution of special meeting of Saskatoon Board of Trade held 8th June, 1917:

Whereas, it has been brought to the attention of this board that the coal mines from which western provinces draw their supplies of coal are in general raising only a small proportion of their normal operating capacity at this season owing to the labor situation;

And whereas, in the interest of railway transportation, power production on farms and in cities, it is essential that the raising of a winter's supply of coal should be proceeded with at once before the small reserve stock in the country is further depleted.

Therefore, resolved, that this board urges upon the Government of Canada the necessity for taking drastic action at the earliest possible moment to secure the resumption of operations at western coal mines and to settle the differences between the operators and workmen and that copies of this resolution be sent by telegraph to the Premier, Sir Robert Borden, and to the member for Saskatoon county, at Ottawa, and the resolution sent to western boards of trade for their consideration.

(Signed) W. P. Kirkpatrick,
President.

I hope the Government will take this telegram into consideration in dealing with the matter.

Mr. HAZEN: I understand that a similar telegram has been sent to the Prime Minister?

Mr. McCRANEY: Yes.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Monday, June 11, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Copy of Order in Council with reference to regulations governing the payment of separation allowances to the Royal Canadian Navy.—Hon. J. D. Hazen.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

BILL INTRODUCED BY THE PRIME MINISTER.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 75, respecting military service.

[Mr. Hazen.]

He said: Mr. Speaker, as the Bill which I am presenting to the House has created a good deal of public interest, I shall, by your leave, make a somewhat fuller explanation of its provisions and of the circumstances out of which it has arisen than would ordinarily be the case on such a motion.

Let me first ask the attention of the House to the events of nearly three years ago. It is unnecessary at this juncture to enter into any prolonged examination of the causes of this war or of the purposes for which it was undertaken. Beyond question it was the aim and intention of Germany to assassinate Belgium's rights and liberties; to crush France; to make eventual peace with Russia; to have our Empire stand aside, so that it might afterwards meet the fate of France and of Belgium in order that Germany might dominate the world. For this purpose Germany made a most intense and careful preparation during nearly half a century, and she proceeded to carry out her purpose by methods so barbarous and revolting that humanity stood aghast.

As to Canada's determination, there was never one moment's doubt. Our nation was united in a common purpose. Men of all parties expressed a most resolute and vehement determination to carry the war to victory and to an abiding peace. It was realized by all that the future of civilization and democracy was at stake.

Within six weeks after the war broke out, 33,000 men, fully armed, well trained, and thoroughly equipped, were ready to depart from our shores. Our authorized forces were increased by 30,000 men on the 7th day of November, 1914; they were increased to 150,000 in all on the 8th day of July, 1915, and to 250,000 on the 30th day of October, 1915.

In 1915 and also in 1916, many delegations from all parts of the country came to Ottawa and waited upon the Government for the purpose of urging compulsory military service. They emphasized with very great force the disadvantages of a voluntary system and the need of more men. I realized then and I explained to them possible difficulties, some of which I communicated privately to the leading members of these various delegations.

On the first day of January, 1916, I issued a message to the Canadian people in which I announced that Canada's authorized forces would be increased to 500,000 men. In that message I used these words:

By the greatness of the need our future efforts must be measured.

The necessary Order in Council was passed on January 12, 1916, and it was laid on the table of the House. 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 Force; but it has been deemed to be a pledge made on behalf of the Government and the people of this country, and I am content so to regard it.

There was a splendid response to that appeal; in three and one-half months more than a hundred thousand men enlisted. The need as it then appeared seemed to be served. But later on it became apparent that the struggle would exceed all anticipations. A second division had gone to the front; then a third went, and finally a fourth. The need of reinforcements became greater, while the recruiting during the summer and autumn of 1916 became less. In the autumn of 1916, I made a tour of six provinces of this Dominion in aid of National Service. I was accompanied by the Director General of National Service, and the duty of service was emphasized to vast audiences whose response was inspiring.

After my return a delegation of representatives of organized labour waited upon me, their mission being one of inquiry with regard to the National Service cards, and they demanded from me a pledge that under no circumstances would compulsory military service be enforced in this country. I gave them a reply on the spot, and I followed that up by a letter which was published in the press and which bears the date of December 27, 1916. That letter contains the following passage:

> You have asked for an assurance that under no circumstances will conscription be undertaken or carried out. As I stated to you at our interview, I must decline to give any such assurance. I hope that conscription may not be necessary, but if it should prove the only effective method to preserve the existence of the State and of the institutions and liberties which we enjoy, I should consider it necessary and I should not hesitate to act accordingly.

Early in February, 1917, I left for England, and in March last I saw at the front a Canadian Army Corps of four divisions, instead of the one division which I had seen in July, 1915. Our forces in France at that time numbered about 130,000 men, including all arms of the service. It is manifest to every one that four divisions require four times as many recruits as one, and at the present time the recruiting is not adequate to the need, as I shall show later on.

There are only two alternatives—to let our forces dwindle from four divisions to three, from three to two, and perhaps from two to one, or, to bring aid by other means than an appeal for voluntary service. That is the problem which confronts Canada today.

Let me say a word about the general conditions of the war. Hon. gentlemen, of course, will understand that I may not speak too freely. The effort of the Empire has been wonderful; the effort of our own Dominion has been notable. But no effort is sufficient unless it assures victory, liberty, security and peace. I am in a position to assure the House and the country that the need of reinforcements is urgent, insistent and imperative. The effort of Russia is paralyzed for the present—no one knows for how long. The effort of the United States is only beginning. It is Germany's hope to win the war before the power of the United States can become effective; more than that, it is her confident belief; for otherwise she never would have risked war with that great power, or staked everything on the submarine campaign and her ability to hold her lines East and West while her undersea boats should starve Britain into submission.

The crying need is for physically fit and thoroughly trained troops, chiefly infantry. The methods by which this war is carried on are perhaps more thorough, and the system by which men are provided and trained for the front and for the various arms of the service is probably more intricate and complex than any of us understand who have not looked carefully into such matters. I have before me a form of return which is used for the purpose of showing the classification, or categorization as it is called, of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. I find at the top: Category "A" with four classes; category "B" with three classes; category "C" with three classes; category "D" with three classes, and category "E."

Category "A" includes all men fit for general service. Class I, includes all men actually fit in all respects for despatch to France. Class II includes men who will be fit for Class I as soon as they are trained. Class III includes casualties who should

be fit for Class I as soon as they are hardened and trained. Class IV includes men under nineteen who should be fit for Class I as soon as they reach that age.

Category "B" includes those fit for service in France but not fit for general service, that is, not fit for service in the trenches at the front. Class I includes those who may give service in garrison or provisional units. Class II includes those who are fit for service in labour and construction units or for other outdoor employment. Class III includes those who are suitable for sedentary work only.

Category "C" includes those who are fit for service in the United Kingdom only. Class I takes in those who are fit for service in garrison or provisional units. Class II includes those who are fit for service in labour and construction units or for other outdoor employment. Class III includes those who are fit for sedentary work only.

Category "D" takes in all those who are temporarily unfit for service in categories "A" "B" or "C," but are likely to become fit within six months. Meanwhile they include those who are assigned to Class I, command depots. Class II is not applicable to the Canadian Expeditionary Force in England. Class III includes those who are awaiting dental or medical treatment.

Category "E" includes only those who are awaiting their discharge and are not fit for any service.

I should explain to the House that this is the system of classification, and these are the categories used by the War Office in dealing with like matters in the British medical treatment.

Let us look for a moment at another classification. I have given the classification by fitness, and I now come to the classification by service. I look at the side of this form and I see at least 24 divisions with perhaps 15 to 20 subdivisions, indicating the extended and comprehensive nature of the services and the great variety of purposes for which men are required in the organization of a modern army.

The divisions and subdivisions are as follows:

ARMS AND BRANCHES.

Staffs—
- General.
- Administrative.
- Departmental.

Cavalry.
Mounted Rifles.
Artillery—
- Horse and field.
- Heavy.
- Siege.
- Trench mortar.
- Anti-aircraft.

Machine-Gun Corps—
- Machine-gun companies.
- Motor machine-gun brigade and batteries.

Engineers—
- Field companies and troops.
- Army troops companies.
- Tunnelling companies.
- Signal companies and troops.
- Cable sections.
- Motor air-line section.
- Wireless section.

Infantry.
Cyclists.
Pioneers.
Army Service Corps—
- Divisional trains.
- Supply Columns.
- Supply detachments.
- Salvage companies.
- Ammunition parks.
- Ammunition sub-parks.
- Field butcheries.
- Field bakeries.
- Depot units of supply.
- Reserve parks.

Army Medical Corps—
- Field ambulances.
- Casualty clearing stations.
- Mobile laboratories.
- Sanitary sections.
- Depots medical stores.
- General, stationary and other hospitals.
- Hospital ship.

Army Dental Corps.
Army Veterinary Corps.
- Mobile sections.
- Veterinary hospitals.

Forestry Corps.
Railway Troops.
- Railway battalions.
- Construction battalions.

Entrenching Battalions.
Labour Battalions.
Army Pay Corps.
Army Postal Corps.
Ordnance Corps.
Military Police.
Training Establishments, various.
Records Office.
Miscellaneous.

Hon. gentlemen will thus realize that a very thorough system is required, not only in reference to the fitness of the men for any service whatever, but also in respect of the various services to which they may be allotted in case of their fitness for any. Now I come for a moment, in view of that, to some statistics. I want hon. gentlemen in this House and the country to realize that the most important need at the front to-day, both in our force and in other forces, is for men of Category "A" Class I; that is, infantry who are able to go into the trenches, who are physically fit and thoroughly trained. From the classification which I have already read, hon. gentlemen will understand that only a moderate proportion of enlisted troops can

be brought within that category and class. I should further emphasize this consideration; that in the enlistments which have taken place during the past year, and which I shall recount in a moment, a very considerable number of men have taken service in Railway Construction and Forestry battalions. These battalions serve a most useful and important purpose, but the number of men available for combatant service in Category "A" is necessarily cut down by enlistment in Railway Construction and Forestry units. The total enlistment during the year ending May 31, 1917, was 85,306. Of course, only a portion of these men were fit for Category "A", and as I have already pointed out, a considerable number enlisted for Railway Construction and Forestry service. During the same year our casualties amounted to 75,492. Our total casualties since the war began amount to 99,639. During April and May we enlisted 11,790 men and during these same two months our casualties were 23,939. During the next seven months we need enforcements to the number of at least 70,000 in order to keep four divisions in the field, and to keep five divisions in the field we need 84,000 men, in both cases principally infantry. Continued offensive operations, such as those of April and May, might increase this number, and if the offensive continues it is not too much to say that we must expect this.

What is the conclusion I have drawn from all this? It is, as I have said before, that reinforcements must be obtained or the divisions must dwindle; there is no alternative. The reinforcements now available will last for only a few months, the precise number of which, for military reasons, I am not at liberty to state. We all are proud that Canada has played a splendid and notable part in this war. The achievements of her troops have placed her in the very forefront of the nations, and the question before the House and the country to-day is this: Is Canada content to relax her efforts in the most critical period of a war which concerns her heritage, her status, and her liberty? I am confident that the answer of the House and the country will be the same, namely that Canada cannot and must not relax her effort.

It seems to me there is something more than this to be taken into account. Is there not, as I have already said in this House, an appeal from the men at the front? They have answered the call, they have given glorious service, they have put aside all material considerations; duty alone has been their ideal. Unconscious of every thing other than the supreme task before them, I know from my personal experience that they cannot realize the thought that their country which so summoned them to her service will be content to desert and humiliate them. 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. When Canada called them to the colours her honour was pledged to this, and I shall do my best to see that the pledge is fulfilled. I never will be responsible for its violation.

Returning on May 14th, I announced on May 18th that the need must be met by applying a principle which, for forty-nine years, has been on the statute book of Canada. I repeat that: There is no principle of compulsion in the Bill which I have presented to this House, except the principle that has remained on the statute book of Canada for forty-nine years. Some people afflicted with a diseased imagination have asserted that I took my present course at the request or dictation of the British Government. No more absolute falsehood was ever uttered by human lips. The subject was never discussed between myself and any member of the British Government; if there had been any such suggestion from them I for one would not have tolerated it. The Government, Parliament and people of Canada are the only authorities that can deal with or determine questions such as those which are embodied in the Bill now presented to this House.

The principle of compulsory service in this Dominion was first enacted in 1868, under a government in which Sir George Etienne Cartier was Minister of Militia and Defence. It was re-enacted with a slight change in form, but no change in meaning, in 1904, by the Government of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In order that there may be no question about this, it is appropriate that I should give a short review of what took place in 1868 and should also deal with the amendment made in 1904.

By the Militia Act of 1868, introduced by Sir George Etienne Cartier, it was enacted—(section 4)—as follows:

> 4. The militia shall consist of all the male inhabitants of Canada, of the age of eighteen years and upwards, and under sixty—not exempted or disqualified by law, and being British subjects by birth or naturalization;

but Her Majesty may require all the male inhabitants of the Dominion, capable of bearing arms, to serve in case of a Levée en Masse.

By section 5 it was provided that the male population so liable to serve in the militia, should be divided into four classes. This enactment is still in the statute book.

Section 16, subsection 3, provides that:

The enrolment shall be held to be an embodiment of all the militiamen enrolled, and shall render them liable to serve under the provisions of this Act, unless exempt by law.

Section 61 enacted as follows:

Her Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for actual service, either within or without the Dominion, at any time, whenever it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion, or insurrection, or danger of any of them; and the militiamen, when so called out for actual service, shall continue to serve for at least one year from the date of their being called out for actual service, if required so to do, or for any longer period which Her Majesty may appoint.

This Bill gave rise to discussion in Parliament, as was natural. On the 12th May, 1868, on a motion to go into committee on the Bill, Mr. Dorion moved, in amendment, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie:

What it be an instruction to the committee to consider the following resolution: "That in the opinion of this House the volunteer system is of proved efficiency, and specially adapted to the spirit and circumstances of the people, and is capable of supplying a more efficient and available force than that proposed to be substituted by this Bill; and it is therefore desirable to amend the same so as to make provision—

1. For the proper maintenance and encouragement of the volunteer organization;

2. For the drilling of the officers of the ordinary militia;

3. That the ordinary militia shall not be actually called out by conscription, save in case of necessity."

On division, this amendment was rejected by a vote of 100 to 41.

It must be apparent, therefore, that the whole question of compulsory service was taken into consideration by the founders of Confederation in almost the first session of this Parliament, and that then it was decided, once for all, that for the defence of this country, and whether within or out of Canada, the people of this country should be subject to compulsory military service. And this has remained the law of the country from the day it was enacted in 1868, and it is the law of the land to-day.

Now, let us look for a moment at the provisions of the Militia Act, which was passed in its present form in 1904, and which is now known as chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906. I will quote section 10 and also section 69 of that Act:

10. All the male inhabitants of Canada of the age of eighteen years and upwards, and under sixty, not exempt or disqualified by law, and being British subjects, shall be liable to service in the Militia; provided that the Governor General may require all the male inhabitants of Canada, capable of bearing arms, to serve in the case of a levée en masse.

69. The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Hon. members will observe that there is a slight difference in the provisions of section 69 from the corresponding section of the Act of 1868, that is, section 61. There was some debate in 1904 upon that change, and to this I will come a little later. Meantime, I desire to point out that this enactment is based upon the principle, which is as old as the principle of self-government, that while the state owes to its citizens certain duties, the citizen also owes corresponding duties to the state. To the citizen the state assures protection and security of his person and property, the enforcement of law and orderly government. To the state, each citizen owes a duty of service, and the highest duty of all is the obligation to assist in defending the rights, the institutions and the liberties of his country. I desire to express my profound conviction that there never has been, and there never will be, an occasion when that duty could be more manifest, more urgent, or more imperative than at the present time.

It may be asked: Why is this law necessary if such provision already exists in the Militia Act? The answer is very simple. We have sent 326,000 men overseas in the Canadian Expeditionary Force besides those who have gone to serve in the Allied Armies. The Militia Act provides that the selection shall be by ballot and in no other way. The Government is convinced that such a method of selection would be unwise, and even disastrous, under present conditions and having regard to the number of men required. We propose not to change or enlarge the compulsory principle, but merely to provide that selection shall not be made by ballot, that is, by blind chance. We are convinced that the selection should be based upon an intelligent consideration of the country's needs and conditions. We must take into account the necessities of agriculture, of commerce, and of industry. Those who in their present occupations are rendering better service to the state than by enrolment in the Canadian Expeditionary Force must not be selected for military service. There is need for men at the front; there is also need for men at home. The

nation's activities essential for winning the war must be maintained. Thus, the only new feature proposed is in the method of selection. The compulsory clauses in this Bill are precisely of the same character, and based upon the same principles, as those which have been in force in this country since 1868.

It is further asked why the new method of selection could not have been accomplished by an amendment to the Militia Act. We considered that very carefully. It would have been necessary to amend, perhaps, a dozen or a score of clauses, so many at least that the legislation would have been less effective, less clear and more confused. The same course has been taken in Great Britain and in New Zealand.

The provisions of the Bill have been very carefully considered. We desire that they shall be most attentively studied. I do not doubt that on some matters there may be room for argument and suggestion. We are prepared to listen most carefully to all suggestions, provided they are reasonable and do not affect the efficiency of the measure.

The first provision to which I ask the attention of the House is section 13, subsection 4, of the Bill, which provides that the reinforcements to be raised under this Bill shall not exceed 100,000 men, between the ages of 20 and 45. The number of men in Canada between these ages, by the census of 1911, and other information of a like character, in respect to the possibility of raising 50,000 or 100,000 men, will be communicated to the House on the second reading. I hope that the information can be presented to the House in a form which will carry conviction. It is certainly apparent to me, from the information which I have already obtained, that there ought to be no difficulty in providing reinforcements of at least 100,000 men, and probably a number even in excess of that. Before proceeding with the explanation of section 1, perhaps I should give to the House the recital, or preamble, on which the Bill is based. It is as follows:—

Whereas by section ten of the Militia Act, chapter forty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, it is enacted as follows:—

"All the male inhabitants of Canada, of the age of eighteen years and upwards, and under sixty, not exempt or disqualified by law, and being British subjects, shall be liable to service in the Militia; Provided that the Governor General may require all the male inhabitants of Canada, capable of bearing arms, to serve in the case of a levée en masse."

And whereas by section sixty-nine of the said Act it is further enacted as follows:—

"The Governor in Council may place the Militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency."

And whereas by the said Act it is further enacted that, if at any time enough men do not volunteer to complete the quota required, the men so liable to serve shall be drafted by ballot;

And whereas to maintain and support the Canadian Expeditionary Force now engaged in active service overseas for the defence and security of Canada, the preservation of the Empire and of human liberty, it is necessary to provide reinforcements for such Expeditionary Force;

And whereas enough men do not volunteer to provide such reinforcements;

And whereas, by reason of the large number of men who have already left agricultural and industrial pursuits in Canada to join such Expeditionary Force as volunteers, and of the necessity of sustaining under such conditions the productivity of the Dominion, it is expedient to secure the men still required, not by ballot as provided in the Militia Act, but by selective draft.

That is the preamble, or recital, upon which the Bill is based. The only important part of section 1 to which I need call attention is that which provides that the Act will be under the administration of the Minister of Justice. It will be under his administration for the reason that there are to be inquiries as to selection and as to exemption or otherwise, and it is not desirable that these inquiries should be conducted by the department which is to take charge of the men when they are once enrolled. These matters are rather of a judicial character until the question of exemption or liability is finally determined. Therefore, the administration of the Act is placed under the Department of Justice.

Section 2 deals with the application of the Bill. No change of any importance is made. The section provides that:—

(1) Every male British subject who comes within one of the classes described in section three of this Act, and who,—

(a) is ordinarily resident in Canada; or

(b) has been at any time since the fourth day of August, 1914, resident in Canada,

shall be liable to be called out as hereinafter provided on active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force for the defence of Canada, either in or beyond Canada, unless he

(a) Comes within the exceptions set out in the Schedule; or

(b) reaches the age of forty-five before the class or subclass to which he belongs, as described in section three is called out.

Such service shall be for the duration of the present war and of demobilization after the conclusion of the war.

(2) Nothing in this Act shall prevent any man from voluntarily enlisting in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, so long as voluntary enlistment in such Force is authorized.

Section 3 deals with the various classes into which men between the ages of 20 and 45, both inclusive, are divided. It is as follows:—

3. (1) The men who are liable to be called out shall consist of ten classes described as follows:—

Class 1.—Those who have attained the age of twenty years and were born not earlier than the year 1894 and are unmarried, or are widowers but have no child.

Class 2.—Those who were born in the years 1889 to 1893, both inclusive, and are unmarried, or are widowers but have no child.

Class 3.—Those who were born in the years 1883 to 1888, both inclusive, and are unmarried, or are widowers but have no child.

Class 4.—Those who have attained the age of twenty years and were born not earlier than the year 1894 and are married, or are widowers who have a child or children.

Class 5.—Those who were born in the years 1889 to 1893, both inclusive, and are married, or are widowers who have a child or children.

Class 6.—Those who were born in the years 1883 to 1888, both inclusive, and are married, or are widowers who have a child or children.

Class 7.—Those who were born in the years 1876 to 1882, both inclusive, and are unmarried, or are widowers who have no child.

Class 8.—Those who were born in the years 1876 to 1882, both inclusive, and are married, or are widowers who have a child or children.

Class 9.—Those who were born in the years 1872 to 1875, both inclusive, and are unmarried, or are widowers who have no child.

Class 10.—Those who were born in the years 1872 to 1875, both inclusive, and are married, or are widowers who have a child or children.

(2) For the purposes of this section, any man married after the eleventh day of June, 1917, shall be deemed to be unmarried.

(3) Any class, except Class 1, shall include men who are tranferred thereto from another class as hereinafter provided, and men who have come within Class 1 since the previous class was called out.

(4) The order in which the classes are described in this section shall be the order in which they may be called out on active service, provided the Governor in Council may divide any class into subclasses, in which case the subclasses shall be called out in order of age, beginning with the youngest.

For example, if it appeared to the Government that the calling out of Classes 1, 2 and 3 might yield a larger number of men than the forces authorized by this Act, it would be possible for the Government to divide Class 3 into sub-classes, so that the number to be called out should not exceed the number authorized by the Act.

I now proceed to the next section:

4. (1) The Governor in Council may from time to time by proclamation call out on active service as aforesaid for the defence of Canada, either in Canada or beyond Canada, any class or subclass of men described in section three and all men within the class or subclass so called out shall, from the date of such proclamation, be deemed to be soldiers enlisted in the Military Forces of Canada and subject to military law for the duration of the present war, and of demobilization thereafter, save as hereinafter provided.

(2) Men so called out shall report and shall be placed on active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force as may be set out in such proclamation or in regulations, but until so placed on active service, shall be deemed to be on leave of absence without pay.

(3) Any man by or in respect of whom an application for exemption is made as hereinafter provided, shall, so long as such application or any appeal in connection therewith is pending and during the currency of any exemption granted him, be deemed to be on leave of absence without pay.

(4) Any man who is called out and who, without reasonable excuse, fails to report as aforesaid or to remain on active service where placed shall be guilty, according to the circumstances, of desertion, or of absenting himself without leave and shall be liable

(a) To be tried by court-martial and convicted and punished by imprisonment, for a term not exceeding three years, or

(b) on summary conviction to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three years.

Section 5 reads as follows:

(5) (1) There shall be established in the manner hereafter set out, the following tribunals:—

(a) Local Tribunals;

(b) Appeal Tribunals;

(c) A Central Appeal Judge.

(2) Any tribunal may hear evidence on oath or otherwise as it may deem expedient, and for the performance of its duties shall have all the powers vested in a Commissioner under Part 1 of the Inquiries Act.

(3) The Governor in Council may, upon the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge, make regulations with respect to the establishment, constitution, functions and procedure of the said tribunals and such regulations may contain provisions for securing uniformity in the application of this Act.

(4) In so far as provision is not otherwise made, the procedure of the Tribunal shall be such as is determined by the Tribunal.

(5) No member of any tribunal shall be responsible at law for anything done by him in good faith in the performance of his duties under this Act, and no action shall be taken against any member of a local tribunal or an appeal tribunal in respect of the performance or non-performance of his duties under this Act, except with the written consent of the Central Appeal Judge.

The next section deals with the Local Tribunals which are to be established.

6. (1) The Minister may from time to time by proclamation or otherwise establish local tribunals at such places as he deems necessary and give each an appropriate designation.

Now, as to the constitution of these local tribunals, of whom shall they consist? That question raised a great deal of difficulty, because it was the desire of the Government to adopt a method which would be absolutely above suspicion. We desired to make it clear that the personnel of the

Board was to be selected fairly and independently. Therefore we provided as follows:

(3) Each local tribunal shall consist of two members. One member shall be appointed by a Board of Selection to be established by joint resolution of the Senate and House of Commons; the other member shall be appointed by the following authority:—

1. In those provinces in which there are county courts or district courts, the county court judge or district court judge or, if more than one, the senior judge for the county or district in which the local tribunal is established, or when the place at which a local tribunal is to be established is not within the territorial limits of any county court or district court, then by such judge as may be determined by the Minister.

The county court judge or district judge is to make the appointment. If there is no such judge within the area for which the tribunal is to be established, then one of the members of the tribunal is to be appointed by such county court judge as the minister shall designate for the purpose.

Then there are special provisions for Quebec which read as follows:

II. In the province of Quebec:—

(a) In the judicial districts of Montreal and Quebec, any judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec who is authorized by the Chief Justice of the said Court or authorized by the judge appointed to perform the duties of Chief Justice in the judicial district.

(b) In the other judicial districts the judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec assigned to the judicial district within which the local tribunal is established.

III. In the Yukon Territory:—

The judge of the Territorial Court or the person appointed under the provisions of the Yukon Act to act in place of such judge; and

IV. In the Northwest Territories:—

The Commissioner of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police.

It has been our purpose, therefore, to establish tribunals which shall be constituted by an authority independent of the Government, by persons appointed under the direct authority of Parliament, and by county court judges or district court judges. In Quebec it will be by judges of the Superior Court, and in the Yukon and Northwest Territories by authorities outside of the Government itself.

It is further provided in the same section:

(4) (a) The names and addresses of all persons appointed on a local tribunal shall, as may be provided by regulations, be communicated to the minister.

(b) The minister may by telegraph or otherwise appoint one or both members, as the case may be, of any local tribunal, if he has not received, within such period before the tribunal is to sit as may be fixed by regulation, the names and addresses of members duly appointed.

(c) A vacancy occurring shall be filled by the authority who appointed the member vacating, and if not so filled or if communication of same as aforesaid has not been received by the minister within such period as may be fixed by regulation, the minister may fill such vacancy.

If the authorities, who are empowered by this Act to make the appointment of the local tribunal, do not make such appointments, or do not communicate them to the minister, then when the time comes for the work of the tribunals to begin, the minister may make the appointment.

There is also a provision that no person shall, without reasonable excuse, refuse to act when appointed to one of these tribunals. If he refuses to act, he is guilty of an offence, and is liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding $500.

With reference to the appeal tribunals, the provisions are very simple, and the section reads as follows:

7. The Chief Justice of the court of last resort in each province, or in case of his absence, or failure to act, then a judge of that court designated by the minister, shall establish for such province a sufficient number of appeal tribunals, and shall assign to each such tribunal, one judge of any court of such province, and shall distribute among such tribunals all appeals from and cases stated under subsection 2 of section 10, by local tribunals of which the Registrar has notice, and such appeal tribunals shall severally hear and decide the same.

As to the final tribunal, the Governor in Council may appoint one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada to be the Central Appeal Judge.

The scheme is to establish Local Tribunals selected by an authority outside of the Government; of these there will be many in each military district. The Appeal Tribunals will be selected by an authority outside of the Government, but a judicial authority, a member of one of the higher courts in each province, and finally there will be a Central Appeal Judge, who will be the final court of appeal, and who will be selected from the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada.

It has been the purpose of the Government to make these provisions absolutely fair. If any suggestion is made to the Government from the House by which the provisions can be made fairer or more effective, the Government will be glad to listen to such suggestion when the Bill is in committee.

I come, then, to section 10, which deals with appeals; it provides for an appeal from the local tribunal to the appeal tribunal, and from the appeal tribunal to the

central tribunal. These appeals are to be carried out under regulations to be made on the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge.

It is also provided by section 10 that the Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge, appoint one or more other judges of any superior court to assist the Central Appeal Judge in the discharge of his duties, and may define their powers. It was thought that there might be more work for the Central Appeal Judge than he could properly attend to, and therefore, this provision was made.

I come now to a very important section, that which concerns exemption. I do not think it is necessary that I should read the whole section; the Bill will shortly be before the members of the House. I shall, however, explain its provisions. It is section 11, and it provides:

(1) At any time before a date to be fixed in the proclamation mentioned in section four, an application may be made, by or in respect of any man in the class or subclass called out by such proclamation, to a local tribunal established in the province in which such man ordinarily resides, for a certificate of exemption on any of the following grounds:—

(a) That it is expedient in the national interest that the man should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he is habitually engaged;

That provision, if I remember correctly, is taken from the British Act. It was inserted in that Act at the instance of representatives of organized labour, who were afraid that otherwise there would be power under the Act to affect prejudicially their interests in certain respects. The list of exemptions continues as follows:

(b) That it is expedient in the national interest that the man should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he wishes to be engaged and for which he has special qualifications;

That is almost identical in its terms with the corresponding section in the British Act. (Reading):

(c) That it is expedient in the national interest that, instead of being employed in military service, he should continue to be educated or trained for any work for which he is then being educated or trained;

(d) That serious hardship would ensue, if the man were placed on active service, owing to his exceptional financial or business obligations or domestic position;

(e) Ill health or infirmity;

(f) That he conscientiously objects to the undertaking of combatant service and is prohibited from so doing by the tenets and articles of faith, in effect at the date of the passing of this Act, of any organized religious denomination existing and well recognized in Canada at such date, and to which he in good faith belongs;

The Bill goes on to provide that if any of the grounds of the application for exemption are established, a certificate of exemption shall be granted to the applicant. It is further provided that a certificate may be conditional as to time or otherwise and, if granted solely on conscientious grounds, it shall state that exemption is from combatant service only.

Another provision which I consider very important and appropriate is taken from the British Act, and was regarded in Great Britain as essential in the interests of labour. It is as follows:

No certificate shall be conditional upon a person to whom it is granted continuing in or entering into employment under any specified employer or in any specified place or establishment.

It was feared in Great Britain that certificates might be granted upon conditions respecting employment which would place employees more or less at the mercy of employers. There was, therefore, in the British Act a direct provision, which we have adopted in this Bill, that no such condition should be inserted in any certificate of exemption.

Another provision in this section makes it an offence to make any false statement or representation before a tribunal or to alter or tamper with a certificate. It is provided also that where a certificate is lost, destroyed or defaced, the tribunal may grant another certificate upon the payment of a small fee.

Section 12 provides that the Governor in Council may make regulations for certain purposes therein mentioned.

Section 13 contains general provisions making applicable the Militia Act, the Army Act and the King's Regulations and Orders for the army in so far as they are applicable and not inconsistent with this Act. This section also empowers the Minister of Militia and Defence to transfer to the Naval Service any man who has reported for duty under the provisions of this Act.

Sections 14 and 15 are not important; I need not refer to them at the moment. Subsection 1 of section 16 is as follows:

This Act shall come into force on such day, after the passing thereof, as the Governor in Council may fix by proclamation.

The only portion of the Act to which I have not directed attention, is the schedule, which sets forth the exceptions. It is as follows:

Exceptions.

1. Men who hold a certificate granted under this Act and in force, other than a certificate of exemption from combatant service only.
2. Members of His Majesty's regular or reserve, or auxiliary forces, as defined by the Army Act.
3. Members of the military forces raised by the Governments of any of His Majesty's other dominions or by the Government of India.
4. Men serving in the Royal Navy or in the Royal Marines, or in the Naval Service of Canada, and members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.
5. Men who have since August 4, 1914 served in the military or naval forces of Great Britain or her allies in any theatre of actual war and have been honourably discharged therefrom.
6. Clergy, including members of any recognized order of an exclusively religious character, and ministers of all religious denominations existing in Canada at the date of the passing of this Act.
7. Those persons exempted from military service by Order in Council of August 13, 1873, and by Order in Council of December 6, 1898.

This last provision relates to certain communities of Mennonites and Doukhobors, who came into Canada on the faith of the Orders in Council which I have mentioned. Under these Orders in Council, the settlers referred to were not to be called upon to perform military service. It is absolutely clear that the faith of a country thus pledged must be kept; therefore this exception is introduced into the Bill.

I have endeavoured to give to the House as clearly and as succinctly as possible the main features of this Bill. There are one or two words that I should like to add before I sit down. The measure is not intended as provocative or punitive; it is put forward in good faith as the only means of insuring national safety in a great peril. It has been stated in the press that Canadians should not be called upon to fight beyond the limits of our territory. But ever since 1868 the law has recognized the obligation of Canadians to fight beyond the limits of our territory, and it recognizes that obligation to-day. I quote again section 69 of the Militia Act:

> The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

It is declared in section 2 of the Militia Act that "emergency" means war, invasion, riot, or insurrection, real or apprehended. Two conditions, therefore, are necessary to the placing of the militia or any part thereof on active service beyond Canada. First, the men must be sent by reason of an emergency; secondly, they must be sent beyond Canada for the defence thereof. Let us consider whether or not those conditions are fulfilled by the present circumstances.

Will any hon. gentleman present deny that there is an emergency within the meaning of the statute? In the midst of the most terrific struggle ever known to history no one will seriously doubt the answer. There is more than an emergency; there is a cataclysm. The greatest of the nations that were once neutral—that great nation to the South of us—has at last been obliged to take up arms to defend its rights, to prevent the domination of militarism, the destruction of liberty and the enslavement of the world. Therefore, I take it for granted that there is no argument open as to the existence of an emergency. Not only is it an emergency; it is the greatest emergency, the greatest peril ever known, the greatest, I believe, that will ever be known in the history of this Dominion.

If it is conceded that there is an emergency, are we not fighting in France and Flanders for the defence of Canada? There are but few members of the House who, in speaking of the war, have not affirmed that truth. Let us look for a moment at Great Britain. We do not know what forces she has in France at the present moment, but we do know, from the returns already made public, that her armies have sustained very nearly a million casualties on the soil of France and Belgium. Is Great Britain fighting in France and in Belgium for the defence of her own territory? Yes, she is fighting to free the soil of France and Belgium from the unhallowed footsteps of the enemy, but she is no less truly fighting in defence of her own territory. I do not suppose that any one, looking at the circumstances as they have developed since the 4th day of August, 1914, could doubt that for one moment. What about Canada? When the Canadians on the 22nd day of April 1915, barred the path of the German to Calais, I say that they barred his path also to Halifax, Quebec, St. John and Montreal. From the North Sea to the borders of Switzerland there is a line nearly 500 miles in length, which is being pressed back towards the German frontier. Along that 500 mile line there is a strip of territory of varying width over which this devastating struggle has swayed to and fro. It was once a glorious country with smiling fields, happy villages and prosperous towns. To-day it is the abomination of desolation, a mass of shell-churned mud with no trace of road or street, house,

habitation or village. Even the fruit trees have been cut down and the wells destroyed. The Hun has spared nothing. Thousands of its inhabitants, especially girls and young women, have been led away by the Germans into a captivity worse than death. Its churches have been destroyed and even its graveyards desecrated. Imagine such scenes in this country of Canada, along a battle line extending from Quebec to Toronto. Where is Canada's first line of defence against such horrors and barbarities? It is in the North Sea, where the Empire's Navy holds back Germany's power, and in the trenches where the Canadians with the other Allied armies are slowly but surely freeing the soil of France and of Belgium from the insulting tread of the invader. If that is not our first line of defence, where is it? Who then will say that the Canadian Expeditionary Force is not fighting for the defence of Canada? Who will affirm that it is performing a less distinctively national service than the force employed in garrison and outpost duty within our territory? And yet, no one for a moment can deny that the force we have called out for garrison and outpost duty in Canada is acting in the defence of Canada. Is the service that is being performed by the force overseas of a different character? I say not, in my judgment, and in this matter, I, and no one else, am responsible for the judgment to which I must come. Some one speaks of the distance. What security is there in mere distance, considering modern means of communication or attack, not only on the sea, but through the air and under the sea? If this war continues for two more years, who shall say that we may not see German aircraft in Canada? Let us not forget that German submarines crossed the Atlantic nearly a year ago.

In the debate of 1904, upon the Militia Act, as it is now constituted, some exception was taken to the change made at that time in the Act as originally passed by Sir George Etienne Cartier. It was agreed on both sides of the House that, whether the change was desirable or not so far as form was concerned, it made no change in substance. After very careful consideration I agreed to that. The Minister of Militia of the day, Sir Frederick Borden, the Minister of Justice of the day, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, now Chief Justice of Canada, the Minister of Finance of the day, Hon. W. S. Fielding, all agreed that if there was a change in form, there was no change in meaning or in substance. At column 6374 of Hansard, of 1904, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick said in response to a suggestion that the Governor in Council ought not to have the power to send the militia to any part of the Empire for the defence of Canada

> We have had that power for a long time.

Later on in the debate he said:

> Here is the position that is taken now, that we give to the Governor in Council authority to employ the troops of Canada either within or without Canada for the defence of Canada. Then we make provision that Parliament should be summoned fifteen days after a declaration of war, and that the troops may be called out, so that Parliament shall decide then what use is to made of the troops whether within or without Canada, and what we are to do with them.

Further on he said:

> The Governor in Council may send the militia of Canada out of Canada at any time when deemed necessary for the defence of Canada. If, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, it should be necessary, because of a war going on in India, to send our militia out there for the defence of Canada, they may, in the exercise of their discretion, do it, because they are the sole judges of what is necessary to be done in defence of Canada. But we do not think it advisable that that power should be absolutely and unrestrictedly in the hands of the Governor in Council. We think it advisable that the period during which they may exercise that power should be restricted and that Parliament should be called together and be consulted at the earliest opportunity. Parliament must be summoned in fifteen days and then the whole matter will be in the hands of the people's representatives.

I could quote many other passages along the same line, but I will only allude to one of them. The then member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) said in the same debate:

> I admit that an emergency might arise when the Government should have the power to call out the militia immediately.
>
> I do not dispute that; but suppose an occasion should arise on which Canada would be called upon to organize its militia and send a large portion of it outside of Canada, when in the judgment of a large number of the people and Parliament of Canada it would be to the disadvantage of the country to have so large a number of troops sent out, Parliament should be the final judge of that question, and the Government should call Parliament to deal with the matter.

So it will be apparent to hon. members of the House that there was no question raised at all as to the power to send the militia outside of Canada for the defence of this country. It was conceded that the Government of the country must in the first instance be the absolute and uncontrolled judge of whether that necessity had arisen, and the only point raised was whether or not, in case that power were

exercised Parliament should be summoned to deal with the question, and within what time. The power to send our citizens enrolled in the militia outside Canada for the defence thereof, was fully conceded in the debate, and the construction placed upon the measure at that time was as I have already indicated.

I repeat that this measure merely accepts and acts on a principle which has been embodied in our law for almost half a century, and which recognizes an equal obligation on all citizens for the defence of their country. There is an equal obligation but, under present conditions there cannot be an equal sacrifice. No sacrifice made hereafter can be as great as that of those who have already gone to the front, some of whom have fallen, and many of whom have already been in the trenches for two years.

It has been said of this Bill that it will induce disunion, discord, and strife, and that it will paralyze the nation's effort. I trust that this prophecy may prove unfounded. Why should strife be induced by the application of a principle which was adopted at the very inception of Confederation?

All citizens are entitled to equal protection of the laws, and upon them is imposed an equal obligation. There can be no national unity unless this principle is accepted. I cannot bring myself to believe that any class or community will expect to assert for itself the right or the power to defy the law, and to set up for itself different standards from those which are applied to the people as a whole.

It was my strong desire to bring about a union of all parties for the purpose of preventing any such disunion or strife as is apprehended. That effort was an absolutely sincere one, and I do not regret that it was made, although the delay which it occasioned may have given opportunity for increased agitation and for excitement arising from misunderstanding. I went so far as to agree that this Bill should not become effective until after a general election, in the hope that by this means all apprehension would be allayed, and that there might be a united effort to fulfil the great national purpose of winning this war. What may be necessary or expedient in that regard, I am yet willing to consider, for ever since this war began I have had one constant aim and it was this: to throw the full power and effort of Canada into the scale of right, liberty and justice for the winning of this war, and to maintain the unity of the Canadian people in that effort.

But I cannot shrink, and I will not shrink, from the determination to support and sustain the Canadian troops now at the front. It is said that the consequences of this measure are to be dreaded. Why they should be dreaded I cannot understand, for it introduces no new principle. I should rather be concerned as to what may ensue if this Bill is not passed. The legislation of 1868 and 1904 was not mere stage play; it was a serious measure with a serious purpose. The conditions which it calls for have surely been fulfilled. God speed the day when the gallant men who are protecting and defending us will return to the land they love so well. Only those who have seen them at the front can realize how much they do love this dear land of Canada. If we do not pass this measure, if we do not provide reinforcements, if we do not keep our plighted faith, with what countenance shall we meet them on their return? They have seen their friends and comrades discoloured and gasping from poison gas at Ypres. They have known what it means to have regiments decimated, to see comrades and brothers struck down. They have held on grimly in the trenches in the Ypres salient and elsewhere against overwhelming numbers and under the devastating power of the enemy's artillery when we lacked guns and munitions. They have climbed the heights of the Vimy Ridge and driven the Germans far beyond it. They have answered the call of service and duty, they have fought and died that Canada might live and that the horrors and desolation of war might never be known within our borders. They went forth splendid in their youth and confidence. They will come back silent, grim, determined men, who not once or twice but fifty times have gone over the parapet to seek their rendezvous with death. 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. It is easy to sow the wind of clamour against the imposition of equal duty and obligation upon all Canadians for the preservation of their country; but those who make that sowing may reap such a whirlwind as they do not dream of to-day.

I hope that this measure will be received by the House and by the country

in the spirit in which it is offered. It is presented from a sense of duty and with no desire or intention of interfering with the legitimate rights of any of the citizens of this country. It is inspired by the sincere belief that in truth we are fighting a battle which involves the destiny of Canada and of the whole world, by the strong conviction that the protection of our country, its citizens, their liberties and their heritage, depends upon the success of our efforts.

I trust that the debate will be characterized by a sense of the grave responsibilities which thus devolve upon this Parliament and upon the people. I hope that it will be conducted with fairness and moderation, with no angry word or taunt, so that those who come after may know that the men of this day and generation representing the Canadian people in their Parliament, were animated by ideals and inspired by motives far above the paltry and insignificant considerations of lesser days. I hope that this measure will be so received that those who are holding the trenches beyond the seas, fighting for our security and our liberty, may realize that their trust in us is not in vain. This afternoon there are 125,000 Canadians pressing back the invaders in France and Belgium. Let us prove ourselves worthy to call them comrades. Some may have made the supreme sacrifice for Canada even as we speak. Let us summon in thought these brave comrades, firm of heart and strong of purpose, those who have fought, yes and those who shall fight no more, let us summon them in the spirit to our deliberations, let us speak and determine as if they were in our midst.

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, as the rules of the House do not permit at this stage a full discussion of the principle which is involved in this Bill, I shall have to content myself with simply making one observation. My right hon. friend has expressed the hope that this debate shall be characterized by frankness and moderation. I can assure him that on this side of the House his wish in that respect will be fully gratified. Whatever we may say as to the measure now before the House we shall say as befits members of the House of Commons and as free British citizens, and if we have to differ, we shall differ more in sorrow than in anger. I appreciate what my right hon. friend has said that the duties that devolve upon him are of great magnitude. Perhaps he will allow me to say that the duties that devolve upon me are as important in one way as are his own; and perhaps he will allow me to tell him that the position which I hold, and which I may have to defend, may be perhaps involved in more difficulties than those which he has to meet. I say no further to-day. I have only one request to make. My right hon. friend refers to matters which he is to lay before the House. He states that before the second reading of the Bill, when discussion will really commence, he will place on the Table the statistics of which he has spoken, but which he did not give, of the number of available men between the ages of twenty and forty-five. I hope he will give that statement to the House in ample time, before we take up the second reading of the Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall endeavour to do it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Would my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) be good enough to say, if he can at this stage, whether it will be the policy of the Government to provide, by amendment of this Bill or otherwise, for registration of the people by statute similar to that passed in the United States?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The provision to which I have alluded is the only provision the Government has in contemplation at present.

Mr. MACDONALD: May I ask if there will be a statutory definition of the words "national interest" used in section 11 of the Bill, or whether the interpretation of the meaning will be left to the different local boards?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is provision that regulations may be made for the purpose of securing uniformity in the application of the Act; but the point has only been taken into consideration in that way.

Mr. MACDONALD: And there will be no statutory definition?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not in contemplation at the moment. I shall be glad to hear the suggestions of my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) or of any other hon. member as to that. At present we have not in contemplation a statutory definition, but we have provided that regulations may be made for the purpose of securing uniformity in the application of the Act. There is a similar provision in the British Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the statistics to be given, showing the number of men avail-

able between the ages of twenty and forty-five, is it intended to give the numbers in different classes, or only the total?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Some of the information we shall give to the House may relate to each of the different classes, but other information that we may be able to furnish possibly will not be so detailed but may embrace two, three or four classes. We will do the best we can in every case.

Mr. MURPHY: In connection with the information the hon. gentleman is to lay on the Table, showing how many men are available between twenty and forty-five, will the Prime Minister be good enough to include a statement of the number of these men who have actually enlisted?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will endeavour to do so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: By your leave, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask one more question. Through the courtesy of my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) I received a copy of the Bill which he has just introduced. But, as between this copy and the Bill which has just been distributed, I find some discrepancies. For instance, in the schedule; in the Bill given me by my right hon. friend there are eight sections, but in the Bill which has been distributed there are only seven. I call the attention of my right hon. friend to this, so that we may have before us a correct copy of the Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It may be that I have sent to my right hon. friend a previous print.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But I am not quite sure which is the correct one.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In the schedule to the Bill there are seven sections.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: So, the last one I have is the correct one. All right.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

SIR JULIAN BYNG.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: I observe by the press of the country that a despatch has been issued stating that Sir Julian Byng has ceased to be in command of the Canadian troops at the front. I desire to ask if this is true, and, if so, whether one of our Canadian officers is going to succeed him.

Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of Militia): I also read the despatch in the morning paper. I expect to have an explanation to-morrow or next day. I have made inquiries, but have not received information up to the present.

PURCHASE OF CHEESE BY THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell). Has the hon. gentleman had any protest from the central and western parts of Ontario with reference to the order of the commission for the purchase of cheese, that this cheese is to be weighed and inspected at Montreal, and not in the warehouse in the West? I have received several protests, which, the writers say, they have sent also to the minister. I should like to know if he has received these protests and what he purposes doing about the matter.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): This matter has been drawn to my attention. I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) that the inspection which formerly took place at western points was really an inspection between the buyer and the seller, but in the present case the British representatives on the commission are buying the cheese f.o.b. Montreal. I have had one or two representations on the lines referred to, and I have turned them over to the commissioners who have offices in Montreal, and who, I am certain, will give to these matters the fullest, fairest consideration, with a view to devising the best regulations and methods for the interests both of the purchaser and of the shipper.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): The Minister of Agriculture last week was kind enough to give information in answer to an inquiry based on information furnished by some constituents of mine whom the hon. gentlemen himself represented as among the most important cheese manufacturers in Canada. I am in receipt of a further letter asking for information. It is pointed out that the price fixed for the cheese, as my hon. friend, I think, stated to the House, last week, is 24¾ cents f.o.b. ship, Montreal. My correspondents allege that there must be taken from that price 1¾ cents for manufacturing, and a further small fractional sum paid to the wholesaler, and that being deducted would make the

net price to the Canadian manufacturer something less than 20 cents. My correspondents point out that the price in Liverpool and in England is 32 cents, and they want to know why the discrepancy between the price in Canada and the price in England.

Mr. BURRELL: I think my hon. friend must be mistaken as to his figures.

Mr. MURPHY (Russell): That is what is stated in this letter.

Mr. BURRELL: The last quotation of the Brockville Cheese Board, I think, was 20¾. I think it will be found that, speaking generally, considering freight, the difference would be about three-quarters of a cent between that and the price f.o.b., Montreal. However, I cannot give my hon. friend any answer on that particular subject, as it is entirely a matter for the British authorities to deal with. They decided what kind of a price they would authorize their representatives to pay. Mr. McGowan has taken the matter up with the most absolute fairness. There is probably no market for any cheese coming from the outside, because the British authorities have commandeered the whole thing. Our only hope —at least representations have been made to that effect—is that the price that is given will not be lessened, and, if possible, it will be bettered. However, it is not a question that we have any control over at all.

Mr. MORPHY (North Perth): Might I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture whether or not he consulted the Western Ontario Cheese Association or kindred associations before he put that legislation in force?

Mr. BURRELL: There is no legislation at all.

Mr. MORPHY (North Perth): There is an Order in Council.

Mr. BURRELL: There is not even an Order in Council.

Mr. MORPHY (North Perth): Well, you have taken action.

Mr. BURRELL: The Government have had the matter under consideration and have appointed, in addition to the British commissioner, Mr. Ruddick, of the Department of Agriculture, and Mr. Alexander, of Montreal, an old member of the cheese trade there, with the idea of seeing that the regulations are carried out, these gentlemen acting in an advisory capacity.

Mr. NESBITT: Are the same regulations in force on the other side of the line as to price as those which are in force on this side and is it absolutely necessary that the cheese men should abide by all the conditions laid down by this Cheese Commission without any remedy? Have they got to comply with them whether they want to or not and are the prices the same on the other side of the line?

Mr. BURRELL: When my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) asks me if they have got to do this and got to do that, I can assure him that under this particular measure there is no compulsion at all. Nobody is obliged to sell cheese to the commission in any shape or form; it is purely voluntary. The British authorities decided that they could offer so much and if people want to sell their cheese they can. If they do not want to sell their cheese they do not have to. Is the price which is being paid on the other side of the line—I presume my hon. friend means the United States—I cannot tell my hon. friend as to that although I should think that, judging from the action lately taken by the British Government, whatever the local prices may be in the two countries, the export price, I should think, would be the same.

Mr. NESBITT: When I asked that—

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will conclude his question because it may lead to a debate on this subject, which would not be in order.

Mr. NESBITT: I quite appreciate that, but I wanted to find out if they would have to sell.

RESOLUTION OF THE MONTREAL TRADES AND LABOUR COUNCIL.

On the Orders of the Day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) asked me some time ago in regard to a resolution from the Trades and Labour Council of Montreal adopted on or about May 17. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), on the 6th June stated that it had not been received by the Government. It was received by myself and I acknowledged it on the 22nd May, 1917. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour was not aware, that the resolution had been received, and I overlooked the fact.

RUMOURED RESIGNATION FROM THE CABINET OF THE HON. MR. PATENAUDE.

On the Orders of the Day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Might I ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister if the rumour which reached us this morning is correct, that the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) had tendered his resignation and whether it has been accepted?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will make a statement to-morrow.

TELEGRAM FROM THE YUKON RE PRICE ADVANCES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I desire to offer a further contribution to the Parliamentary literature on the subject of the high cost of living. I have a wire which is as follows:

Dawson, Yukon, June 9, 1917.

Frank Oliver, M.P.,
Ottawa.

May twenty-fourth Dawson flour advanced from seven to eleven dollars at one jump; bread almost doubled in price. This advance is on old stock bought at last summer's prices; no new stock received. Women's protective league wrote urgent letter to administrator Williams requesting immediate action. He states there will be no written answer to our letter. We then held open meeting to discuss high prices. Yukon councillors publicly invited but not one councillor attended. Miners came in from Creeks to meeting which was largely representative of working people. Result of meeting night letter two hundred fifty words to Premier Borden sent June first; no answer yet. Administrator Williams endeavours to justify extortionate increase. Outside of official and commercial circles general dissatisfaction and indignation freely expressed. Situation becoming serious. Please see Borden; telegraph and act. We trust you implicitly. Answer prepaid.

(Sgd) Geraldine McD. L. Sharpe,
Secretary Women's Protective League.
Marie Fotheringham,
Secretary Yukon Progressive League.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had assumed that it was the purpose of the hon. gentleman to ask a question of the Government. In not having done so, he has taken a liberty with the rules.

Mr. OLIVER: Of course, the question is contained in the telegram and I hope my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will give the answer desired by these two women's leagues in the Yukon.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are passing through unusual times and I have endeavoured not to be too rigid in the enforcement of the rules of order, but I must appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to regard this indulgence in a much more careful manner than has recently been the case.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has not fulfilled his trust because I cannot recall that he has seen me on the subject. However, the telegram there alluded to was transferred by me to my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) who has just informed me that he sent a reply to Mrs. Sharpe. Since then I have not had the matter brought before me until my hon. friend mentioned it to-day. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour will make a statement on the action which he took.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): The telegram referred to by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was received at the Prime Minister's office and referred to me. After consultation with the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) I replied to Mrs. Sharpe and I also wrote—it was not a matter that we could telegraph very well—to the company referred to concerning the prices. I sent a copy of this telegram and asked them what they had to say about it. There has not been time yet to receive a reply from him. As soon as I have an answer I shall show it to my hon. friend and take such action as is considered proper.

EMBARGO ON PENNSYLVANIA COAL.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Has the Minister of Labour anything to state regarding the message I gave him about an embargo on Pennyslvania coal coming into Canada? Is he in a position to give me any information in the matter?

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): I think it was on Thursday evening that the hon. gentleman from Bonaventure showed me a letter stating that Pennsylvania had placed an embargo on coal. I took it up with the Board of Railway Commissioners, and this morning I received a letter in reply to say that the Pennsylvania Railway, through Mr. Rogers, general superintendent at Buffalo, had advised that embargo number 1437 had been cancelled on May 31. I take it that that number refers to the embargo the gentleman who communicated with my hon friend complained of. So that it appears the embargo was removed on the 31st May.

LABOUR STRIKES IN WESTERN COAL MINES.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I notice by the papers that the coal strike, which formerly was confined to Southern Alberta, has extended to Northern Alberta, as a result the bituminous mines on the railway lines west of Edmonton are tied up. Has the minister any information on that point, and has he taken any action which may be disclosed to the House?

Mr. CROTHERS: In reply to my hon. friend from Edmonton, I may say that Mr. Green, a member of this House, reached Calgary, I think a week ago this morning. He has been in communication with the operators and the representatives of the mines since that time. I have not received any particulars as to the progress he has made, I sent him a message on Saturday asking for particulars, and requesting him to state the present situation, and the prospect. I expected a wire from him, but it has not arrived. If I receive any information I shall communicate it to my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a very wide difference in locality between the two areas. Hitherto they have not been under the same co-operation in union matters. I should be very glad if the minister would get information relating specially to the mines in Northern Alberta, in which I am more particularly interested, as they took no part in the strike until the last few days, showing they are not under the same jurisdiction as the other mines, and are animated by different motives.

Mr. CROTHERS: If my hon. friend would give me the names of the mines to which he refers, I could perhaps answer his inquiry.

Mr. OLIVER: Jasper Park Collieries at Pocahontas, and Brulé Lake Mines, on Brulé Lake on the Canadian Northern, the Pacific Pass Mine and the Mountain Park Mine. These four would be the principal ones.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have received no information concerning a strike at any of these points. When did the hon. member learn it?

Mr. OLIVER: I saw it in the press on Saturday.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have no information, but I will inquire.

[Mr. Crothers.]

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 70, for the relief of Colin Darrach Poole.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill No. 71, for the relief of Thomas Edwin Jory.—Mr. Nickle.

Bill No. 72, for the relief of Florence Evaline Synder Lockwood.—Mr. Kay.

QUESTIONS.

Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.

PROVINCIAL DIRECTORS NATIONAL SERVICE.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM:

1. What are the names of the Provincial Directors of National Service for each province, and what compensation, if any, is paid them?
2. How many are employed as assistants in each province?
3. Are the assistants paid for their services?
4. If so, on what scale?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

Province and Director.	Monthly Salary.
Ontario, M.D. No. 1, K. W. McKay	$250
Ontario, M.D. No. 2, Lt.-Col. H. Brock	None
Ontario, M.D. No. 3, Capt. W. N. Bowen	$250
Quebec, M.D. No. 4, J. H. Sherrard, Col. A. Mignault	None
Quebec, M.D. No. 5, Lt.-Col. C. A. Chauveau	$250
Nova Scotia, M.D. No. 6, G. S. Campbell	None
P. E. Island, M.D. No. 6, J. A. Macdonald	$250
N. Brunswick, M.D. No. 6, L. P. D. Tilley	None
Manitoba, M.D. No. 10, E. R. Chapman	$250
Br. Columbia, M.D. No. 11, R. F. Green	None
Saskatchewan, M.D. No. 12, A. L. Haining	$250
Alberta, M.D. No. 13, Hon. A. C. Rutherford	$250
Director of Munitions Labour.	
Mark Irish, Toronto	None

2, 3 and 4. Those assisting Directors of National Service in the various Military Districts are voluntary workers and do not receive salary.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. How many Canadian officers and soldiers took part in the military expedition in the Transvaal?
2. What amount has been paid by the Government of Canada generally, on account of said expedition?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. 384 officers, 7,988 rank and file; 8,372 all ranks.
2. $2,830,965.07.

THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

1. Who are the members of the Economic Commission?

2. When was the Commission created?
3. Have they reported?
4. If so, where is the report available?
5. What amounts, if any, have been paid to each of these Commissioners to date?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. The Hon. Sir James Lougheed, Calgary, chairman; the Hon. W. B. Ross, Middleton, N.S.; J. G. Rutherford, Esq., Calgary; William Farrell, Esq., Vancouver, B.C.; E. N. Hopkins, Esq., Toronto; S. J. B. Rolland, Esq., Montreal, Que.; J. C. Watters, Esq., Ottawa, and William Smith, Esq., M.P., Columbus, Ontario.

2. By Order in Council (P. C. 1517) of 28th June, 1915.

3. No report has been made, but the duties of the commission being largely suggestive and advisory, their views on certain subjects have been discussed informally with the Government for the purpose of advising or assisting the Government touching many subjects upon which it has been necessary to take action either by way of legislation or otherwise.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. The following amounts, made up of per diem allowance provided for by Order in Council (P. C. 2722) of December 18, 1915, living and travelling expenses while on the business of the commission, have been paid to the commissioners, namely, Hon. Sir James Lougheed, chairman, $620; William Farrell, $761.45; E. N. Hopkins, $474.10; S. J. B. Rolland, $148.50; Hon. W. B. Ross, $438.90; J. G. Rutherford, $424.40; William Smith, $91.05; J. C. Watters, $80.

LEWIS MACHINE GUNS.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. Did General Lessard make a report on the state of Militia matters effecting Canadian troops in England?
2. If so, is there any information contained in said report regarding Lewis Machine Guns subscribed for by the people of the Dominion of Canada?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. No such report is to be found on the files of the department.
2. Answered by No. 1.

MR. R. G. M. PARKER, HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR.

Mr. MACNUTT:

1. Is the Government aware as to whether or not Mr. R. G. M. Parker, Homestead Inspector for the Yorkton District, accepted the Conservative nomination for the Pelly District for the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly, on April 3rd last, and as to whether or not he is still drawing salary as Homestead Inspector?
2. If not, at what date did he cease drawing said salary?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No; he is not receiving salary as homestead inspector.
2. 31st of May, 1917.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—COAL CARS.

Mr. MARTIN:

1. What was the date of the last order for coal cars given by the Railway Department to Canadian Car Companies?
2. How many cars were ordered, and from whom?
3. When were said cars delivered?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. October, 1914.
2. 250—From Eastern Car Company.
3. June, 1915.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES—CASUALTIES.

Mr. SMITH:

1. What has been the total number of casualties in the Canadain Expeditionary Forces since June, 1916, to date?
2. What has been the total number of recruits enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces from June, 1916, to date?
3. What was the total number of casualties for the months of February, March and April last?
4. What was the total number of recruits for the same months?
5. What is the recruiting record for the Canadian Expeditionary Forces by months since the outbreak of the war?
6. What has been the total number of recruits enlisted for the Canadian Defence Force to date?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Statement of casualties of Canadian Expeditionary Force reported to Record Office from June 30, 1916, to June 5, 1917:—

	Officers.	Other Ranks.	Totals.
Killed in action	610	11,454	12,064
Died of wounds	176	3,634	3,810
Died of sickness....	38	873	911
Presumed dead.....	24	1,304	1,328
*Missing	50	553	603
Wounded	2,018	43,805	45,823
Prisoners of war....	41	969	1,010
	2,957	62,592	65,549

* The above totals of missing are amended, as the number of officers and other ranks included under this category are subsequently reported killed in action, presumed dead, prisoners of war, etc.

2. Number of recruits enlisted in the C. E. F. from June 30, 1916, to May 31, 1917, 74,510.

3. Statement of casualties of Canadian Expeditionary Force reported to Record Office from February 1 1917, to April 30, 1917:—

	Officers.	Other ranks.	Totals.
Killed in action ..	180	2,891	3,071
Died of wounds ..	50	792	842
Died of sickness ..	19	483	502
Presumed dead ..	1	425	426
Wounded	614	11,629	12,243
*Missing..	54	436	490
Prisoners of war ..	4	57	61
	922	16,723	17,645

* The above totals of missing are amended as the number of officers and other ranks included under this category are subsequently reported killed in action, presumed dead, prisoners of war, etc.

4. Number of recruits enlisted for the months of February, March and April, 1917, 19,584.

5. Number of recruits obtained for the Canadian Expeditionary Force during 1916 and 1917, by months:—

	Recruits 1916.	Recruits 1917.
January	29,212	7,721
February..	26,658	7,644
March..	32,819	6,670
April..	23,289	5,270
May..	15,090	6,520
June	10,796	
July	8,675	
August..	7,267	
September..	6,357	
October	6,035	
November	6,548	
December..	5,803	
Total..	178,549	33,825

No authentic monthly records available prior to January, 1916.

6. Five hundred.

LOCKPORT COLD STORAGE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

What amount has been paid by the Government of Canada to the Lockport Cold Storage Company, Limited, formerly the Maritime Cold Storage Limited, as a subsidy?

Mr. BURRELL: $17,055.04.

OLEOMARGARINE.

Mr. MARTIN:

Is it the intention of the Minister of Agriculture to submit, during the present Session, a measure to authorize the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada?

Mr. BURRELL: Any announcement on this subject will be made in due course.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR: For a copy of all corrrespondence, telegrams, requests, petitions and other papers in the possession of the Department of Trade and Commerce relating to providing a supply of salt for the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces.

[Sir Edward Kemp.]

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the chair.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—ANNUAL STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital —Canadian Government Railways, contruction and betterments, $6,500,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is usual for the minister, in bringing down his Estimates, to make a general statement in regard to the Government railways.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): We are now operating as the Canadian Government Railways System 4,063 miles of railroad. Briefly, the results of operating these railways show that we will have a surplus of $1,074,334 on the Intercolonial, and that we will sustain a deficit of $1,890,371 on the Transcontinental Railway for the recent fiscal year.

Mileage.

Intercolonial, 1,562; Transcontinental, 2,009; Prince Edward Island, 275; International, 112; St. John Valley, 105. Total, 4,063.

Earnings.

The earnings on the Intercolonial during the four winter months were abnormally low, on account of the fact that our operations were directly mainly to the handling of war supplies to Halifax and St. John, and as these ports take the same freight rate as Portland, the Intercolonial's proportion of the through freight rate for its 836 mile haul to Halifax, or 740 mile haul to St. John, as against the Grand Trunk's 297 mile haul to Portland, or the Canadian Pacific's 481 mile haul to St. John, gives an earning as low as $2.20 per ton on hay, oats, flour, etc., which is less than 50 per cent of the actual cost of its transportation. We have also had to move for war purposes large quantities of other low class war freight, and, in order to do this, had to embargo many ordinary lines of shipment which paid higher rates. In this way we were called upon to sustain losses upon operations during these months which, under ordinary conditions, would have shown surpluses.

Intercolonial Railway.

The figures that I am using are subject to slight modification, but on the Intercolonial during the recent fiscal year we earned $16,805,723.64 and spent $15,731,389.

giving us a surplus of $1,137,713, which will be absorbed by our equipment renewal account. Our surplus last year was $1,517,295.

Operating expenses during the year have increased greatly, due to the enhanced cost of coal, increase in wages, increase in cost of material and supplies. On the Intercolonial, operating expenses were unduly heavy during the recent winter, because of extreme weather conditions and the congestion of traffic in Montreal terminals.

Transcontinental Railway.

On the Transcontinental railway we earned $5,916,550, as compared with $3,758,387 last year, and the operating expenses were $7,883,177, as compared with $4,410,528 for the eleven months of the previous year.

The large deficit on the Transcontinental railway is due to the comparatively small amount of traffic offering for that railway and to the fact that we have been obliged to establish trains not at present warranted by the business offering. In addition, we are maintaining the road to the standard of other transcontinental railways, so that we may offer the same safety and comfort in travel as is offered by other transcontinental lines.

Government Railways System.

The operating expenses of the entire Government Railways system for the twelve months were $24,645,433 as against $17,797,061 for the previous year. The earnings for the year were $23,465,565 as compared with $18,373,143 for the previous year. The deficit, therefore, on the combined operations for the year amounts to $1,179,867.

Coal Troubles.

I have already mentioned the reasons given by the management for the great increase in the cost of operation. The item of coal alone was most serious. We contracted for an ample supply, but during the winter the coal miners in eastern Canada claimed to be unable to make delivery, although we offered them more money. Rather than commandeer the output consigned over our lines for commercial and industrial purposes, we had to import large quantities at an increased cost of $486,240.

Extreme Weather Conditions.

Weather conditions last winter in Quebec and Northern New Brunswick were the most severe in many years. Heavy storms and zero weather prevailed almost continuously from January 20 to February 19, and there were also some bad storms in March. Snow-fighting gangs and snowplough trains had to be continuously employed during this period. Our snow-fighting expense during January and February between Montreal and Moncton was $169,288, as compared with $64,757 last year.

The cost of operation was adversely affected also by heavy weather and consequent delays, and on account of Grand Trunk congestion at Montreal. This led to a most unfortunate situation as, under the 99-year joint terminal agreement entered into by the late Government in 1898, we are dependent upon the Grand Trunk for terminal accommodation at that point. This inability of the Grand Trunk to accept business from us resulted in the setting out at one period of about 3,000 west-bound cars, blocking numerous passing tracks, resulting in delay to more than 700 cars of steel urgently required for munitions, and necessitating marshalling westbound trains on our line, work ordinarily done by switch engines in Montreal yards. Overtime in freight service increased $38,000. These conditions at Montreal obliged us to return 49 locomotives and vans, without loads, from Halifax to Montreal in order to maintain our overseas movement. It will be seen, therefore, that conditions were quite abnormal.

Curtailed Passenger Service.

In common with the other great railway systems in Canada, and after conference with the Chairman of the Dominion Railway Board, we decided, in view of the coal situation and urgent overseas movement, to curtail the Intercolonial passenger service, and several local trains and one of our through express trains were taken off during the winter. This also tended to reduce our revenue, and the curtailed service led to considerable inconvenience; but, with the advent of spring and the opening of navigation and the general easing up of conditions, the passenger service heretofore enjoyed on the Intercolonial railway has been resumed.

Nearly Six Million Passengers Carried Without Fatal Accident.

The total number of passengers carried over the system during the calendar year, January to December, 1916, inclusive, was 5,673,796. Included in this number were militia and naval passengers totalling 277,155, carried in 443 special trains. Although we carried nearly six million passengers

during the year, there were few accidents and no passengers were killed although 22 suffered injuries.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister speaks of there being no loss of life. My information is that in one week last winter there were twenty train wrecks, twenty locomotives being thrown off the track. Does the minister make any reference to that?

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister makes reference only to loss of life, not to train wrecks.

Mr. COCHRANE: The hon. member would like to gain a political point; that is his idea.

Troop Trains Well Handled.

As regards the handling of troop trains, my advice is that, while the schedules of these trains were slow, the movements were uniformly good, and that at no time was it necessary to delay a ship at Halifax waiting for troops. In the majority of cases the delay has been the other way, and it has been necessary to hold troops in trains at Halifax for considerable periods before they could embark. The largest single movement was 25 trains.

Halifax Terminals Speeded Up.

To assist in handling the overseas shipment of stores and timber, special efforts were made to complete three berths and two immense temporary sheds at the new Ocean Terminals, Halifax. This was a big undertaking but was satisfactorily completed by November 15. When the war broke out our yards could accommodate 1,844 cars in and around Halifax; we are now able to handle 3,748 cars, which is a striking indication of our overseas development at that point.

The grading from Point Pleasant to Fairview has been practically completed. The substructure of the subway at Fairview has been completed and a temporary steel span erected. Two concrete highway arches, one at Mumford road and one at Quinpool road, have been completed, and the foundations finished for Chebucto and Byers roads and Prince Arthur street.

Work Well in Hand.

The filling behind the bulkhead passenger landing quay wall and north of basin No. 1 is about 60 per cent completed, but very little more can be done until the quay walls are finished. The foundation of the quay walls for the bulkhead passenger landing quay, north quay wall, basin No. 1 and quay walls pier No. 1 are practically finished. The dredging for the first unit is about 90 per cent completed; the breakwater wholly so. The new outlet for the city sewer is finished to the head of basin No. 1.

Line Improvements.

Eighty miles of main line track on the Intercolonial have been relaid with 85-pound rails, as well as 10 miles of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway branch line, which will make the connection between the Intercolonial and the new Prince Edward Island car ferry.

One million one hundred thousand tie renewals have been made on Government railways. One hundred and seventy miles of track have been re-ballasted. Eight passing sidings were extended, two new ones built, as well as fourteen business sidings and fifty-two private sidings. The following terminal yards were enlarged to the total extent of 3,061 cars capacity: Chaudiere Junction, 580 cars, St. Rosalie Junction, 230 cars, Moncton, 369 cars, Truro, 282 cars; Rockingham, 1,600 cars.

This work alone cost us about a quarter of a million dollars, but without it we could not have begun to handle this last winter's business, when the steel shipments from the Maritime Provinces, westbound, were very heavy, and quite as important, from the standpoint of munitions, as the eastbound traffic. These greatly enlarged terminals and extended passing sidings really saved the day from the traffic standpoint.

A million bushel concrete grain elevator is being erected by contract at Transcona, and a 500,000 bushel grain elevator with conveyers at St. John, both of which are to be completed for the grain business this year.

The steamship Northumberland was purchased from the Charlottetown Steamship Navigation Company for use between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

The work of beautifying the station grounds was continued during the year, and some 33 new lawns and flower beds constructed.

In addition to repairs to a large number of structures, 22 steel railway bridges were erected and 6 overhead bridges replaced with steel spans.

Increased Engine Capacity.

Sixty modern freight engines, of the Mikado and Santa Fe type, were contracted for, the former having a haulage capacity of 265 per cent and the latter of 320 per

cent, as compared with 220 per cent, which was the capacity of the largest locomotives previously in the service.

Slow Delivery of Freight Cars.

We ordered 1,000 fifty-ton box cars in the spring of 1916 from two large car manufacturers in eastern Canada, delivery to be completed by October 1, 1916, and January 1, 1917, so as to assist in the winter overseas freight movement; but the contractors failed to make delivery, causing much disappointment and delay, and adversely affecting overseas business. Delivery of one order of 500 was only completed on April 15 last, and in the other case only 167 of the 500 had been delivered up to April 17.

Busy Shops.

The immense demand for transportation facilities created unusual demands for locomotives and cars. By employing an increased number of car repair men our "bad order" freight cars were reduced from 1,410 to 400 during the year. We have repaired over 12,000 freight cars during the year, converted 225 to pulp cars and vans, and built 50 new flats, applied metal draft arms to 500 and safety appliances to 700. We made heavy repairs to 218 passenger cars during the year and completed the building of 4 baggage cars and 2 postal cars with steel underframes, all completely built in the Moncton shops, and also remodelled and overhauled 79 sleeping, dining and parlour cars. We looked closely after repairs to foreign equipment, and have a balance in our favour for the year of about $90,000.

Providing Military and Hospital Trains.

We have been very busy in the Passenger Car Department during the winter endeavouring to provide passenger car equipment for military purposes, which embraced transportation on both the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental. We converted 10 sleeping cars into military hospital cars. Eight of these were repaired and painted and converted into hospital cars in 14 days. The foremen and mechanics worked in relays at high pressure, day and night, Sundays and holidays, on these cars with gratifying results, and all hands were commended and thanked for the performance of such difficult and unusual work in such a short time. In addition to these 10 hospital cars we have assigned for hospital movement seven standard sleepers, and equipped 13 tourist and six old style sleepers which we use as tourist cars, making a total of 26 cars in hospital service. The 10 Red Cross cars aggregate 105 cots, 10 sections, 99 uppers and 5 drawing rooms. The tourist cars have a carrying capacity of 971, making total carrying capacity available for 1,200 persons.

Prince Edward Island Car Ferry and Terminals.

The car ferry steamer has been in service during the winter, between Pictou and Prince Edward Island ports, as an ice-breaking steamer, and has demonstrated her capacity for dealing with any ice conditions which may arise. At Cape Tormentine the landing pier and the bridges for transferring cars between pier and steamer deck are completed, some adjustment of machinery in the power house, and the installation of electric light plant, being all that is required to render this terminal available for service. Additional stone is yet to be added to the breakwater, and the capping stone placed, but the structure in its present condition affords good protection to the steamer berth and turning basin.

At Carleton Point progress during the season suffered through shortage of labour and the occurrence of violent storms.

The railway connection between the ferry landing and the existing lines of the Prince Edward Island railway has been completed, together with the terminal yard and buildings at Carleton Point. Some additional facilities for handling freight at this point will be added as business develops. About a week's dredging is required to clean up some high spots to give a workable turning basin for the steamer, although considerable dredging will be required to enlarge the basin to specifications. This, however, can be done during the summer. Taken altogether, the landing at Carleton Point is now usable except for the lack of a spring fender. The work on this is well forward and the placing of the fender should be completed about the middle of June, and the work in all respects completed this season.

The total estimated cost of the work is $2,910,000, of which we have expended to date $2,600,000.

Hudson Bay Railway and Terminals.

During the past year the rail has been brought up to Mile 332, which is the crossing of the Nelson river at Kettle rapids. The work was behind schedule, partly owing to a labour shortage and partly to the destruction by fire of the contractor's track-laying outfit thus preventing the construc-

tion of the substructure of this bridge before the rise of water which here accompanies ice formation. The substructure of this bridge will be completed on the south side of the Nelson river on May 21, and preparations for start on north side will follow immediately. The steel work of the superstructure is en route to this site. Of the ninety-two miles of grade between this bridge and Port Nelson, work remains to be done at isolated points to an aggregate amount of eleven miles of light grading. Some train filling remains to be done on the portion of the line now built, and much of it has only received a first lift of ballast. It is contemplated that track will be laid into Port Nelson this year and the ballasting of the line brought into fair shape to within a few miles of that terminus.

At Port Nelson a somewhat restricted programme has been followed owing to the effect of war conditions upon labour, materials and ocean tonnage. The bridge structure connecting the deepwater wharves with the mainland was completed, and 1,600 lineal feet of the cribwork of the island placed, built up and filled. The hydraulic dredge worked throughout the season in the channel. The clam shell dredges were employed in dredging stone and gravel from the river bottom for crib filling. During the present season it is hoped that a considerable portion of the island, including the site for the elevator, will be enclosed, and several sections of the deep water dock face cribs placed in position.

The total estimated cost of this work is $26,000,000. We have expended to date $18,175,000, of which $12,565,000 has been in connection with the railway and $5,610,000 in connection with the terminal work at Port Nelson.

Welland Ship Canal.

The estimated cost of this work is fifty million dollars. We have expended to date about thirteen million dollars. As we could not get a return upon our investment for some years, we did not consider the continuance of construction justifiable under our immediate and pressing financial burdens, and orders have been issued suspending operations

Of the nine main sections into which the work have been divided by the engineers, four are now under contract, the estimated value of each of these and the amount expended thereon being:

Section No. 1, estimated value, $3,488,000; expended to date, $2,238,000. Section No. 2, estimated value, $5,377,000; expended to date, $3,111,000. Section No. 3, estimated value, $9,540,000; expended to date, $3,234,000. Section No. 5, estimated value, $1,946,000; expended to date, $1,251,000.

The balance of the expenditures made on account of this work have been for purchase of land, cement and other materials furnished by the department, bridge superstructures procured under separate contracts, operation of construction railway, and miscellaneous. The work is in such condition that no damage is anticipated to occur during the period of suspended operations, and when conditions permit the resumption of the work none of the expenditure which has been made will have been lost.

Trent Canal.

Work upon the Ontario-Rice Lake Division is now drawing to a close. Sections Nos. 1, 5 and 7 are fully completed, and the remaining sections advanced to such a degree that we were able to take our lock gate lifter through the division and hang all the lock gates. The work remaining to be done is for the most part cleaning up the dredging, and this will be completed this season. The Grand Trunk Railway Company have assured us that they will proceed this season with the work involved in raising their low level bridge at Campbellford, so that navigation between lake Ontario and lake Couchiching may be confidently expected on the opening of the season of 1918.

On the Severn division work has proceeded upon the upper two sections which were under contract at the outbreak of the war. Section No. 1, to connect the upper river with Georgian bay, has not yet been placed under contract. The estimated values of the several main contracts and the amount expended to date upon each is as follows:—

Ontario—Rice Lake Division.

Section No. 1, estimated value, $1,105,569; completed. Section No. 2, estimated value, $750,000; expended to date, $721,000. Section No. 3, estimated value, $295,300; expended to date, $229,510. Section No. 4, estimated value, $1,265,000; expended to date, $1,226,000. Section No. 5, estimated value, $634,972; completed. Section No. 6, estimated value, $542,500; expended to date, $510,667. Section No. 7, estimated value, $460,029; completed.

Severn Division.

Port Severn section, estimated value, $160,000; expended to date, $152,900. Section

No. 2, estimated value, $712,000; expended to date, $247,300. Section No. 3, estimated value, $900,000; expended to date, $465,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Can the hon. minister (Mr. Cochrane) give us information as to the number of bushels of wheat shipped over the Canadian Government railways during the past year, more particularly over the Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have not that information, but I will get it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Last session, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) who was acting Minister of Railways in the absence of my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) gave me the assurance, in answer to a question, that by June or July of that year a regular fast passenger service would be established between the cities of St. John and Halifax and Winnipeg. Yet, all we have to-day from New Brunswick is a service which almost meets the description given by a man in the Southern States of the railway facilities in his own section,—the train went down the line one week and next week tried to get back, making a tri-weekly service. I would ask the Minister of Railways why the promise made to us has not been carried out.

Mr. REID: As the hon. member mentioned my name, perhaps I may be allowed a word. If I remember well, the question was asked by the hon. member when there would be a service through between the eastern provinces and Winnipeg on the Transcontinental, and I said that we expected that it would be established in June. That service would be from St. John and Halifax to Winnipeg, via Quebec and the Transcontinental. I think it was carried out about that time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all; the service to-day is what it was before the question was asked and the assurance was given. If there is any change at all, the service is worse than it was then.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister does not imagine that there is any service through from Moncton, say, to Levis? There is a sort of a freight train, or mixed, that leaves Moncton and goes as far as Edmundston, then tries to get back the next day—sometimes succeeds, but mostly doesn't. Then there is another sort of train that leaves Edmundston for Lévis, I presume, the following day. But surely the minister does not pretend that we have anything like a through service.

Mr. REID: As I recollect it, the question put to me was when passengers would be able to travel through from the lower provinces to Winnipeg, on the Government system. You can come through from Halifax to Levis on the Intercolonial. I never expected that there would be a through service on the Transcontinental alone. But passengers can get through over the Government railway system.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. minister could not have meant that; he has forgotten the position. We had the mixed service twice a week—

Mr. CARVELL: Three times.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We had the tri-weekly, or semi-weekly service from Moncton to Levis at that time. I called his attention to that, and said that the object of the Transcontinental was to afford a comfortable through service for passengers between Halifax and St. John and Winnipeg, and the minister gave me assurance that a fast Pullman service would be established. He spoke of a Pullman service. But we have no different service from what we had when he gave the promise. You can leave Moncton and go to Edmundston, stay there over night, then, next morning, you can go on some distance further and stay over night again, making progress at the rate of about fourteen miles an hour—just about the same service that we had before. But what the minister promised was that in June or July there would be the same sort of service as on the Canadian Pacific between St. John and the West. The minister is absolutely mistaken if he says that he simply meant that we should be able to get through in some way from Moncton.

Mr. REID: I suppose that Hansard will show what I said, but as I recollect the discussion the point was as to when passengers could leave Halifax or St. John and go over the Government railway system to Winnipeg, because at that time they were going over the Government railway system to Montreal, then over the Grand Trunk and then connect with the Transcontinental again at Cochrane. I stated that about the middle of June a passenger service would be established between Quebec and Cochrane, so that passengers could go through from Halifax and St. John to Levis, cross at Quebec, and so to Winnipeg over the Transcontinental system. That is what I had in mind. Surely the hon. member would not think that when we were running two through passenger trains a day between Halifax and Levis on the Government sys-

tem we were going to run another train over the Transcontinental between Moncton and Levis, with practically no passengers.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What did the minister mean when he gave the assurance that there would be an improved service? At the time that the minister made the statement, and before, passengers were able, though with these delays, through the mixed service, freight and passenger, to go from Moncton to Winnipeg entirely over the Government system. That was in effect at that time. But the minister assured us that we would have this new service. If all that the minister intended was that we were simply to have the service that we have to-day, then he must have spoken in ignorance of the conditions existing at that time. The minister says that it would be useless to establish a passenger train service since we have one on the Intercolonial.

Mr. REID: I mean through passenger trains.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Transcontinental railway was built for the purpose of making a transcontinental road between the Atlantic and the Pacific, it is a splendid line, passing through the best country and the people of the Maritime Provinces and the West have a right, within a reasonable time, to a proper service. You cannot build up the country and you cannot encourage travel unless you give the people proper accommodation. From the very day that the Canadian Pacific was open through to St. John they had a regular passenger service and they have developed that traffic. To-day they are doing a very large passenger business. That is what I understood from the minister was intended and I am very sorry indeed because he led us, in the lower provinces, to believe that we were going to have the transcontinental railway developed and a real transcontinental service, both passenger and freight, established.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals to the station at Levis. Levis is possibly the most important point between Montreal and New Brunswick. The station was destroyed by fire two or three years ago and the Government have erected a station which is simply a shack and which is very unworthy of the administration of the Intercolonial. Of course, I understand that during war time the Government is not disposed to spend any considerable amount of money or as much as they would spend for a station at a place of the importance of Levis. At the same time, from my own personal experience, from what I have heard from passengers and from what the press in and around Quebec is saying about the matter, it seems to me that the department should, if it cannot this year undertake to provide a permanent station worthy of the place, make improvements to the present emergency station. The premises are unsanitary. I have been there in winter. I have seen hundreds of passengers packed into a very close room, filled with smoke, women with children in their arms and no seats in the cold days in winter when trains are usually late. I would ask my hon. friend, if he does not intend to build a permanent station now—and I understand why he cannot undertake large expenditures at the present time—to make improvements to the present temporary quarters so as to accommodate the public fairly well. The station could easily be enlarged so as to give the public a chance to move about especially in the winter. I am simply echoing public opinion in this matter. I have heard many passengers speak about it, I have read what the press has said about this station at Levis and I have had personal experience of its unsanitary condition. If the minister were to spend $5,000 he could give the public temporary accommodation which would be suitable until he builds his permanent station.

Mr. COCHRANE: We have in the Estimates $127,000 for a new station at Levis. If we do not go on with the new station I will see that the place is made sanitary and that proper accommodation is provided before winter.

Mr. CARVELL: I wish the minister to bring after dinner whatever information he may have regarding the reports, and expenditures, on the pedestals of the Salmon river viaduct in New Brunswick. I want to discuss that subject with him and I, of course, want him to have the information here unless he has it at hand at the present time.

Mr. COCHRANE: I will try and get it for my hon. friend; if not this evening, I will have it before my Estimates are finished.

Mr. CARVELL: Even if he does not have it, I would like to give him some information which has been placed in my hands and he can see whether it is correct or not and make whatever answer he wishes regarding it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: While the Minister of Customs is here I want to refresh his memory by calling his attention to just what he said about the matter of a transcontinental service. He will find it at page 3042 of Hansard, April 19, 1916:

Mr. Pugsley: I think you told them on one occasion, if I remember aright, that if they thought Mr. Pugsley had not made large enough provision for harbour improvements to come to you as Minister of Customs—

That was referring to St. John—

Mr. REID: I remember that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This may bring my hon. friend back to it.

Mr. Reid: The hon. member will remember that since that statement was made, we have been trying to economize.

Mr. Pugsley: Things have tightened up pretty considerably.

Mr. Reid: We expect to be running a through train service from Halifax and St. John to Winnipeg on or about the first day of June.

Mr. Pugsley: Of this year?

Mr. Reid: Yes, that is what I meant. We expect to run a through passenger service, with Pullman cars attached.

Mr. REID: That is all right; I did not say that we were going to run them over the Intercolonial from Moncton to Levis. We have been for the last fifty years running through Pullmans between Halifax, Moncton and Levis over the Intercolonial.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is what the minister meant? Then he goes further:

Mr. Pugsley: Will that be a daily or a tri-weekly service?

Mr. Reid: We will, at least, run a service that will be satisfactory. We have ordered cars and we are trying to get more power as soon as possible, and I think that what we have done so far and the arrangements we have made for a through service ought to be satisfactory to the House and to the country.

The minister is speaking of the Transcontinental. I never dreamt he meant to simply continue the service we had over the Intercolonial railway, from St. John to Halifax.

Mr. REID: If I remember rightly, there was a through service between Quebec and Cochrane.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Mr. REID: And the intention was that the through passengers could come from Halifax, St. John, and Moncton to Levis on the through Government passenger service, and at Quebec they could take the train through to Winnipeg, and travel the whole distance on the Government railway lines, and that statement which has just been read corroborates what I have stated.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They had all that before them last year. The minister will tell you that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What service is there this summer from Montreal to Rivière Quelle and from Rivière Ouelle to Murray Bay? I was assured the other day, —and I think correctly—that the steamer service would be continued. Is there a Pullman between Montreal and Rivière Ouelle, such as last year, and on what days will the Pullman be attached to the train for Rivière Ouelle?

Mr. COCHRANE: I think the service will be the same as it has been for the last two years.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As the season is beginning, will the hon. gentleman consider a suggestion with reference to the days when this Pullman will be most acceptable to tourists? Of course, I am speaking, not only for the Canadian tourists, but for all the Americans who spend the summer at Murray Bay. A large number of American tourists, including former President Taft, were very much annoyed at the changes made last year in the Pullman service. I think, with a little good will in the department, everything could run smoothly. If the Pullman car, instead of returning to Montreal on Sunday morning, were to return Monday evening, it would be more convenient for tourists. If my hon. friend will accept some suggestions, I will send them to him.

Mr. COCHRANE: Certainly.

Mr. KYTE: I would like to get some information as to the amount of money spent for betterments on the Intercolonial railway, from Point Tupper to Sydney during the past year.

Mr. COCHRANE: I will obtain that information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CARVELL: Would the minister bring down what correspondence he may have, between parties interested and Mr. Gordon Grant and himself, as to the pedestal of the Salmon River viaduct?

Mr. COCHRANE: I will bring what I can; I do not know that I have it.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to make some inquiries in regard to traffic on the Transcon-

tinental between Winnipeg and Quebec. When were the rails connected between Quebec and Winnipeg?

Mr. COCHRANE: I will have to get that information; I do not remember.

Mr. OLIVER: What were the rates on grain last winter over the Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Quebec?

Mr. COCHRANE: The same as the year before. The information is in Hansard of last year.

Mr. OLIVER: What were those rates?

Mr. COCHRANE: Six cents a bushel from Armstrong to Quebec.

Mr. OLIVER: What was the approximate amount of grain transported between Winnipeg and Quebec last winter?

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not remember that; I will have to get the information.

Mr. OLIVER: Was the amount considerable?

Mr. COCHRANE: I am not sure.

Mr. OLIVER: Was it equal to the amount transported in the previous year?

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think it was as great.

Mr. OLIVER: Has the department in contemplation such arrangements as will induce a larger proportion of western wheat to take the Transcontinental route during the coming season?

Mr. COCHRANE: That is pretty hard to say. Wheat is routed by the man sending it. We named a very low rate last year, largely because the elevators were full at Fort William, excepting some on the Canadian Pacific railway, which barred wheat shipped by the Transcontinental. For that reason we established a low rate from Armstrong to the Montreal and Quebec elevators.

Mr. OLIVER: The Transcontinental Railway has been completed for a number of years under the administration of this Government, and we should now know whether it is possible to secure the advantage of the transportation of the western crop over that road. There is no doubt that the excessive manipulation of grain prices during the past spring was a direct result of the failure of the grain to go forward to the Atlantic seaboard during the winter. The grain was held either in the interior elevators or at Fort William, and became the subject of price manipulation, to the very great detriment of the public. The results of this manipulation were felt particularly by the eastern public who, being in larger numbers, naturally consume more flour than the western public, although both suffered. If there is to be no relief from that condition; if grain is not to go forward all the year round as was intended when the Transcontinental was built, the country will continue to be subject to such dangers of price manipulation as prevailed last winter. Is it contrary to Government policy that the road should be used in that way, or is it a question of impossibility?

Mr. COCHRANE: The Government is not opposed to the shipment of grain or anything else over the Transcontinental. At the close of navigation, shippers object to sending the grain over the Transcontinental to Quebec because of the difficulties in the way of further shipment. Portland, New York and Boston are more easily reached from Montreal than St. John and Halifax from Quebec. We should be very glad to take charge of shipments of grain, particularly in the winter, when very little traffic is moving. Local traffic on the Transcontinental is limited, and will be limited for some time. We shall be glad to get shipments of anything in order to keep the trains moving.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister will appreciate the query that is in the minds of the people of the West in this connection if he makes a comparison between the present summer rate from Port Arthur across the lake—which, I am credibly informed, is seven cents a bushel—

Mr. COCHRANE: That is to Montreal.

Mr. OLIVER: I understand not. I am informed that the rate is applicable from Port Arthur to Buffalo or Midland. To that is added the rail rate from Midland to Montreal or from Buffalo to New York. When we compare that summer rate by lake and rail with the all-rail rate that the department put in the winter before last, and which prevailed again last winter, we reach the inevitable conclusion that there is something wrong somewhere. It may be admitted that grain can be carried by lake cheaper than by rail, but it must be admitted also that if the lake rate, which can be taken advantage of only during a few months in the year, is higher than the rail rate, which can be taken advantage of during the whole year, the railroad should be carrying that grain. If it is not, then the

blame is upon those who have charge of the railroad's business. The business is there; the rates are such as to admit of the business being handled. If the business is not handled, the responsibility rests upon the management of the railway.

Mr. COCHRANE: The statement made by my hon. friend is not true in any sense of the word.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to get into a discussion with my hon. friend—

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not wish such a statement as the hon. gentleman has made to go to the country unchallenged.

Mr. OLIVER: I have to ask you, Mr. Chairman, to rule that my hon. friend is out of order in declaring that a statement made by me is not true.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is not true. We can only take what grain is given us by the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. OLIVER: I ask for your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: It is against the rules of the House to say that a statement made by another member is not true.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to get into a heated controversy, but, with all due respect to the minister, I cannot submit to a statement such as he has made without its becoming the means of arousing a controversy. He will understand, therefore, why I called the attention of the Chairman to his language. The matter to which I refer is of the gravest importance to the people of Canada, particularly to the people of the West.

I am within my rights and my duties in this House in calling attention to the facts as they exist. If I have not stated those facts correctly I shall be glad to be corrected, but the statements I have made are according to the information I have. It is a fact that the rate on the Transcontinental from Armstrong to Quebec is six cents a bushel, and it is a fact that the rate from Fort William to Midland is seven cents a bushel; that is to say, it is costing more to haul the grain in the summer time from Fort William to the seaboard than it cost all last winter to haul grain over the rails of the Transcontinental. Now, was that because there was not rolling stock for that railway? Was it because there were not such terminal facilities on the Atlantic coast as there should have been? Was it because it was contrary to the policy of the Government to use that railway? I ask these questions. The country is entitled to an answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item be carried?

Mr. OLIVER: If the minister does not think these questions are worthy of answer I shall have to make what further remarks I desire to make in this connection without the courtesy of his consideration. The facts being as I have stated them, this Government will have to stand charged with the responsibility of having taken over a great national public work, and, after having completed that work, of having deliberately and of intent, neglected, or failed, to use it for the purpose for which it was intended, which purpose it was absolutely calculated to serve; and doing so to the detriment of Canada, both east and west. I desire to bring these facts to the attention of the House and of the country for the purpose of emphasizing the point that, so far as this Government, at any rate, is concerned, Government administration of railways is not a success. If this is the result of administration by this Government of the Transcontinental railway between Quebec and Winnipeg it certainly would be suicidal for this country to place the administration of more railways in their hands. We can only regret that circumstances are such as to have placed that stretch of railway in their hands at this time, when, above all other times, it could have been used to the good of the country instead of being allowed to lie idle. Of last year's crop, the returns show that over 150,000,000 bushels found their outlet to the Atlantic seaboard by way of the United States. The carriage of those 150,000,000 bushels belonged to Canada. The Transcontinental railway was built by Canada for the purpose of carrying that wheat. The loss of the carriage of that grain was a loss to the revenues of Canada as well as to the revenues of the railway administration. It is necessary that these facts should be known in order that, when we are told that Canada is overbuilt with railroads, it should be thoroughly understood that Canada has business for her railroads, and that this Government, having control over this railroad, refused to take business over it.

Mr. COCHRANE: What grain or other commodity did we refuse to handle on the Transcontinental?

Mr. OLIVER: I shall have to explain my statement as it will be understood by every one who cares to listen. No person

would suppose that if I took a load of wheat to the management of the Transcontinental and asked them to ship it I would be refused the privilege of shipping it; but if the Transcontinental does not fit itself with rolling-stock or terminal facilities, or does not take care of business when it comes, that in effect is refusal of business, and that is certainly what has taken place.

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) cannot get an answer from the minister, I will bring to the minister's attention another matter in connection with the Transcontinental, and I hope he will be able to give me some information in regard to it. I refer to some repairs done to and reports made upon the Salmon river viaduct in New Brunswick. This viaduct was completed about 1909 or 1910. It is, I understand, the highest and longest viaduct on the system, and I think, the highest viaduct in Canada east of the Rocky mountains. It is about three-quarters of a mile long and about 200 feet high in the centre. There are fifty or sixty pedestals on which the feet of the different portions of the steel work rest, and to my personal knowledge, when that work was under construction, a great deal of care and attention was paid to it to see that everything was properly constructed. I remember in this House, some time before the election in 1911, when all the questions as to the kind of material that was to go into that viaduct were discussed. We were told that the contractors brought material at first some 125 miles; then they found material nearer that the engineers claimed, after it had been tested out at Ottawa, would be satisfactory, and the engineers used all their skill and ability to make that viaduct a permanent structure. All went well until 1915, when some men commenced to dig holes around the side of some of the pedestals. These pedestals are only three or four feet thick at the top and shaped like an obelisk, and they would not be more than three or four feet out of the ground, the greater part of them being under ground. The contractors had to dig down until they came to a solid foundation. When these men commenced to dig a few holes around the sides of the pedestals, people wondered what they were doing. At first it was thought they were digging for the purpose of doing damage. It may be interesting to the minister to know that a gentleman who, in the beginning worked on the construction of those pedestals and who was then working as a fireman in a sawmill nearby, wrote to me wondering if the Germans were attempting to blow up the pedestals of this bridge. It turned out, however, that they were not Germans, but simply employees of the minister who were digging these holes for the purpose of making an examination.

On the 29th of December, 1915, a report was made by Mr. Duff, the substance of which was as follows: The pedestals under that viaduct cost $110,973, while they should have cost only $83,259. In other words, the contractors, practically with the connivance of the engineers, are reported to have stolen $27,714 from the country by not putting in the pedestals the amount of concrete which they said they did. If you can imagine, Sir, a more serious charge against bona fide contractors and engineers, from the district engineer down to the resident engineer, than that I should like to know what it is. In order that the minister may appreciate the full significance of this report, I will put it in another way. They claim that $27,000 worth of concrete had been paid for, not a yard of which had been put in the pedestals, that representing 1,960 cubic yards at 11 cents a yard. They also claim that included in that figure there was a small amount of excessive excavation. The engineers and contractors, when this came to their attention, naturally took drastic steps to have the matter straightened out. The minister will remember that I went to him myself some time in the month of April or May, just after he had returned from the south, in 1916. I told him that I had letters from the engineers and contractors, in which they not only requested, but demanded, that these pedestals be uncovered and offered, if the Government would not uncover them, to uncover them themselves at their own expense if the Government would allow them to do so, so that they could show to the minister and the world that this report was unfounded, false, and malicious. I do not blame the minister at all for the character of the investigation which must have been made by his officials, because I do not think he knew anything about it. It was done, I presume, under the instructions of the then manager of the Government railways, who seems to have had a mania for finding fault with the Transcontinental, in the hope of showing that it was a great piece of corruption from beginning to end. I do not know what has led to the retirement of that gentleman.

Mr. COCHRANE: $5,000 more salary.

Mr. CARVELL: While I think the Liberal party has lost its greatest asset in his retirement, still it is a good thing for

Canada that he has gone. If the amount had been five cents, that is about his size, and I think he would have taken it. However, I am not here to discuss that. From the time the Minister of Railways put that man in charge of the Government Railways he has done nothing but make trouble, and whenever he could make a report or give information detrimental to the Transcontinental it gave him the greatest delight.

I want to show something of the character of the report which the minister received and acted upon. I have only got fragments of the story, but such as they are I gladly give them to him, and I hope at some future date the minister will be able to furnish the committee with the remainder of the data. Away back as early as the 12th of October 1915, Mr. Duff submitted a report to Mr. Gutelius showing the character of the work which they found under these pedestals. The pedestals, I might explain, are in pairs and are designated No. 1 right, No. 1 left, No. 2 right, No. 2 left, and so on. The bridge sheets show that there should have been 99.16 cubic yards in No. 4 right, whereas as a matter of fact there were only 57 cubic yards, or a difference of 42.16 cubic yards.—An actual steal of about 40 to 50 per cent. If these contractors and engineers put in only 57 instead of 99 cubic yards in a pedestal supporting a bridge 200 feet high, and then charged for 99 cubic yards and made the public believe they had put in that amount, those men were criminals, and if the minister believed the report he should have had them prosecuted. There is not a man in this House but will agree with me that these men were criminals if, in a bridge of the magnitude I have indicated, over which the traffic of this great transcontinental system was to be carried, they put only 57 cubic yards in the pedestals that required 99 cubic yards.

With respect to No. 13 right, the plan as shown on the bridge sheets calls for 129.49 cubic yards, and the engineers reported that only 89.7 cubic yards were put in, or a difference of 39.79. There again, if these facts are true, every man who had anything to do with the work should have been prosecuted and sent to the penitentiary for as long a term as possible.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. gentleman assert that there was this shortage?

Mr. CARVELL: I say it did not occur. I assert that the statements in the report are absolutely false. If the shortage did occur, I say that the minister should have prosecuted these men, but I repeat that it did not occur. I shall be able to give some of the facts, and I hope the minister will furnish the Committee with the rest, for he has the whole of them.

There was an individual report on each pedestal. Some of them were shown to be all right; in others the concrete was claimed to be soft, in others very soft. In some cases it is claimed that a pier that was supposed to have at the base 10 feet, let us say, of solid concrete, had only one foot; in other words, instead of having ten feet of solid concrete from the hard pan up, in order to make a good foundation for the great sturcture, only one foot of concrete was put in, and the remainder was sand. When these facts were investigated further, we found that these reports were all false. I have blue prints here of all the pedestals, nearly 100 of them. There is a plan of each pedestal as it was supposed to have been constructed, and a plan marked over the original showing how the pedestal was constructed according to this report, indicating that there was a shortage of about 30 to 40 per cent, and consequently a steal to that extent.

The contractors for the work were as responsible a firm of contractors as ever did business in Canada, Messrs. Powers & Brewer. These gentlemen began doing business on the Canadian Pacific, they have done business in Nova Scotia, and they are doing business to-day in New Brunswick, and they bear as honorable a name as any contractors in the Dominion. The district engineer was Mr. C. O. Foss who has been connected with railway work in Canada all his lifetime. The divisional engineer was Mr. Balloch. Both of these gentlemen have the highest reputation in their profession. I am not able to say who the resident engineers were. As soon as this report became known, of course a protest went up. The first protest was made by the contractor, and I want to read to the minister a letter sent by these contractors to the chief engineer of the Transcontinental railway:

March 15th, 1917.

Gordon Grant, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, Transcontinental
Railway Commission,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,

We have received from Mr. Longley copy of Mr. Duff's report on the Little Salmon River pedestals, and the bridge sheets of same showing concrete as returned and also as Mr. Duff claims it was actually constructed.

The charges of over return are absolutely false, and this statement can be easily proven by properly uncovering his most glaring misrepresentations, pedestals 2 R. and L.

We think you should demand that the Government make an independent examination, in justice to all the engineers who were in any way connected with the work, and more particularly ourselves as contractors.

We would be glad to have you advise us if they will do this, and if so, when, so that we may be present and see the pedestals uncovered.

Yours very truly,
Powers & Brewer,
per H. H. Brewer.

It would take too much time to go through all the correspondence so I will only briefly refer to some of the letters that passed. The contractors demanded that these pedestals, No. 2 right and No. 2 left, be taken, because they were near the bank and it was easy to get at them and they were willing to make these a test of the whole thing. They were willing to try any of them at all, but they chose these for the reason I have already given and because they were reported as being among the most vicious of all. No. 2 left was the one concerning which it was said that, after you got to the base of the shaft and came to the pedestal, where there should have been twelve feet of concrete there was only one foot of concrete. I say again that any firm of contractors, or any engineers that would put in one foot of concrete where there should be twelve, are criminals of the blackest character. It is no wonder that these men protested and demanded that the work should be uncovered, that it might show for itself. I have the correspondence regarding No. 2 pedestal, and I will refer briefly to that correspondence.

First I will call attention to a letter from Mr. Duff to Mr. Gordon Grant, stating that they were starting in to repair the substructure, and that if anybody wanted to be present he could attend. Then there is a letter from Mr. Gordon Grant to Messrs. Powers & Brewer which I will read in full:

Ottawa, June 8th, 1916.

Messrs. Powers and Brewer,
Contractors, 107 Prince William Street,
St. John, N.B.

Re Little Salmon River.

Dear Sirs,

For your information I enclose herewith copy of letter I have received from W. A. Duff, I.C.R. Engineer of Bridges, which speaks for itself. I am sending you this in case you should want to visit the bridge while it is under repair, and you can see for yourself whether or not the representations made by Mr. Duff are correct.

You may notify Mr. Foss, in case he should be sufficiently interested in the matter, to also visit the bridge.

[Mr. Carvell.]

The remainder of the letter merely refers to the fact that the minister had been away and was then busy. Then followed a letter from Messrs. Powers & Brewer to Mr. Gordon Grant, dated 16th June, 1916, acknowledging Mr. Grant's letter and proceeding:

We note from Mr. Duff's report of December 29th, 1915, that he intends to entirely rebuild pedestals 10 R. and 11 R., but the repairs to others will only be to first footing.

If Mr. Duff will advise us when excavation for 10 R. and 11 R. we would like to be present. We would also like to have Mr. Duff uncover the foundations of 2 R. or L. and 15 R. or L. at the same time.

No. 15 right was one of the bad ones according to the first report, and 13 right was another very bad one. Then there was a telegram dated 17th July, 1916, from Mr. Brewer to Mr. Duff:

Have had no reply to our letter of June 16th to Gordon Grant, copy of which we presume has been forwarded to you. I plan on being at Salmon River Thursday, twentieth, and would like to see pedestal two uncovered. Please wire reply.

H. H. Brewer.

On 18th July, the following answer was sent to Mr. Brewer:

Your wire of seventeenth to hand. Mr. Duff is away at present, will not be back until Thursday.

Regarding the uncovering of pedestals 2 and 15 at Little Salmon River, Mr. Duff is making arrangements to have these pedestals uncovered right away.

He will write and let you know when they are ready for inspection.

This was followed by a letter from Messrs. Power & Brewer to Mr. Gordon Grant, dated 19th June:

Yours of 16th instant enclosing copy of Mr. Duff's letter of June 13th received.

Would it not be possible for you to arrange with Mr. Duff to have the excavating around pedestals No. 2 done at once?

Then there is the following letter from Mr. Duff to Messrs. Powers & Brewer:

Moncton, N.B., August 11th, 1916.

Messrs. Powers and Brewer,
Contractors,
107 Prince William Street,
St. John, N.B.
Little Salmon River Viaduct.

Gentlemen:

Referring to your letter of June 19th to Mr. Gordon Grant and my letter to Mr. H. H. Brewer of the 11th July.

We have now excavated to the bottom of foundation of pedestal 2 R, and I will be obliged if you will make arrangements to visit the site of the bridge for the purpose of inspecting this at an early date, as it will not do for us to leave the foundation uncovered very long.

I am sorry that we have been unable to uncover pedestal No. 15 R or L. as yet on

account of water conditions. Will you please advise me when you will visit the site of the bridge, as I would like to be there at the same time if possible.

Yours truly,
W. A. Duff.

This, it will be seen, is a notification that they have excavated to the bottom of pedestal No. 2 right. If they had done so, there could not be very much difficulty in finding out who was right and who was wrong. Mr. Brewer sends back a letter dated 15th August, 1916, addressed to Mr. Duff:

Yours of 11th instant received. We have had No. 2 pedestal examined by Mr. M. J. Powers of Grand Falls, and he advises us that in his opinion your excavation does not reach the bottom of the pedestal but only to a set of walling timbers inside the sheet piling.

He advises that it would not be of any use for me to go up until he is satisfied that the excavation has been carried to bottom of footing course. Will you please have this done, and I would then be pleased to meet you there.

Then, on August 22, there is another letter to Mr. Duff from Messrs. Powers & Brewer, as follows:

Please advise if you are arranging for further excavation of No. 2 pedestal as asked for in our letter of 15th instant.

We are anxious to have the letter cleared up as soon as possible.

Mr. Duff answers on 26th August:

We are arranging for further excavation of pedestal No. 2 and will advise you as soon as I get definite information with regard to same.

It will be noted that three weeks before this they had reported to the engineer that they had uncovered No. 2 pedestal. The contractor sent a man there who saw that they had not uncovered it at all. And on the 26th August they say: "We are arranging for further excavation," and "will advise you." And they did. On the 22nd September they wrote again:

Referring to your letter of the 22nd of August, and mine of the 26th of August.

We have excavated as far down as pedestal No. 2 as it is safe for us to do—

They did not go to the bottom, but they excavated as far as it was safe to do.

—and we have drilled an inch and a half hole through the footing course, and find it to be eight feet thick.

Will you please advise me if you wish to examine this pedestal any further, as we wish to fill in the excavation within a short time?

Then, to follow the history of that one transaction, Mr. Duff did not hesitate to report to the minister and to the country that responsible engineers and contractors had built a pedestal one foot thick when it should have been 11 or 12 feet thick under a bridge of the magnitude of that which I have described, or to say that he had dug down and uncovered one side of every pedestal in the whole bridge. If you want confirmation of that, you will find it in the report in which they say they dug down one side to the bottom, and assuming that this pedestal was square they figured out the contents. Here is a case where they reported one foot of concrete. But the contractor said: "You are wrong." He even said worse than that. They were sent back and they dug again, and they went down a little way and they said: "We were to the bottom." The contractor sent a man down to look at it, and he said: "You are not at the bottom." They said: "We will dig a little further," and they went on and dug eight feet, and still they did not go to the bottom. Then they would not dig any more, and they tried to drill, but they admitted that they never got to the bottom. They admit eight feet of solid concrete in their report instead of only one foot. I would like to know what the minister has to say of engineers who are making reports of that class, and thereby attempting to blast the reputation of honourable men who are trying to earn an honest living. I have given the facts regarding this No. 2 pedestal. They said that it was not necessary to go to the bottom to show that it was proper work, but Mr. C. O. Foss, the district engineer, followed these men to the very end. The contractors did not propose to be put in a false light by these men if they could help it. However, I do not believe that it was Mr. Duff; I believe the real man behind him was Mr. Gutelius. They reached the point, in the month of October, I think, when Duff had to say that he would not dig any further. Finally he named a day when he would be present to go over the work with Messrs. Powers and Brewer. He said that it would be some day next week. Mr. Brewer, who was the man having charge of the work, remained in St. John a whole week, but never was called upon, and finally was notified by Duff that he had to go away and could not meet him, but that he would send one of his assistants. Duff did not dare to go on the work with Powers and Brewer, and therefore sent his subordinate. The subordinate went there.

Mr. COPP: Do the papers give the name of the subordinate?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, Mr. Leightner, representing Duff, and the representatives of the contracting firm appeared on the ground. I have in my possession, and I

want to read, a letter addressed by C. O. Foss, district engineer, to Gordon Grant, dated the 7th November, 1916, which purports to give the result of that interview. If this be true, and the minister will know whether it is or not, it reveals a condition of affairs for which the minister ought to make a public apology to these contractors and to the engineers connected with the matter. It is as follows:

Nov. 7th, 1916.

Gordon Grant, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, N.T.R.
Little Salmon River Viaduct.

Dear Sir:—

Since your communication of the 8th of June I have tried, in conjunction with Messrs. Powers and Brewer, to get something definite from Mr. Duff either confirming or disproving his charges of last year. As you know we asked to have the foundations of pedestals Nos. 2 and 15 uncovered as two of the most glaring examples he had reported of work that was not done. On August 11th he wrote me that he had excavated down to the bottom of foundation of pedestal No. 2R and notified me that if I wanted to inspect it I must do so at an early date as he would not leave the excavation open very long.

On the same date he wrote Powers and Brewer to the same effect and added in the letter to them that he had not been able to excavate down to the bottom of the foundation of No. 15 owing to water conditions. This was not surprising to us as we knew that it would be absolutely impossible to excavate to the bottom of either of these pedestals without the use of a powerful pump, though from his report of last year he apparently had no trouble from water conditions then. On the day we received the letters from Duff, Mr. Powers' brother, who lives at Grand Falls and was watching the work, reported that they had not reached the bottom of No. 2R, and Mr. Brewer so notified Mr. Duff. Some time later, on September 22nd, he wrote Brewer that they had excavated as far down on pedestal No. 2R as it was safe for them to do and had drilled an inch and a half hole through the footing course and found it 8 feet thick.

Following this there was considerable more correspondence which culminated in an agreement by Mr. Brewer to meet Mr. Duff on the site upon the receipt of a wire; finally Duff wrote and wired that his assistant Mr. Leightner would meet him or his representative on Tuesday, October 31st, and as Mr. Brewer had already made an engagement in Montreal for that date he had to send his accountant and Powers whom I have mentioned before. As a result of that meeting we have the following admissions.

This is the point. I am reading now from a statement by Mr. Foss to the chief engineer, and the minister will know whether that statement is correct or not.

In the case of No. 2R as I have already stated he admits that he has drilled through a footing 8 feet thick instead of one foot as reported last year. In the case of No. 10R they removed it altogether and admit that it was 13-6 deep, being nearly 2 feet more than they found last year. No. 15R they admit is 14-7 to bottom, which is nearly 5 feet more than they found last year. No. 4R they found nearly 5 feet more than last year, and at No. 13R about 4 feet more. They state that Mr. Leightner is prepared to admit that the report of last year is not correct. Of course this is quite superfluous as the figures given prove that. I am quite satisfied that if they will send another investigating party there who is anxious to get the truth they will find the balance which they claim is still lacking as shown by our bridge sheets. Mr. Brewer and self intend to interview Mr. Brown soon with a view to learning his attitude with regard to the matter of last year's charges in the light of the information obtained this summer. If you put the figures I have given you on your sheets you will see at a glance how the matter stands under their present claim. I trust you will bring the matter to the attention of the minister in order that he may understand that by their own present findings we are relieved of the great part of the charges made last year.

All the answer there is to that is a simple acknowledgement by Mr. Grant stating that he had forwarded a copy of the letter to the minister, and as it was forwarded to the minister, no doubt he caused an investigation to be made, and he will be able to tell us whether the admission of Mr. Leightner is correct or not. I am sorry that my voice is in such a condition that I will not be able to follow this up very much further. I do not intend to weary the committee by going into the details at any greater extent. I have shown the minister two things. First, his engineers reported to him that they had made an actual investigation of every one of those pedestals, when they did not. There is no getting away from that. These men never measured those pedestals, and I doubt very much if they ever measured any single pedestal out of the whole hundred. That is a pretty strong statement. In the first place, there could not be very many of them measured without very extensive pumping arrangements, because that is in a great valley, and when those pedestals were put down, they had to pump water continuously, and the cost was much more excessive than they imagined it would be, on account of the difficulty in keeping the water out of the cofferdam. They never could have measured down to the bottom of any of them, and we have now the admission of four or five of these people that what they did make was all wrong, in Nos. 2, 4, 10 and 13; because, in this case, they dug down and found they were all wrong. They blasted out concrete which was as solid as anything could possibly be in this world, unless it were steel. I will bring samples and show them to the minister. I have a sample of rock blasted out of one of the pedestals, where the con-

crete was so solid and firm that the blasting broke the rock, instead of breaking the concrete, and I think the minister received samples of the same kind, where they blew these pedestals out with dynamite, in order to put in new ones. I do not know how many men they have employed there, but they must have squandered at least $60,000 or $70,000 in carrying on this unnecessary work, and for what purpose I cannot imagine. I know it was used as a political machine. I know that scores of men were employed upon it, for the purpose of getting their votes at the next provincial election, and they did not get the votes, if that is any satisfaction to the minister. I know thousands of dollars were thrown into the pockets of Mr. White, who ran a general store at Grand Falls, and who was then representing the county in the local legislature, but he is not representing it now. I know it was the greatest piece of political jugglery that has taken place in New Brunswick in my day. There was probably $50,000 or $60,000 of public money absolutely wasted in tearing out concrete piers, which would have been there a thousand years hence, if left alone, and they replaced them with concrete piers, no better than the former ones.

Mr. COPP: What year was this done?

Mr. CARVELL: Last year, when the provincial elections were coming on, and I suppose they expected a Dominion election as well. This is one of the greatest scandals, considering the amount of money involved, that has ever taken place in that country. It is a by-word among the people for miles and miles around. I have letters, which I suppose I should not refer to, from engineers on the American side of the boundary line, who heard about this business and came over, not one but many, to see what kind of butchery the Government was carrying on. I have received correspondence from these engineers stating their opinions about it. And yet the minister squandered all this money, and has nothing to show for it, excepting, I suppose, he will say he knows now what the bottoms are. The bottoms were there all right, but the $60,000 or $70,000 is gone. We can forgive him if he will publicly apologize to the men who have been slandered by his general manager and the officials of his department. That will atone to some extent for the wrong done by this piece of political jobbery.

Mr. COCHRANE: The hon. gentleman from Carleton told me this afternoon that he intended to bring this matter before the committee. I told him that I had not all the papers here, and I wanted him to postpone it, but he said he would rather not. In reference to his charges against Mr. Gutelius he is absolutely unfair, because what first brought it to the general manager's notice was the resident engineer, Mr. R. A. Black, reporting to the superintendent, Mr. H. B. Fleming, on an examination made by him of the substructure of the Salmon river viaduct on the National Transcontinental east of Grand Falls station, and finds there is a rise of ten inches in the first span going into the bridge. This is due to a settlement of the abutment and the girders should be jacked up to place, and the bridge seat raised to the proper level either with concrete or capstones, also that many of the pedestals are in a bad and dangerous shape, on account of defective concrete having been used, etc.

I have a short report of what was done, as follows:

During the past summer repairs to the substructure of this bridge were carried out under the supervision of Mr. James Finley, and twenty pedestals in all were repaired, these being 3R, 3L, 4R, 4L, 5R, 5L, 6L, 7R, 7L, 8R, 8L, 9R, 9L, 10R, 10L, 11R, 12R, 15L, 19L and 25L. The details of the repairs which were done to these pedestals are given in report dated the 10th of November, from Mr. Finley to me, covering the work done during the past summer, copy of which report I attach hereto.

You will note in Mr. Finley's report that he recommends that the following pedestals should be repaired next year:—11L, 13L, 14L, 28R, 28L, 34L, 37L, 39L and 43R.

During the present summer the actual size of the following six pedestals were determined:—2R, 4R, 2L, 10R, 13R and 15R. Pedestals 2R, 4R, 4L and 13R were measured in the presence of Messrs. Powers and Tilley of the firm of Powers and Brewer, Finley, Oulton, Bridge and Building Master Turner and Assistant Engineer G. C. Leightner. It was necessary to entirely remove pedestal 10R, and pedestal 15R was excavated to the bottom of the foundation under Mr. Finley and the depth of the foundation thus determined. The measurements of these pedestals show that there is one hundred and forty-two yards less concrete in them than is shown on original bridge sheets.

I would like to call your attention particularly to the quality of the concrete taken out of the pedestals which were repaired this year, as shown in Mr. Finley's report.

The repairs which were undertaken this year under the supervision of Mr. Finley bear out fully the information given in my report of December 28, 1915, to you, as to the quality of the concrete and the necessity for making the repairs. When the concrete was taken out of the pedestals, the quality of same was found, if anything, to be worse than indicated in my report to you and some idea of the quality of the original concrete put in these pedestals may be obtained from looking at photographs

attached to Mr. Finley's report of pedestals 11R and 12R.

On October 1 sent Mr. G. C. Leightner, Assistant Engineer, to this bridge to meet Messrs. Joe Powers and Tilley of the firm of Powers and Brewer, and he examined the foundation of pedestals 2R, 4R, 4L and 13R in their presence and also in the presence of Messrs. Finley, Oulton and Bridge and Building Master Turner. Mr. Lightner reported to me in connection with pedestal 2R as follows:

"A rod was thrust into the hole which Mr. Finley had bored through the footing and depth measured as a little over eight feet. A rod was then driven some three feet further and then pulled out and the last three feet of the rod were found to be covered with mud. Mr. Tilley was satisfied to accept the thickness of eight feet which Mr. Finley had reported, but Mr. Powers, however, was still sceptical and asked to have another hole drilled in the footing so that he could watch the drilling. Mr. Finley offered to do this for him if he, Mr. Powers, would pay the expense of drilling providing Mr. Finley's finding of eight feet was confirmed. This offer was not accepted. Mr. Powers gave his ground for belief in this pedestal extending deeper, that the man who inspected the work on this pedestal was on his first job of inspection and, he said, would therefore be most careful to have the work done in accordance with the plans."

In connection with pedestal 4R, Mr. Lightner reports:

"Giving them—the contractors—the benefit of every doubt, we concluded the measurement to be 13′ 11″ from the top of the pedestal to the pedestal to the top of the bottom footing and 16′ 7″ from the top of the pedestal to the bottom of the bottom footing. The bridge sheet shows these two dimensions as 13.7′ and 17.7′, or 1.1′ deeper than we found."

With regard to pedestal 4L, he reports:

"The total depth is 2′ 4″ less than shown on the bridge sheet."

With regard to pedestal 13R, Mr, Lightner reports the total height to be 2′ 6″ less than shown on the bridge sheet.

Mr. Leightner's report says: "Got very little satisfaction from either Mr. Powers or Mr. Tilley as to the quality of the concrete which had been removed. They both seemed to think that the concrete when first put in, although the gravel might not have been as good as possible, was of good quality, and that their workmanship had been as good as ordinary, and that the present condition of the pedestals was due to deterioration which might happen to concrete any place. They cited several examples of work in Nova Scotia, which I understood they had built and were now having to rebuild. As to the quality of the gravel which was used, Mr. Powers was inclined to blame the engineers in charge; that is, he stated that the engineers in charge inspected and passed all material used, and if unsatisfactory got into the work, it was not the contractors' fault.

My opinion from the appearance of the broken concrete which had been removed from the pedestals is that in general the concrete was poorly mixed, not properly tamped in the forms, contained insufficient cement and somewhat dirty aggregate and altogether too large a quantity of plums, some of them not judicially placed."

I have some photographs here, and I leave it to any man who examines them to say whether the concrete is good. Several of the photographs show that the concrete could be picked out without blasting or anything of that kind. Some portions of the cement are good, but others are not. In a bridge of that size, bad concrete is apt to crumble out; the work can hardly be said to be proper if there is a bad mixture of cement. If Mr. Powers wants to be prosecuted in the matter, I think that we can put up a case that will hang him.

Mr. CARVELL: You had better go to work and do it, then.

Mr. COCHRANE: I shall be very glad to get a full report and present it later.

Mr. OLIVER: On a previous occasion the attention of the minister was directed to the so-called embargo which was put upon the shipment of grain from the prairie west during last fall and winter. I offer no apology for mentioning the matter again and asking the minister whether there is, under the authority with which he is vested, any remedy for that condition; because when a shipment of grain is refused, a serious loss is suffered by the owner who desires to ship it.

Mr. COCHRANE: Where was the embargo placed?

Mr. OLIVER: On all lines in Alberta from the Canadian Pacific Railway main line north as far as the Saskatchewan river. Notices were issued from time to time by the railway companies that they would not take grain for shipment to Fort William or to Minneapolis—though they would take grain for shipment to the interior elevators. There is no doubt that the railway companies did this under the authority of the Railway Commission. I want to know, on behalf of the people interested, if there is any authority higher than the Railway Commission. Have the people of western Canada any remedy in this matter, which, affecting, as it does, the shipment of their produce, is to them a matter, if not of actual, at any rate of profitable, existence?

Mr. COCHRANE: This is the first time that the putting on of an embargo by the railways has been drawn to my attention. I will inquire into the matter. I will try to get the information for my hon. friend from the Railway Commission.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend surely remembers our discussing the matter in the House on a previous occasion.

Mr. COCHRANE: When?

Mr. OLIVER: On the occasion, I think, of the Budget debate.

Mr. COCHRANE: I was not present then.

Mr. OLIVER: I know that there was an exchange between my hon. friend and myself on that subject on a previous occasion during this session. However, let it be noted that this is a matter in which the people are deeply interested. They want to know if the railway companies are being supported in their refusal to act as common carriers and to take freight to such destination as is indicated by the shipper. My information is that in a certain case a man had 17,000 bushels of threshed oats lying in his field contiguous to the Canadian Pacific main line a little east of Calgary, and the shipment of that grain to Fort William or Minneapolis was refused him by the railway company. That was one instance. It is a general case I desire to make my statement on, and I desire to get the best attention in regard to it.

Mr. COCHRANE: I will get the information.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister said a few minutes ago that the Government had never refused to accept shipments over the Transcontinental. These three railroad systems in the Prairie West are naturally the feeders to the Transcontinental; it is over those lines or some of them, at any rate, that the business must come that the Transcontinental shall handle, and when those railway companies refuse to take grain for shipment to Winnipeg or Fort William, of course, that business is not there for the Transcontinental to handle. If the minister, will pardon me for saying so, it seems a strange administration of a great railway system in the hands of the Government of our country, when such a condition can exist without the knowledge of the head of that administration.

In regard to the removal of rails on the Grand Trunk Pacific west of Edmonton, in what manner are the interests of the coal mines on either side of Jasper and Brulé lakes being protected?

Mr. COCHRANE: The matter of the three transcontinental railways west of Winnipeg bringing goods to the Transcontinental for shipment does not require very much explanation, because two of them run right through to the Atlantic, and we have to depend on what the Grand Trunk Pacific brings to the Transcontinental.

So far as the removal of rails is concerned, my engineer returned on Saturday, on which day I unfortunately had to be away, I hope to-morrow to be able to ask my hon. friend to change his question into an order for return, and I will endeavour to lay on the Table to-morrow full particulars in reference to that matter.

Mr. OLIVER: In regard to the lifting of rails on the Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Quebec, the House is entitled to a definite statement as to what rails have been lifted and as to how far the lifting of those rails might effect the successful operation of the railway.

Mr COCHRANE: The first 300 miles of rails have been lifted and are now either gone overseas or waiting for shipment. I will lay on the Table a plan showing where those rails have been lifted.

Mr. OLIVER: How many tons of those rails are now piled on the dock at Three Rivers?

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not know. I will try to find out.

Mr. GERMAN: Two weeks ago the minister stated in answer to a question of mine that the Government's policy in regard to the railway situation in Canada would be announced very shortly. Will the policy of the Government regarding the railway situation in Canada, consequent on the two reports of the Royal Commissioners, be announced within the next few days?

Mr. COCHRANE: The Government is not ready yet to make its announcement, and I cannot say just when it will be.

Mr. GERMAN: That answer is as indefinite as Government answers to questions of that kind usually are. I do not know that I can blame the minister any more than any of his predecessors in regard to such answers, because that is the kind that is usually given. The railway situation in Canada, notwithstanding the great war that is going on, is the most serious proposition that Canada has to face. The war is undoubtedly a serious matter, but the present railway situation in Canada will, in the near future, tax the ability and energy of the best men that Canada can produce. The Government have appointed a Royal Commission consisting of three notable men of experience in railway matters, and those men have agreed that the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific are bankrupt, and that if the Grand Trunk Railway Company is compelled to carry out its obligation entered into with the Government in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental, the Grand Trunk

Railway Company will also become bankrupt. That being the situation, the Government should, in the interest of the country, immediately announce a policy on this very momentous and important question. I presume that the Government will do in this matter what it has hitherto done in regard to other matters of a similar kind, and what probably other governments have done in matters of equal importance, and that is, leave the question until the dying days of the session, and then bring in the most important legislation which will be before Parliament during this session, to be disposed of in four or five of the closing days of Parliament. I, for one, wish to protest most energetically against such a situation. No further money should be voted in reference to the railway management in this country until the Government shall have announced its railway policy, because the matter is too important. I have no criticism to make against the Minister of Railways and Canals, so far as my knowledge of the situation is concerned, he is as good a Minister of Railways as we have ever had, and perhaps that is not damning him with very great praise. But the existing railway situation in Canada is too important to be trifled with or to be postponed until the closing days of the session, and I wish to give the minister warning now that he will hear from me about this matter in other sessions in this committee until we have an announcement of what policy the Government purpose pursuing in regard to this very serious and important situation.

Mr. COCHRANE: I agree with my hon. friend that the railway situation is very serious, and it deserves and will receive the consideration of the Government; but to say that it is the greatest problem before the Government is not true; the war is the greatest problem, and that we will attend to first. The Bill introduced to-day is the most important legislation ever introduced in this country, and until that is disposed of we cannot expect to deal with much more legislation.

Mr. OLIVER: Will an opportunity be given, when the minister's estimates are up again, to discuss the information he is to lay on the Table to-morrow?

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh, yes.

Mr. KYTE: What amounts were spent last year for betterments on that section of

[Mr. German.]

the Intercolonial between Point Tupper and Sydney?

Mr. COCHRANE: I made a note of the hon. gentleman's remarks before dinner and wired to Moncton for the information. As soon as I receive it I shall be glad to communicate it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is the minister proceeding with the construction of a viaduct at Trenton, in the county of Pictou, to avoid the railroad tracks in connection with the steel company?

Mr. COCHRANE: I think there is an item in the Estimates for that. I will let my hon. friend know later on.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the situation with regard to the coal supply for the Intercolonial? Have arrangements been made for the coming year, and contracts been let?

Mr. COCHRANE: We have bought all the coal we need for the Intercolonial and the eastern part of the Transcontinental, except about 75,000 tons. At the head of the lakes we have about that amount for the Transcontinental in the West.

Mr. MACDONALD: Where was this coal purchased?

Mr. COCHRANE: Some from American coal companies, and some from Montreal. We have also two boats carrying coal from Sydney to Levis, to supply that port and points down to Riviere du Loup.

Mr. MACDONALD: What coal companies are supplying this coal for the Transcontinental and the Intercolonial?

Mr. COCHRANE: I cannot give that information to-night, but I will get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has the question of the Acadia Company been settled yet?

Mr. COCHRANE: For 25,000 tons.

Mr. MACDONALD: At what price?

Mr. COCHRANE: $4.25.

Mr. MACDONALD: 25,000 tons have been ordered at $4.25?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has that amount been accepted?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think the minister told me before that the amount at issue was something like 75,000 tons.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, we have only purchased 25,000 tons from them.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the amount of coal purchased from the American companies for the Intercolonial?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have not the figures, but will get them for my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister cannot expect to get his Estimates through unless he supplies us with the usual information; it is not the practice of Parliament.

Mr. COCHRANE: If the hon. gentleman will tell me what information he wants, I shall be glad to get it for him. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer to carry all this information in one's head.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister cannot assume that attitude with me; it may do with some people, but not with me. Every other minister, when his estimates are up, is prepared to give the Committee this ordinary information.

Mr. COCHRANE: I told my hon. friend I would get the information for him as soon as possible.

Mr. MACDONALD: That means we shall never get it. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when his estimates were before the House two or three days ago, did not adopt the attitude of my hon. friend, but had his officials here and was ready and anxious to give all the information that was asked for; there was no delay. The minister knows that my questions are reasonable.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): Carried.

Mr. MACDONALD: What do you mean, Sir, by calling Carried in the midst of this discussion?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have done nothing to call forth such a remark from my hon. friend.

Mr. COCHRANE: I have told the hon. gentleman that I am getting the information, and I think almost any other hon. member would have accepted my word. I do not make statements that I do not carry out.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was pointing out that it is the practice with ministers at the head of great spending departments such as this, to come prepared with information on most ordinary questions that are likely to crop up. In regard to the questions asked by myself and by my colleagues, the minister has given us no information at all.

Mr. COCHRANE: We are not on the item of coal, anyway.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is no item for coal.

Mr. COCHRANE: It comes under operating expenses, and that is not under discussion now.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have asked the minister whether he proposes to construct the viaduct at Trenton in the county of Pictou, and if so, is it to be done by contract or day labour? I should also like a full statement of what coal he has purchased for the Intercolonial, from whom, and at what price. If the minister says he will give me that information at an early date I have no more to say, except that he should be prepared to furnish the committee with information of this kind when his Estimates are up.

Mr. KYTE: I was somewhat disappointed at being unable to get the information I asked for with regard to the expenditure for betterments on the Intercolonial. The item before the committee is for construction and betterments on the Canadian Government railways, $6,500,000. It is well known that for the past two or three years the Department of Railways and Canals has been spending a very considerable amount of money on the Intercolonial railway between Point Tupper and Sydney for straightening curves, reducing grades, putting in concrete culverts and approaches. I congratulate the minister on these expenditures, which are very important to that section of the road, but I am bound to say with all deference that I did hope to be able to get the information I asked for this evening. I am not finding fault with the minister, but inasmuch as there is a great deal of information pertaining to this particular item to which the committee is entitled, I should be glad if the minister would allow the item to stand for the present.

Mr. GERMAN: I was to inquire further of the minister regarding the report of the Royal Commission on the railway situation. I think the House should have this information at a very early date. The report of Sir Henry Drayton and Mr. Acworth states that the Grand Trunk Railway Company claim to be, and in the opinion of both these gentlemen are, re-

lieved from legal liability in connection with the operation of the Transcontinental portion of the system under the terms of the agreement. Has the minister had any opinion from the Department of Justice, or, if not, will he secure an opinion from that department, to inform the House whether or not this company is relieved from legal obligation to operate the portion of the railway built by the Government from Winnipeg to Moncton? For, if they are legally relieved from this obligation, it can only be by reason of the fact that the contract entered into between the Government and the Grand Trunk Company has been violated by the Government; no violation of that contract by the Grand Trunk Railway Company or by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, could relieve the Grand Trunk Company from this liability. This House and the country ought to know whether the company has been relieved from its legal obligation. This is an exceedingly serious matter, far too serious to be passed over without full information and thorough investigation.

Mr. COCHRANE: All I can say is that there has been no violation on the part of the Government. The Grand Trunk refused to operate the road when it was finished, therefore, there was nothing left but for the Government to operate it. The whole subject will have to be taken up when the railway question is brought before the House for discussion.

Mr. McKENZIE: I fully sympathize with what has been brought to the attention of the minister by the hon. member for Welland. This and other large questions will have to be dealt with when the matter comes before the House. But there are some matters of a local character relating to my own constituency, which I desire to call to the attention of the minister. These may appear small matters, but this is the only railway operated in the part of the country from which I come, and the minister is the one representative of the owners of that railway before whom we can bring any difficulties or grievances, and so we must bring to his attention small matters as well as great ones. By correspondence, I have already brought to the notice of the minister the fact that there is a good deal of faultfinding in the county of Cape Breton and the county of Victoria, by reason of the fact that the people are refused proper railway crossings. It was in 1887, I think, that the right-of-way for this railway in the island of Cape Breton was obtained. That is a good many years ago, and at that time the farming population of Cape Breton and the products of the farms there were not as important as they are to-day, nor was there such a call for farming as there is at present. In those days, it was quite common to have a farm of two or three hundred acres, and for each farm there would be one crossing. But in many cases it has happened that one or two sons have taken fifty or a hundred acres of the old farm and have started farming on their own account. Yet the Department of Railways, as I understand it, refuses to give more crossings. It is not very much encouragement for a young man to remain on the land and carry on the agricultural production that we consider to-day so very necessary to find that he is refused a farm crossing, in fact that may make the difference between the young man starting a farm or not starting it. I have in mind a case where the railway not only cuts a young man's farm in two, but runs between him and the post road, and so in order to reach the road he must go over to his father's farm and get out by way of the old crossing. There should be more sympathy between the railway management and the farmers in these matters. I have understood that the reason crossings were not granted was that the railway officials did not want to establish a precedent. But there should be no feeling of that kind on their part. To accommodate the farmers in these matters means to develop the country. Even if a farm crossing should cost $100—and few of these crossings, I think, would cost more—the expenditure would be a good one and one with which, I am sure, the members of this House would not find fault. I trust that a more generous policy in this matter will be adopted by the department and that the officers on the line, the track-masters and superintendents, will not regard the farmer who asks for a crossing as a man who is trying to make trouble. It is a matter of general complaint against the hon. minister's officers that they are not in sympathy with those in whose way difficulties are placed, or to whom damage is caused by the railway. So long as the Government runs this road it must expect the same kind of trouble that other railways have. It is more difficult to get at a Government-owned railway by means of the courts, and for that very reason it should be made more easy to approach the officials of the department and get matters of this kind settled.

At our end of the line, at Sydney, North Sydney and Sydney Mines, there is great reason to complain because of the irregularity of the trains. This irregularity has continued for nine months or a year past. Trains due at nine o'clock in the morning frequently do not arrive until four o'clock in the afternoon, though they come only from Halifax, a distance of 250 miles. Some say that the irregularity of the trains is due to bad coal, some that it is due to bad engines, while others say that the track is to blame. Wherever the difficulty lies, at least it will be easy for the minister to find out the facts as to the irregularity we complain about, if any record is kept of the time when the trains leave Halifax and when they arrive at Sydney. Several letters have been sent to me and business people, and those who travel over this road have asked me to bring this matter to the attention of the minister and see if something can be done for a betterment in this regard.

I would like to also mention to the minister that between our town and Sydney we had very poor accommodation last year. We have a local service when there is ice in the harbour. In the summer we have no local service and there is no necessity for it. We have only one local train a day between Florence, Sydney Mines, North Sydney and Sydney. Last year the first train we could get from North Sydney to Sydney was at two o'clock in the afternoon. To do business, or to attend court in Sydney, we must be there at ten in the morning. The minister will tell me that we should get there on the express in the morning and the fast train coming in at night. But the train is often late and you can never tell when it is coming in. If you have any important business in Sydney you have to leave the night before on the evening express so that you may be sure of being there. In other years we had the train leaving at nine in the morning and that took people from Florence, Sydney Mines and North Sydney to Sydney. But this year instead of the nine o'clock train, we have to depend on the incoming express which, nine times out of ten, is late and there is a feeling on the part of the business people that it cannot be depended upon. I hope that the minister will instruct his officers to have a proper local service next winter because we cannot be left to depend upon the service we had last year.

Mr. COCHRANE: In reference to my hon. friend's complaint about crossings, we have endeavoured to do as other railways do, but as we propose putting the Government railways under the Railway Commission, these matters will be settled by them if they are not being attended to as it is thought they should be by the minister. With reference to the local train, I have made a note of it and we will discuss it with our officers before winter comes and see what can be done.

Mr. LOGGIE: I am glad to hear the minister say that the trunk lines of the Government railways are going to be put under the Railway Commission. Is it the intention to have provincially chartered branch lines also placed under the Railway Commission? Will the Railway Commission give a through rate on freight arising on a branch line constructed under a provincial charter a number of years ago and connecting with the trunk line?

I would like to call the minister's attention to the condition of the Caraquet railway, an enterprise that is very much retarded because of the lack of equipment and proper roadbed. It is proposed in some cases to increase the rate 50 per cent in order to make up the earnings. Lack of equipment, especially of facilities for dealing with snowstorms during the winter, is one of the difficulties with which the road has to contend. I hope, however, now that the trunk line of the Government railways is to be under the Railway Commission, that it will have some control over the branch lines that are feeders to the trunk line. It is a matter of great importance to the communities that are served by these branch lines that have been constructed under provincial charters. I would ask the minister to make a note of this, and see what can be done at the earliest opportunity. I would urge the minister, in the public interest, to make an effort to come to some terms with the bondholders of the Caraquet railway, and take over the management of that piece of road. The road has good earning power but the rails are light, the roadbed is in a bad condition, and during the stormy portion of the season they can do nothing but battle with the storm. Perishable freight is left where it arises, and a great loss occurs to the commercial interests of that part of the country. We talk about production, we are urging production, but how can production be overtaken if there are no facilities for moving the products to the market? This is a portion of the country that has not the

transportation facilities that it requires for the carriage of its products.

I would also like to ask the minister if any progress is being made with regard to the construction of a bridge from Chelmsford to Millertown? The minister said that he would take the matter up with the local Government, and that he hoped that the local Government would make some move in that direction. He intimated that the Railway Department could perhaps find the iron work of the bridge. It is the imperative duty of the Government to provide communication from the Chelmsford side of the river. The minister took the rails up for 26 miles along that part of the river, the residents of that section have no railway facilities whatever, and they have no means of crossing the river to the railway that is operated on the other side. I believed the minister was in earnest when he told us that arrangements would be made with the local Government with a view to having that bridge constructed. The survey was made, and I have no doubt the report of the survey is in the department. I am not prepared to say that it was finally made, but I know that some location was made in view of the possibility of the bridge being constructed either by the Federal or the Provincial Government. The minister will recall that a few years ago there was a contract entered into for the construction of a Y at Derby Junction. For some reason, which I have never been able to understand, the contract was cancelled, and the Y was not constructed. When representatives of my town called upon the manager, he said that if it was found to be unsatisfactory he would endeavour to have the Y constructed. The matter has remained in that position. The local train runs from Loggieville to Derby Junction and stops there, and it cannot turn because there is no "Y" there, and it must back into Chatham. I should like to know why the "Y" was not constructed at Derby Junction. I hope the minister will take that into consideration.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is impossible to bring these branch lines, constructed under provincial charter, under the Railray Board, unless they are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada. It would be strong handed work for the Government to place them under the Railway Board. The "Y" cannot be proceeded with, because we cannot get rails.

Mr. LOGGIE: That is a good reason.

[Mr. Loggie.]

Mr. COCHRANE: We have taken up a good many branches, in order to procure rails. We have succeeded in placing a contract for 10,000 tons of rails with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in reference to that bridge. I do not think I made the promise he refers to. The promise may have been made in my absence by someone else.

Mr. LOGGIE: I am glad the hon. gentleman has given the reason why the "Y" was not constructed, and I am pleased to have his promise that when the rails are available it will be constructed.

Mr. COCHRANE: I did not make the promise.

Mr LOGGIE: Better make it at once.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not make promises

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not know whether the minister gave us the details of the items contained in the $6,500,000 for construction and betterment. If the details have been given, and it appears on Hansard, it will be to the advantage of the House to know it, but as the information is not given in detail in the vote, as is generally done, this Committee is not in a position to give the matter full consideration. I think the minister should let the vote on construction and betterment stand till the former Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) is present. He is attending a public function in Brockville, and was not able to come. He asked me to mention this matter in his absence, and ask to have it stand. Perhaps the minister will grant that courtesy. The Committee should have the details before passing the item.

Mr. COCHRANE: I can give the hon. gentleman the details.

Roadbed and track	$ 333,000
Bridges	364,200
Buildings	571,000
Miscellaneous	$4,158,000

Mr. NESBITT: That would make up more than the amount.

Mr. COCHRANE; No, it only makes $5,042,000. Then the next items:

Prince Edward Island, roadbed and track	$ 7,600
Bridges	900
Miscellaneous	2,200
New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, Buildings	14,500
Roardbed and track	64,000
Bridges	55,600
Miscellaneous	4,000

Mr. COPP: What buildings would that be applied to?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have not the details.

Cape Tourmentine terminal facilities, standard 40,000 gallon tank and supply	$ 6,000
Four stall frame engine house	8,000
Coaling plant and shed	500
Total	$14,500

Mr. MACDONALD: The first one you gave us was roadbed on the Intercolonial Railway. This is capital expenditure. Is it new construction?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: Where is the money to be expended?

Mr. COCHRANE: Chaudiére junction yard extension; to settle land claims, ballasting charges, $15,000; St. Germain extend passing siding, $3,000.

Survey and inspection.	
To prepare record plans and profiles, and spiral and recenter curves, etc.	$ 20,000
Total roadbed and track	333,000
National Transcontinental Railway buildings	118,900
Roadbed and track	151,100
Bridges	74,000
Miscellaneous	22,700
Winnipeg elevator	425,000
Lake Superior Branch, G.T.P., buildings	3,800
Roadbed and track	15,400
Bridges	87,700
Miscellaneous	20,000

Mr. MACDONALD: I would like to ascertain from the minister, speaking of what has been hitherto known as the Intercolonial, whether the amount which he mentioned for roadbed covers any new construction in any part of the road, or whether it involves a shortening of the road.

Mr. COCHRANE: For business and private sidings, there is $43,100; for Chaudiere Junction yard extension, to settle land claims and ballasting, $15,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: I understood the hon. gentleman to read an item something like $500,000 for roadbed. Did that include the construction of any new piece of roadway?

Mr. COCHRANE: The item was $335,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is contained in the item of miscellaneous, $4,000,000?

Mr. COCHRANE: Halifax, team delivery yard at deep water, $50,000. New Glasgow, paving South street, $6,500. Moncton shops: machinery, $35,000; stores, shop elevator, $1,200; air compressor, $16,500. Scotia No. 1, bridge for life boats, $3,500. To provide safety appliances on rolling stock as per requirement of Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada and Interstate Commerce Commission of United States on interchange of equipment, $17,300. Halifax ocean terminals, $3,500,000. Total new work, miscellaneous, $3,630,000, less amount of revote not required for Sunny Brae branch, $477,000 and Levis improvements, $127,000. Total, $3,026,000.

Mr. COPP: On whose report or advice was the track removed from the main line of railway at the wharf at Sackville?

Mr. COCHRANE: The track was taken up because we wanted the rails. We do not propose to abandon it; we shall replace it as soon as we can get rails.

Mr. COPP: In discussing the removal of rails from the Transcontinental the other day, the minister intimated that only a certain kind of rail would serve the purpose for which rails were required on the other side. The piece of track to which I refer is not more than half a mile long. Some years ago a large wharf was built at Sackville at a cost of about $40,000, and, as it was not connected with the main line of railway, it could not be used. Subsequently the Government, at considerable expense, repaired an old wharf to which there was access by rail. For two years, during the construction of the car ferry terminals at Cape Tormentine, it has been impossible to use the pier at Cape Tormentine for the shipment of lumber and other commodities, and the Sackville wharf has been used for that purpose. Last March the rails connecting with the wharf were taken up, and business men who had built warehouses on the wharf and stored in them large quantities of fertilizer and other goods were subjected to great loss and inconvenience. It is unfortunate that the only means of shipping in that section of the country should have been suddenly taken away. I agree that when rails are required we should give as many as we can. But I understood from the discussion the other day that in the case of the removal of rails in other localities, care was taken that there should be no serious interference with business arrangements and that proper accommodation should be given in some other way. In this case it is not possible to make other satisfactory arrangements under which the business people of the locality affected may use the wharf. I think, therefore, that the minister was ill-

advised in taking up that short piece of track, thereby occasioning great loss to the shippers and to the people generally of that locality.

Mr. BOULAY: Some six years ago the Department of Railways decided to build two subways at St. Fabien, in the county of Rimouski, one at the east and one at the west end of the station. Although the subway proposed to be built at the east end of the station was the one most necessary, the one at the west was built, while the construction of the other was postponed. The siding at the station completely blocks the public crossing, and people travelling to the village have often been detained in winter from thirty to forty-five minutes being unable to cross the track. These delays occasion great annoyance and inconvenience. I understand that for many years provision had been made in the Estimates for completing the construction of both subways, but up to the present time the one at the east has not been built. I would ask the Minister of Railways to look into this matter and to do the best he can to make this improvement as soon as possible. In view of the nature of the crossings and the need for improved facilities, this subway is one of the most urgently required improvements on the Intercolonial railway. Upon approaching the track, the farmers have to climb a heavy hill. At the top the ground is level for a distance of about twenty-five or thirty feet, and sometimes ten or fifteen teams collect on that small piece of ground. There is a downhill slope on the other side of the track, and the whole crossing is very dangerous. If the minister will examine the plans and reports that have been made on the subject, he will realize the truth of what I am saying and appreciate the benefit that the construction of this improvement would be to the public in that locality.

Mr. COCHRANE: I shall be very glad to have the matter looked into, and if the situation is as the hon. member says it is, there is no question that there ought to be a crossing at that point, and we will see what can be done.

Mr. MACDONALD: This item in the Estimates this year is in a peculiar situation. There does not appear to be any vote upon income for the Intercolonial, and the only item which relates to the Canadian Government railways is contained in this one on page 52 of the Estimates:

Construction and betterments, Dartmouth to Deans, branch line, and to provide car ferry—construction terminals, etc.

[Mr. Copp.]

I would gather from what the minister said with regard to construction and betterments that he included a large expenditure for bridges and roadbed on the Prince Edward Island railway. Do I understand that notwithstanding the fact that this is war time, the minister purposes making this very large capital expenditure in Prince Edward Island for the purpose of changing the gauge of the railway?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: What then is the minister intending to do with all this money?

Mr. COCHRANE: I read out what we were doing.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is on account of what the minister stated in a general way —so many hundred thousand dollars for roadbed and so many for bridges—that I asked the question. Those items I would have thought would naturally have come out of income and not be charged to capital unless they involved a change of gauge.

Mr. COCHRANE: There is only $900 for bridges in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MACDONALD: Am I to understand that the changing of the gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway for the purpose of utilising the car ferry is not to be made now?

Mr. COCHRANE: Not this year.

Mr. MACDONALD: I impressed upon the minister twice this session the necessity of securing an increased quantity of rolling-stock for the purpose of ensuring the transportation of coal. The coal situation in Canada is very serious. By reason of the fact that the vessels engaged in the transportation of coal from Nova Scotia to the St. Lawrence river having been commandeered, and that at the present moment it is problematical whether arrangements can be made for transporting the coal at Nova Scotia ports, the question is very grave as to whether the people of Quebec who depended on Nova Scotia in the past for their coal supplies will be able to obtain any this year. We were absolutely dependent on the Intercolonial railway for the distribution of coal throughout the Maritime Provinces, with the exception of one or two ports. I am advised that conditions in regard to the supply of what are known as coal cars are very bad. A few days ago the minister told me that about a year ago there had been given to a car company in

my constituency an order for some coal cars which order had not been filled. I have made some inquiries into the matter, and I am advised that the order to which the minister refers was given more than a year ago, and that it had been filled.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think I said coal cars; I was speaking about box cars.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was directing the minister's attention then, and I am directing it now to the necessity for the reasons I have indicated, of getting some new coal cars on the Intercolonial. I hope the minister is buying cars liberally for this reason: that last year whatever occurred between the Canadian Pacific and the Intercolonial, the Canadian Pacific would not take freight for transport and delivery to the Intercolonial; in fact complaints came from as far as Newfoundland to that effect. The other day I received a telegram from a friend of mine in business in Newfoundland asking me to see whether some means could not be found for the shipment of some goods which he had ordered in the West, and which of necessity had to go over the Intercolonial to North Sydney to reach Newfoundland, because there is no communication by sea from Montreal. On account of the fact of which the minister is well aware and which I am told is true, that there was some difficulty in regard to the interchange of cars, freight conditions in the Maritime Provinces last winter were such that business men were put to the greatest possible inconvenience. The reason given locally by the railway officials was that cars could not be secured. If that be so, and taking into consideration the fact that extra demands were made upon the railway by reason of the shipment of war supplies, that only accentuates the argument in favour of the minister ordering at once a large number of cars. Over a year ago when the Minister of Customs was putting through the Railway Estimates I urged him to place an order for a supply of cars, and I understand that later on an order was given, but it was given very late in the season, I think, in July.

Mr. COCHRANE: In May.

Mr. MACDONALD: We were discussing the matter only about this time last year, and the order was placed after that.

Mr. COCHRANE: Parliament had prorogued long before this time last year.

Mr. MACDONALD: Parliament prorogued in the early part of June last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS: In May.

Mr. MACDONALD: Well, it was in May, just before prorogation that we were discussing the matter. I understood that what the minister referred to was coal cars and not box cars. I would urge him to take steps to ensure that an ample supply of coal cars be obtained for the Intercolonial, and that a supply of box cars is ordered now so that we shall get them within a reasonable time. If we do not order them now, we shall never get them, because there is no telling when the war will stop. It is imperative that the minister should have these cars.

Mr. COCHRANE: I must have misunderstood the hon. member or he must have misunderstood me. It was box cars that the Eastern Car Company had not delivered on the order given more than a year ago. They sent in a quotation to-day for a number of box cars which they said they would not deliver before March of next year. Therefore, the hon. member can see how hard it is for us to get cars.

Mr. MACDONALD: The longer you put the matter off the longer the delay.

Mr. COCHRANE: We are not putting it off, we have given that company an order for a thousand cars which must be filled before the end of the year; we have given an order for another thousand to the Canada Car Company, and we are asking for tenders for 5,000 more. We have scoured the United States for second-hand coal cars in order to help out the situation in the Maritime Provinces; we have secured some, but not as many as we expected. It is almost impossible to get them.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to bring to the notice of the minister the necessity for some improvements at the end of the Intercolonial in connection with my county. The station in my town is absolutely inadequate for the traffic there. It is a small station-house with only one small compartment for all kinds of passengers. The minister knows that it is the place where we land passengers for Newfoundland, and he will find, if there is any record kept, that the number of passengers leaving the train at North Sydney is perhaps as large as in any other place with the exception possibly of the city of Halifax.

There are no conveniences at the North Sydney station at all; the accommodation is altogether inadequate for the traffic, and I trust that some steps will soon be taken to give to North Sydney station accommodation commensurate with its needs. As

one of the public, I am sure I may say to the minister that no person in Canada expects the Government Railways to be behind the private companies in providing accommodation at stations where the agent whether man or woman, has to stay at night. There is a railway station at a place called McKinnon's Harbour which is not fit for a man to live in. This station is in a magnificent farming centre, but I suppose the amount of traffic there is not very large. The agent, however, has to stay there summer and winter, and the accommodation is practically no better than what you would get if you turned a packing case upside down. I should be glad if the minister would provide this agent with accommodation worthy of the railway and of the country. A little farther along the line there is a place called Christmas Island, which is quite a traffic centre. Five or six country merchants get their goods at this station, and I am sure the traffic pays well, but there is no accommodation for the goods left at the station and consequently they have to be left on the side of the road with nobody to look after them. Those are three matters that I wish particularly to bring to the attention of the minister because the need is very great, namely, better accommodation for the traffic at North Sydney and Christmas Island, and reasonable accommodation for the agent who is obliged to live at McKinnon's Harbour. I hope the minister will look into these matters and provide for the accommodation in his estimates next year.

Mr. OLIVER: When did the Government become possessed of the International Railway, and at what price?

Mr. COCHRANE: It is a branch line from Campbellford to Leonard's Junction, 113 miles long, and was purchased three years ago for about $2,700,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Was the purchase made before the war?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes, we should not have bought it after the war.

Mr. OLIVER: I think I read in the newspapers that it was acquired by the Government in January last.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, that was a mistake.

Mr. GERMAN: Who was the road bought from?

[Mr McKenzie.]

Mr. COCHRANE: From a man named Thomas Malcolm, who had some bond company, I think, associated with him.

Mr. OLIVER: The Government seems to have plenty of money for railroads in every place except the Northwest. Railroads already existing in New Brunswick and railroads partially existent in Quebec are being bought, but the Northwest seems to be getting no attention from the Government at all. I heard the minister say a few minutes ago that it would be a very serious matter to declare a certain provincially-chartered branch line in New Brunswick to be for the general advantage of Canada, thereby bringing it under the Railway Commission. The Government has no hesitation in doing that in the province of Alberta, but they do not seem to be taking any measures for the completion of the road. The plea made by the Minister of Finance, when I brought up this matter the other evening, was lack of money, but I notice there is an abundance of money to buy roads in New Brunswick and Quebec.

Mr. LOGGIE: Have any steps been taken to take over the Caraquet railway?

Mr. COCHRANE: There is not much to take over.

Mr. LOGGIE: I think the minister's answer is the strongest reason why something should be done in the public interest. If the road was operated as it ought to be the country would be helped. The road does a good business and should be fairly remunerative. I do not suppose, however, that it would pay the interest on the investment necessary, and that is the reason why the present bondholders do not put the road in proper shape to give satisfactory service in stormy weather. The minister says there is not much to take over, but what there is of it should be taken over in the interests of that section of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to say a word or two on the subject of branch lines because it brings prominently before the House the question whether public men are to keep faith with the people of the country, or whether no further attention is to be given to their pledged words. In the latter case we have a condition of affairs that is not calculated to retain the respect and confidence of the people. I think there

have been only two branch lines taken over in the lower provinces. The International railway is a very valuable road, occupying a very important strategic position, and if it were owned by a private company a very large traffic would no doubt be taken away from the Intercolonial.

I think the minister was well advised in carrying out what had been approved of by his predecessor. It has also taken over the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island road. These are the only two. As the minister knows, for years there has been an agitation in this House and throughout the country, in favour of taking over branch lines and operating them as part of the Intercolonial system. As far back as the early fall of 1911, when the general elections campaign was in progress, the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), who is not at present with us as his duties have taken him overseas, was running in a constituency where an intense interest was taken in this question. The people for years had been demanding better accommodation, especially in the county of Gloucester in regard to the Caraquet railway to which my hon. friend has referred. The hon. member for Kings and Albert was exceedingly desirous to give the people to understand that if the Conservative party were returned to power the branch lines would be taken over and made part of the Intercolonial railway. He wired to the leader of the Opposition of that time, the present Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) asking for a telegram clearly defining the policy of the Conservative party on this subject. He received a reply which he deemed entirely satisfactory and which, unfortunately, the people to whom he was appealing also regarded as entirely satisfactory. The words of that telegram from the present Prime Minister I do not recall, but the effect of it was that it had always been the policy of the Conservative party to take over the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway. It gave Colonel Fowler clearly to understand that if the Conservatives were honoured with the confidence of the people this policy would be carried into effect. Six years have passed since then, and nothing whatever has yet been done in regard to taking over the railways in that constituency. There are three of them of great importance, the Albert railway, the Elgin and Havelock, and the St. Martins railway. The minister will remember that quite a number of years ago the House unanimously passed a resolution in favour of taking over the branch lines and making them part of the Intercolonial, and it has been a great disappointment that nothing whatever has been done in the matter. There are not very many of them and they would be valuable feeders to the Intercolonial, and they would be of infinitely more importance if they were taken over and put into good order so as to operate winter and summer and so that the people could rely upon a continuous and satisfactory service. This ought to appeal to the minister because of the pledged word of the Prime minister which this Government has utterly failed to carry out, greatly to the disappointment of the people. They relied upon the promise, and they are extremely disappointed that it has not been kept. Redress should come from some quarter, though I do not know where it can come from. I feel that if there were a change of government the obligation which this Parliament has taken upon itself in this matter would be fully met. The people despair of getting justice in this matter from this Government, but I think they rely with some confidence upon the pledge if this Parliament being kept, for not only has the Government pledge been given but Parliament also is committed to this policy.

Mr. COCHRANE; I do not know of any time since I became minister when Parliament committed itself to it. Parliament passed a Branch Lines Act, but that does not commit it to the purchasing of all the railways down there. Some of them, as I said once before, instead of being feeders are milkers. There is not any of them but has to be rebuilt, and you could almost build new railways for the same money that it would cost to repair them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What does the hon. minister mean by "milkers"? Does he mean that they are like cows that give good milk? It would seem that the Intercolonial takes the milk out of these branches.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not think so. We do not interfere with their rates.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You take it out of the passengers.

Mr. COCHRANE: Nothing of the kind. This is not a question to bring up in war time, when our expenditure in the war is a million a day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What about the Highways Bill?

Mr. COCHRANE: The Highways Bill is proposed for good reason. If the war should cease, we have to have a lot of work for our returned soldiers.

An hon. MEMBER: Breaking stone.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GERMAN: What about the Quebec and Saguenay which was taken over a long time after the war began?

Mr. COCHRANE: It was agreed to be purchased before the war.

Mr. GERMAN: What about paying the Quebec and Saguenay bond-holders a million and a half which, it is said, they are not entitled to?

Mr. COCHRANE: We have not paid them.

Mr. GERMAN: You have a Bill to pay them.

Mr. CARVELL: I wish to call attention to another matter of the branch lines down home, even if it be war time. It is all very well for the minister to talk about "war time" and say that he cannot build roads now; but he could provide $3,000,000 to spend around the North Pole on what they call the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. COCHRANE: Your friend beside you (Mr. Oliver) will defend that.

Mr. CARVELL: That does not change the latitude of this work, nor does it change the fact that the minister is spending these millions on it.

Mr. COCHRANE: Both parties were committed to it before I came in.

Mr. CARVELL: So they were committed to the branch lines. It is no trouble to the minister to go back on the express policy of both parties with regard to the branch lines, but he must go on building the road from Le Pas to Hudson bay. Both parties may have been committed to that project, but, so far as I am concerned, I am not guilty.

Mr. COCHRANE: The contract was let before I came in.

Mr. CARVELL: That may be, but I am not guilty. There was another agreement made with regard to a road down in my part of the country, which agreement was not lived up to; and I think the time has come when this Government should look into it very seriously and do something to make good the loss occasioned to the province of New Brunswick. When these hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in 1911, they found legislation on the statute book providing for the operation of the so-called Valley railway. Providing it was built under certain terms and conditions, they were to take it over from the province and operate it, paying forty per cent of the gross earnings. The first thing they did was to change the law in 1912, so that they were able to build the road with seven-degree curves and unfavourable grades. Instead of building the road up to the standard set, they built it much below that standard. There was also legislation under which this road was to be built from a point on the Transcontinental at or near Grand Falls to St. John.

It was to be the outlet for all western transcontinental business coming to the port of St. John. One of the first official acts of this Government was to drop the subsidy on the upper end of the road and make it impossible to make that connection. But, acting on the strength of the promise made by this Parliament before this Government came into power, the Government of New Brunswick of that day entered into the construction of this road and have spent somewhere about $7,000,000—I am not sure as to the exact amount, but a very large amount. They have got the road built from a very bright little town in my constituency called Centreville, extending southwards and in a few months it will be completed to a point on the Canadian Pacific from which they can get connection with St. John. But it is only a local road, and as a result it has only local traffic. They are only able to run one mixed train one way each day, because that enables them to take care of all the traffic that arises. I submit to the House that the expenditure of this money by the Government of New Brunswick was never justified except upon the theory, and upon the agreement, that it was to become a part of the Transcontinental railway. If this Government had carried out the contract which Parliament had made with the people of New Brunswick, if they had not degraded the road, or allowed their friends in New Brunswick to degrade it, if they had not cancelled the subsidy, if they had built the bridge across the St. John river at Andover and made it possible to get connection with the Transcontinental railway, the province of New Brunswick would have received sufficient from its 40 per cent of the earnings of the road to have fairly paid the interest on the bonds. I find from the Budget speech made in the Legislature of New Brunswick at Frederic-

ton last week that they have figured a deficit of a quarter of a million dollars this coming year in interest over and above their share of the earnings of the road. A quarter of a million dollars is an enormous amount to be taken out of the ordinary revenues of a small province like New Brunswick. It has reached a point when there must be direct taxation upon the people of that province to take care of the interest, all because this Government have not carried out the pledge that was made to the people of New Brunswick by virtue of the legislation which they found in existence when they came into power. It is true that they have taken over the operation of the road on an agreement that practically means that 40 per cent goes to the province. But unless they carry out the trade that was made by Parliament in its spirit as well as in its letter and build that road through to the Transcontinental railway, or assist to carry it through by renewing the subsidy which they cut off, unless they stand by the trade in such a way as to enable it to be made a through line, it is the duty of the Government to take over the road, take over the bonds, pay them and relieve the province of New Brunswick of the enormous drain that they have upon their public revenue. I do not see, in view of the action of the present Government, anything to do but to assume the payment of these bonds, and, of course, take over the road and run it as a part of the Intercolonial.

I am bringing this matter to the minister's attention in the greatest sincerity. I am pointing out how he and his friends have created the condition that exists today. I am not blaming the minister personally at all but I am blaming his Government and their friends for the very unfortunate condition in which we find ourselves to-night. Unless he will in some way get this road through to the Transcontinental and put it where it will get through business, I see nothing in the world to do but take the road over, assume the bonds and run it as a part of the Intercolonial. I hope the minister will give this very serious consideration and I can assure him that no matter what Government is in power in Canada, or what Government is in power in New Brunswick, this is a question which must be faced. I think this is the first time that it has been brought to the attention of this House but it will come up again because the condition is such that it is simply intolerable, all due to the fact that the Government have not carried out the pledge made to the province and which has forced upon the province an expenditure of $7,000,000 or $8,000,000.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not see how the hon. gentleman can say that we have not carried out our promise. The Bill was put through and we have lived up to it. We agreed to give a subsidy and we have done so.

Mr. CARVELL: You have absolutely repealed the subsidy from Andover.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, it lapsed; it was not repealed.

Mr. CARVELL: It was not renewed.

Mr. COCHRANE: I know it was not renewed because they have not been able to build the road. We are now living up to our agreement and paying them 40 per cent of the earnings. We have not built the bridge across the river at Andover but—

Mr. CARVELL: You will not carry out your agreement.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is impracticable to build it.

Mr. CARVELL: Then you refuse to carry out the agreement of Parliament.

Mr. COCHRANE: I know, but there is common sense in all things and there are things that the Government should do and things they should not do. You know as well as I do that there would not be any traffic over that bridge which would cost I do not know how much—

Mr. CARVELL: It would not cost more than a quarter of a million dollars.

Mr. COCHRANE: A quarter of a million your granny; you could not touch that for a quarter of a million.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is talking about something that he does not know anything about.

Mr. COCHRANE: I know the best engineers in the country think that.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend has never seen the location of the bridge.

Mr. COCHRANE: It would not make any difference if I had; I am not giving my own opinion.

Mr. CARVELL: The minister is not speaking on the reports of any engineers.

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes, I am. The chief engineer of the old Government appointed

for the building of the Quebec bridge made a report in which he said that it would cost $3,000,000.

Mr. CARVELL: I knew my hon. friend did not know what he was talking about. He is not talking about the bridge I am talking about.

Mr. COCHRANE: You are talking about the bridge across the St. John river?

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly—at Andover.

Mr. COCHRANE: Oh, well.

Mr. CARVELL: I knew my hon. friend was not listening to me.

Mr. COCHRANE: It is the bridge across the river to go to St. John that I am talking about.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not talking about that at all. The original proposition was to construct three bridges of which one is at St. John and one at Andover. The bridge at Andover would not cost more than a quarter of a million and I think it might not cost more than $200,000. It would be necessary to make connection with the Transcontinental near Grand Falls. It is an altogether different bridge from the one the minister is talking about?

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not finding any fault in regard to that matter because the Government are making connections with St. John, although I do not think it was the best arrangement to make. They are making connection by Westfield and using a portion of the tracks of the Canadian Pacific. But I do find fault that in the other case they have stopped simply in the country and that they have refused to renew the subsidy from Andover to Grand Falls although they renewed the subsidy from Andover South. In spite of the fact that the department agreed to build that road and have the money all voted for building the road across the St. John river at Andover, the minister has refused. That is why I say he has refused to carry out the trade made between this Parliament and the people of New Brunswick. If he will not carry out this trade upon which we have invested $7,000,000 on a line which is not productive, it is the duty of the minister to take over the bonds, pay the interest, take over the road, operate the line himself and not compel the people of New Brunswick to pay a quarter of a million dollars interest which we would not have been called upon to pay if we had not had the promise of this Parliament and if we had not acted upon that promise.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has called the attention of the minister to this matter. It is certainly one of very great importance. I am able to corroborate all that has been said because I was a member of the Government which arranged for the original subsidy all the way from Grand Falls to St. John.

Delegations came from New Brunswick, representing the Provincial Government, boards of trade, and other important interests, and the whole idea was based upon connection with the Transcontinental railway at Grand Falls. If it had not been for that, I should not have asked my colleagues nor the people representing New Brunswick, to engage in the enterprise at all. It was only by reason of the road being part of the National Transcontinental railway that the matter could be justified. A subsidy was granted originally on the road from Grand Falls to St. John. The hon. gentleman from Carleton has said very truly that different connection has been made from Gagetown to St. John from that which was originally contemplated. Perhaps that may work out fairly well, but certainly not so well as if the original project had been carried out. It leaves the upper end simply terminating in a prosperous village, but having no connection with the Transcontinental system. The minister is entirely in error when he says the company failed to complete the road, and that the subsidy from Andover to Grand Falls lapsed. The company had the road under construction when this Parliament was asked by the minister to repeal that portion of the subsidy which applied to the section from Andover to Grand Falls. There was no failure on the part of the company. The subsidy had not lapsed, and if the minister will refer to the statute he will find a new subsidy from Andover to Grand Falls was substituted for the one from St. John to Grand Falls, and none of us could understand why it was left out. There must have been some Ethiopian in the woodpile, and just what it was I do not know.

Mr. CARVELL: We all protested.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes. And the late Premier Flemming went up to Grand Falls, and told us that it was going to be built, notwithstanding the fact that the minister himself had induced Parliament to alter the statute by repealing the provision for a subsidy from Grand Falls to St. John

and substituting a subsidy from Andover to St. John.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to place before the committee the position in regard to certain railways in the West, to which I made allusion a few minutes ago. I noticed the minister's remark that a time of war was not a time to consider the building of railways. In the instance I wish to mention, I think I can prove to him that the time of war is the time these roads should be completed, because this is the time when we desire to increase production, and people are settling in these districts depending upon the completion of these railroads for the increase of production.

Mr. COCHRANE: To what roads do you refer?

Mr. OLIVER: Canadian Northern, the line northwesterly from Edmonton and the line northeasterly from Edmonton. Those districts are occupied by a large number of people who have been retarded in the development of their land by reason of the lack of railway communication, but when the road was graded from Edmonton to White Court, in 1913, it was universally taken for granted that the establishment of railway facilities was only a matter of another year. The people who were already in the country were encouraged, and other people went into the country and established themselves there, and the operations of those people have been at a standstill ever since, on account of the road not being completed. The grade is there for over fifty miles from the present terminus, at the crossing of the Pembina river, to White Court, and the grading is going out of repair. It was almost completed ready for the rails, and very expensive work had been done on it. Large cuttings and large trestle works have been put in. The St. Paul de Métis road is directed towards a settlement, some of the settlers in which are 120 miles from the road to-day. Those settlers went into that large tract of country a number of years ago. The district is fertile and attractive. The people are enterprising, but it is impossible for those people to increase their production at such a distance from the railroad. These railroads were chartered originally by the provincial government. They are built under provincial government charter, and aid was given the Canadian Northern Railway Company by provincial government guarantee. The bonds guaranteed by the provincial government were sold by the railway company to cover one hundred miles on the St. Paul de Métis branch, and about the same on the White Court branch, and construction was begun on the St. Paul de Métis branch, The grade was completed on the White Court branch for a distance of 130 miles from Edmonton. Later on steel was laid on the White Court branch for 70 miles from Edmonton, and no steel was laid for some years on the St. Paul de Metis branch, but recently the grade on the St. Paul de Métis branch was completed for 100 miles, and it is understood 50 miles of steel is now being laid, leaving 50 miles yet to be covered by the steel. When the $45,000,000 guarantee was given to the Canadian Northern, security was taken by this Government on the Canadian Northern western branch lines, and the money raised on the bonds guaranteed by the provincial government appeared in the statement of the assets of the Canadian Northern as security to this Government for the guarantee of $45,000,000. The conditions of the guarantee were that these properties were mortgaged to this Government by second mortgage. The provincial government, which gave the guarantee held a first mortgage on the properties. The second mortgage held by the Dominion Government acted as a bar to the railway company raising any more money, because the money could not be raised in the face of the mortgage to the Dominion Government, and their enterprise has been stalled in that condition ever since, and for that reason this Government, in order to protect its second mortgage, paid the interest on the bond guaranteed by the provincial government and sold by the company. If the interest were not paid, the road would become the property of the provincial government under their first mortgage. In that way, the Dominion Government becomes responsible for the construction of these roads, and still the roads are not completed and have no earning power. I have brought the matter to the attention of the House during previous sessions, and have urged that, under the circumstances, the Government having made itself responsible for the interest on the bonds, they should complete the railway so that it may be able to earn the bond interest. If these roads were completed to White Court in one case, and 100 miles toward St. Paul de Métis in the other case, it would add enormously to the productiveness of that part of the country, in which population is already established,

but is unable to increase its production because of lack of railway facilities. Money employed to secure the completion of these railroads would not be money diverted from the purpose of winning the war; it would rather be money well spent for the purpose of increasiing the production that is necessary to win the war. My hon. friend's Government has money with which to buy and to bonus railroads in other parts of Canada. If it was necessary to put up money to the extent of the ordinary aid given to a railway company in order to complete these roads, no precedent would be broken. It would be doing no more for the people in the part of the country affected than is done for people in every other part of the country. I urge upon the minister the desirability of the Government's taking steps to put these railroads in a position to earn interest on their bonds and to secure largely increased production at the hands of people who are settled along those lines and who are discouraged by the disappointment that they have suffered through the non-completion of the roads, the construction of which was their inducement to occupy the lands.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: We have heard a good deal to-night about what the Government are doing in other provinces; about their building and bonusing railways in other parts of Canada. That phrase "other parts of Canada" has been referred to so often that I do not think that it should pass unchallenged. Only a few years ago hon. gentlemen who are now advocating the Government's doing something for their respective provinces strenuously objected to the payment of the usual subsidy to a railroad in Ontario which the Provincial Government itself undertook to build and pay for. The members for Edmonton and St. John were members of that Government. Year after year the Provincial Government made application for the subsidy. We remember the strenuous opposition that was made when this Government took steps in the matter; how the Bill was finally passed and then rejected by the Senate; how it was passed again the next year and approved by the Senate by only a narrow majority. I do not like to hear so much about "other parts of Canada."

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think that the province of Ontario applied for the Dominion subsidy after the road was built. The road was under construction long before application for subsidy was made to this Government.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am quite positive that time and again application was made to the Government in power at that time for the subsidy, and that it was as often refused.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does my hon. friend say that application was made by the Ross Government?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think so.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The late Hon. Sir George Ross himself is on record to that effect. The member for St. John says that the Government ought to take over and operate certain roads in the eastern provinces. We all remember the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite last year when the province of Ontario objected to the renewing of a charter to an outside company, in view of the fact that the province itself was willing to build without asking this Government for a dollar. Yet hon. gentlemen in this committee and elsewhere strenuously opposed the attitude of the Ontario Government. The Government desire to be consistent; they desire to deal with all provinces alike. They cannot single out New Brunswick and extend to that province concessions which are not extended to other provinces. I think the time has passed when arguments of that nature should be made in the House.

Mr. CARVELL: What does the hon. gentleman say about the Quebec and Saguenay railway?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Year after year, discussing the branch lines in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, hon. gentlemen told us the same story. In the case to which I refer, they were opposed to the granting of the usual Government subsidy of $6,400 a mile, although the Ontario Government were themselves building the road. No company would build it, because of the view that the undertaking would not be profitable. That shows the difference in the conditions existing in the several provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would suggest that we let this item stand—the late Minister of Railways is absent; he would, perhaps, like to speak on this item—and pass items 104, 105, and 106. The minister has made good progress in the way of getting the ideas of the members—which is almost as good as getting votes through, because discussion must take place.

Mr. COCHRANE: I accept my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. McKENZIE: The member for Richmond might later desire to say something on item 106. There will be no objection to that?

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Tuesday, June 12, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 76, for the relief of George Walter Sherald Garrett.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 77, for the relief of Gertrude Ellen Beal.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 78, for the relief of Donald George Whibley.—Mr. Fripp.

RESIGNATION FROM THE CABINET OF HON. MR. PATENAUDE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I desire to state, in the absence of the Prime Minister, that Mr. Patenaude has tendered his resignation, and that the correspondence in reference thereto will be laid on the table of the House as soon as the assent of the Governor General has been obtained.

APPOINTMENT OF FUEL CONTROLLER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I desire to lay on the table of the House an Order in Council passed on the 8th of June, 1917, constituting a controller of fuel for the Dominion of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Who is the controller?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. C. A. Magrath. The order in Council is as follows:

The Committee of the Privy Cuncil have had before them a report dated 8th June, 1917, from the Minister of Trade and Commerce, submitting the following observations on the coal situation in Canada:—

Last winter very considerable difficulty and hardship were experienced owing to shortage of supplies and congestion of transport, resulting in increased prices to consumers, serious temporary curtailment of production in factories, and much discomfort and privation in the homes of the poorer classes in towns and cities. These causes bid fair to continue and with increasing force during the present season, and are added to by the scarcity of labour for the mines, the increasing difficulties in transport and the added demand for coal in both the United States and Canada owing to the ever increasing exigencies of the war.

At the present moment the outlook for the coming season gives cause for grave anxiety and calls for prompt and efficient action if subsequent shortage and its consequent privations are to be avoided. The Quebec district, which formerly drew for its needs for railways and factories some 2,000,000 tons of bituminous coal from Nova Scotia mines, cannot estimate on more than 200,000 tons from that source. Nearly all the prospective output of these mines will be required for local needs, bunkering purposes and the use of the Intercolonial Railway. This transfers the supply of this deficiency to the United States mines, whilst in Middle Canada the demands have to be met, if at all, by drawing upon United States sources.

Here two difficulties are encountered. First, the high price and shortage of supply in the United States mines, caused by extraordinary demands and reduced output owing to scarcity of labour. The entrance of the United States into the war and the vast preparations necessary for the equipment of sea and land forces and the growing needs of the Allies call for vastly increased output of coal and added restraint of export for other than war purposes. In the second place transport by land and water is daily becoming more inadequate compared to the increasing volume of freights to be moved, and freight costs are continually increasing.

In the western prairie provinces the supply has been diminished by strikes in some of the mines and in respect to those working the output is restricted by the tendency to neglect putting in orders during the summer season, and consequent failure to haul coal to consuming centres during the slack and favourable season.

The minister represents that it seems, therefore, to be necessary that a competent fuel controller should be appointed:

1. To examine into the coal situation of eastern and middle Canada from the Atlantic coast to the Rockies.

(a) As to the probable demands for consumption therein for the coming season.

(b) As to the output of Canadian coal that can be relied upon towards meeting those demands and what, if any, measures can be adopted to increase this output.

(c) As to the sources outside of Canada from which the deficiency can be provided, and the possibility of obtaining the necessary amount.

(d) As to the possibility of providing sufficient transport for the carriage of both Canadian and foreign coal from the points of production to distributing points.

(e) As to the possibility of early and continuous co-operation between producers, carriers and consumers, with a view to economizing and facilitating the needed supply.

2. That in the course of and in connection with such investigation, he be authorized to confer with and co-ordinate the different interests with a view to ensure so far as possible a sufficient supply of coal for Canadian

requirements during the approaching autumn and winter seasons and from time to time to report and recommend to the Government ways and means for effecting the same.

The minister recommends that Charles A. Magrath be appointed Fuel Controller and be charged with carrying out the purposes outlined in the foregoing memorandum, and that all expenses incurred by him for clerical assistance and travelling and living expenses in connection therewith constitute a charge upon and be paid from the War Appropriation Funds.

The committee concur in the foregoing and submit the same for approval.

(Sgd.) Rodolphe Boudreau,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

APPOINTMENT OF BOARD OF GRAIN SUPERVISORS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I also desire to lay on the table of the House two Orders in Council of the 11th June, 1917, constituting the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada. I just desire to say in reference to these Orders in Council that the Government has passed them after consultation and consideration, first, in the interest of Canadian producers of wheat and consumers of flour made therefrom, to regulate and control in an intelligent and reasonable way the price at which wheat shall be sold, and the methods of dealing therein, and the transportation thereof; secondly, to assure for Great Britain and the Allies the total exportable surplus of Canadian wheat and flour at a time of great exigency, from a source which geographically and in regard to the safety and facility for transport, is most available of all overseas countries; thirdly, to act in conjunction and to co-operate with the authorities of the United States who, for similar reasons, are arranging for a like arrangement and control in that country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In view of the importance of these Orders in Council, may I suggest that they should be printed forthwith or appear in Hansard or the Votes and Proceedings?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no objection to their appearing in Hansard.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We shall take them as read and put them on Hansard.

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the importance of these Orders in Council, I can see no objection, with the unanimous consent of the House, to their being considered as read and being placed upon Hansard.

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. KNOWLES: Will these gentlemen receive remuneration?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Orders in Council will give my hon. friend that information, but I may say that this is an entirely honorary board.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are any gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces included in the list?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. The Orders in Council are as follows:

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA.

Monday the 11th day of June, 1917.

Present:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

Whereas, by reason of war conditions, it is considered necessary to provide means whereby the grain of Canada in excess of domestic requirements may be made available for purchase by or on behalf of His Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom and of the Allied Powers, and that the distribution of domestic requirements be controlled in such manner and under such conditions as will prevent to the utmost possible extent any undue inflation or depreciation of values by speculation, by the hoarding grain supplies, or by any other means;

Therefor His Excellency the Governor General in Council, under and by virtue of the provisions of the War Measures Act, 1911, is pleased to make the following regulations and the same are hereby made and enacted accordingly:—

1. The Governor General in Council may appoint a Board to be designated "The Board of Grain Supervisors of Canada" hereinafter called the Board. Such Board shall be honorary and shall consist of not more than twelve (12) members.

2. The Members of the Board shall be paid travelling and living expenses while actually engaged in the duties of the Board but otherwise shall receive no renumeration.

3. The Board shall make such inquiries and investigations as from time to time it deems necessary to ascertain what supplies of grain are now available or will be available. The Board shall ascertain the location and ownership of such grain and what transportation and elevator facilities are available in connection therewith, as well as all conditions connected with the marketing and the market price of the same. For the purpose of any inquiry or investigation held by the Board, the Board and the several members thereof shall have all the power of a commissioner acting under part 1 of the Enquiries Act.

4. The Board shall have power from time to time to fix the price at which grain stored in any elevator may be purchased, and the conditions as to price, destination or otherwise under which grain may be removed from such elevator and may also prescribe what grain shall be sold to millers or milling firms in Canada or elsewhere (hereinafter called "Millers") and what grain shall be sent to the United Kingdom and the Allied powers and it shall be the duty of the Board to issue such orders and take such action as it

deems necessary to facilitate at all times the transportation and delivery of grain in excess of domestic requirements to the United Kingdom and the Allied powers.

(a) Any price so fixed shall be subject to the approval of the Chairman of the Board.

(b) The Board may from time to time appoint an executive committee of not less than three of its members of whom the Chairman shall be one and may assign to such executive committee any duties or powers within the competence of the Board.

5. The Board shall have power to receive offers for the purchase of grain from millers and from the Wheat Export Company Limited, or from any other person or body corporate, hereinafter referred to as "Overseas Purchasers" representing or acting for the Government of the United Kingdom or for any of the Allied nations or for any combination of the same, and from time to time to fix the prices at which such grain shall be sold.

6. The Board shall have power to take possession of and sell and deliver to millers or to overseas purchasers at the prices so fixed grain stored in any elevator, and to account and pay over to the owners thereof the proceeds of such sales after deducting all expenses connected with the taking possession, sale and delivery.

7. The Board shall, as far as possible, and having regard to position and the cost of transportation, fix a uniform price throughout Canada for grain of the same kind quality and grade.

8. Notwithstanding anything in the Grain Act or in the Railway Act, the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada shall have power to order any railway company to provide cars and other transportation facilities for handling grain and to transport as directed, grain taken possession of or owned by the Board.

9. Every person shall truthfully and promptly answer any inquiry made by the Board or by any person duly authorized on its behalf about any matter within its powers or duties, whether such inquiry is made verbally, in writing, by telegraph, or in any other way.

10. In this order "Elevator" means and includes any terminal, country, private, public and hospital elevator, and any elevator licensed by the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada.

11. The Board, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may make any regulations it deems necessary for the purpose of fully and effectively carrying out the objects and provisions of these regulations, and in particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may make regulations.

(a) For appointing representatives in different places in Canada for the purpose, from time to time, of making known in such localities the prices for grain fixed and other regulations or directions made by the Board, and for reporting to the Board any violations or any order issued by the Board or any regulations made hereunder, and generally for assisting the Board in the effective discharge of its duties;

(b) To authorise the engaging of clerks, employees and asistants and the paying of their salaries;

(c) Creating offences and providing penalties in respect of violations of any order made by the Board or of any regulation made hereunder.

(Signed) Rodolphe Boudreau.

Certified copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 11th June, 1917.

The Committee of the Privy Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Trade and Commerce advise that the following persons be appointed members of the Board of Grain Supervisors for Canada, the appointment of which Board was authorized by Order in Council of 5th January, 1917, the first-named to be the Chairman.

Robert Magill of Winnipeg, Man.,
H. W. Wood of Carstairs, Alberta,
Samuel J. Rathwell of Moosejaw, Sask.,
Thomas A. Crerar of Winnipeg, Man.,
William L. Best of Ottawa, Ont.,
John Charlie Gage of Winnipeg, Man.,
William A. Bawlf of Winnipeg, Man.,
William A. Matheson of Winnipeg, Man.,
Lionel Clarke of Toronto, Ont.,
Joseph Ainey of Montreal, Que.,
James Stewart of Winnipeg, Man.

The Committee further advise on the same recommendation that until the Board shall otherwise determine, seven members of the said Board shall constitute a quorum.

Rodolphe Boudreau,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

PRIVATE JOHN TITUS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. McCOIG: I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to a message I have received from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Chatham Branch of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. This is the message:

Private John Titus,—

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member purpose asking a question?

Mr. McCOIG: I just want to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to this letter:

Private John Titus, No. 491181, 33rd Battalion, present address, 217 King Street East, Chatham, Ontario, has not received any money since March 20, is still in khaki, a wounded soldier. I wired Ottawa June 1, also have written them, can get no reply as to why this man does not receive his allowance.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I respectfully submit to the hon. member that this is a matter which more properly could be submitted by letter, or by a question placed on the Order Paper.

YUKON FLOUR PRICES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: May I ask the Minister of Labour, to whom was referred the condition in regard to the prices of flour in the Yukon,

if he has any information to offer the House on that subject?

Mr. CROTHERS: That has not been referred to any one. I simply wrote the company that takes in most of the supplies to Dawson—I have just forgotten their name—for an answer to the telegram, the substance of which is the same as my hon. friend had yesterday.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I suggest to the minister that it takes possibly a week or two weeks for a letter to reach Dawson, and I anticipate that the reason for the sending of the telegram was because of urgency.

Mr. CROTHERS: The place of business of this company is San Francisco, not quite so far away as the Yukon.

LABOUR STRIKES IN WESTERN COAL MINES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: Has the Minister of Labour any information with regard to coal strikes in the bituminous mines west of Edmonton?

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): The Prime Minister received a telegram to-day from one of the companies operating at Jasper Park, stating that the men had ceased work.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I trespass so far on the rules as to ask the minister to give information to the House at a definite time as to the causes for the men leaving work, the prospects for resumption, and whether the strike includes domestic coal mines or is confined to steam coal mines.

Mr. CROTHERS: The telegram did not mention domestic or steam coal mines, but set forth that the men had struck over the question of wages, and would accept whatever arrangement was made in District 18.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House went into Committee on Bill No. 68, to amend the Civil Service Act.

On section 2—persons placed in third class under 1908 Act who had passed qualifying examination, etc., eligible for promotion to second class:

Mr. MURPHY: Might I ask if a distinction is drawn between those who have passed the examination and those who have not?

[Mr. Oliver.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This section applies to those who had prior to the coming into force of the Civil Service Act of 1908 passed the qualifying examination, or have been appointed under sections 37 or 40 of the Civil Service Act, chapter sixteen of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906: that is to say, this section applies to those who have passed the qualifying examination or have been appointed on account of technical skill or special training under the provisions of sections 37 and 40 of the former Civil Service Act.

Mr. MURPHY: Under the present section are those who did not pass such an examination wholly ineligible, or is machinery provided whereby they may become eligible for promotion?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The only way in which they could become eligible is by qualifying under the present Civil Service Act of 1908, or by being specially mentioned in the Estimates. In this Act we deal only with those who have passed the qualifying examination, or were otherwise qualified under the legislation in effect before the Civil Service Act of 1908 came into force.

Mr. MARCIL: Is any provision made for the comparatively large number of officials who were not required to be qualified before the coming into force of the Act?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will observe that this section refers not only to those who have passed the qualifying examination, but also to those appointed under sections 37 and 40 of the Civil Service Act, by reason of technical knowledge or some special skill which they possessed.

Mr. MARCIL: I have received a number of communications the substance of which I might give for the benefit of the minister. One of the officials suggests that the annual increase of from $50 to $100 might also apply to those employees who have been at the maximum of subdivision B of the Second Division for not less than three years. This amendment would not in any way interfere with the existing minimum and maximum salaries of the Second Division, but would have the effect of promoting these employees into subdivision A of the Second Division.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We gave that matter very special consideration and came to the conclusion that as we were giving special advantages to the Third Division by increasing the maximum to $1,300, that would be sufficient to meet the case. For instance, any one in the Third Division who

has attained the maximum of $1,200 may now go up to $1,300. If he merited it, he would receive the annual statutory increase until that figure was reached. Then, if he passed the Civil Service examination, he would be eligible for appointment to the Second Division.

Mr. MARCIL: Those who complain are those who have reached the maximum of $1,600 and have been at that figure for some years. Nothing is done for them, and they ask that they should be promoted to subdivision A of the Second Division. Some men have been at the maximum of $1,600 for four or five years, while the cost of living has been going up all the time.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think my hon. friend must be talking about the Second Division.

Mr. MARCIL: Yes, the man who is getting $1,600.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: He would have to wait until he was promoted. He is eligible for promotion to Subdivision A without passing an examination. It is a question for the departmental head to consider in each case. The civil servant is not debarred from advancement by inability to take the examination, because when he advances to the Second Division no further examinations are necessary.

Mr. MARCIL: Sir George Murray in his report recommended that the Third Division should be divided into three subdivisions, but no effect is given to that recommendation. I thought it my duty to bring these matters to the attention of the minister. I am probably better known to some of the officials than are many other members, and I suppose that is why I have been asked to make these representations on their behalf. These people find that they have remained without promotion for seven or eight years, and that, notwithstanding the increased cost of living, nothing whatever has been done for them. Though they have reached the maximum of their class, and may have been at that point for four or five years or more, they get an increase of only $100, and, unless promoted by departmental action, they get nothing more.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This legislation is merely to exempt an official from taking the examination. It has nothing to do with giving him promotion. Whether he is promoted or not would depend upon his ability, and upon his chief recognizing that ability. We are dealing, in this section, only with those who qualified for the service prior to 1908, but have not qualified for promotion under the existing legislation.

Mr. MARCIL: I am sure that the hon. minister does not wish to do injustice to any civil servant, but there have been cases in which civil servants have been recommended for promotion by the chief of the branch, and that recommendation has been set aside by higher authority. There is another point to which I might call attention while I am on the subject. Under the law a civil servant, after he has been a certain number of years in the service, may be superannuated. But, as to the time when he shall be superannuated he is not given a hearing, nor has he any appeal. One of the oldest employees of the House of Commons, one who, when I was Speaker, was one of the ablest of the staff, learned on the street one day, after forty years of service, that he had been superannuated, though his fellow-members of the staff knew that he was just as competent for his duties then as he had been at any time before. I understand that under the rules of the Indian Civil Service, a civil servant who is superannuated has the right to appeal. A provision of that kind, if introduced into our law, would, apply no matter which party happened to be in power. I think that a man who has been a long time in the service should have a protection of that kind. The minister should consider whether this would not be a fair amendment to make.

Section agreed to.

On section 3:

3. Sections twenty-nine and thirty and subsection one of section thirty-two of the said Act are repealed, and the following are substituted therefor:—

"29. In the second division the minimum and maximum salaries shall be as follows:

In subdivision A, $1,600 to $2,100;

In subdivision B, $1,000 to $1,600.

"30. In the third division the minimum and maximum salaries shall be as follows:

In subdivision A, $1,000 to $1,300;

In subdivision B, $600 to $1,000.

"32. (1) The minimum and maximum salaries for the positions of messenger, porter, sorter and packer, and for such other positions in the lower grades as are determined by the Governor in Council, shall be $600 and $1,000 respectively, and, unless the official record to be kept as hereinafter provided shows him to be undeserving thereof, there may be given to every person holding such a position an annual increase of fifty dollars until the maximum is reached."

Mr. BOULAY: I would urge the minister to consider paying higher salaries to those civil servants who are in the Third Division.

If salaries from $1,600 to $2,100 are paid to those in the Second Division on the ground that the amount is needed for the support of their families, I do not see why the man who belongs to the Third Division, and who may have the same family responsibilities, should be paid so little. In view of the high cost of living, I do not see why those in Subdivision A of the Third Division should not be paid from $1,000 to $1,500, and those in Subdivision B from $600 to $1,200, with an increase of $100 a year in either case. I am told that those in the Third Division sometimes have qualifications equal with those in the Second Division, and are even doing work of equal importance. If there are any men who need increases in order to support their families certainly they must be those who now are lowest in the Civil Service. A salary of $600, or $700, or $800 for a man—I do not say for a woman, because I am against high salaries for women, though there are many in this House who disagree with me on that point, but I still believe that the salaries paid to women should not increase beyond a certain amount—any such salary for a man with a family to support is certainly not enough. I think the minister should be willing to increase the salaries to the figures I have stated, and I believe that such an amendment of the Bill should appeal to the sense of fairness of honourable members of this House.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boulay) will observe that we are fixing the minimum and maximum of the grades. There is nothing to prevent a promotion from Subdivision B to Subdivision A, provided the necessary recommendation is made and agreed to by the minister and the Government. Sir George Murray recommended that the Third Division should be divided into three subdivisions. But here there are only two. In all offices it is customary to have the junior clerks and those who do the less skilled work paid at a less figure than those who are trained and who do more expert work. That is the reason for the subdivision of the division into A and B, with the differences in scale as shown in the Bill.

It is to be pointed out that we get in the service every year a number of untrained, or practically untrained, young women, or maybe young men, who are not really worth more than $500 or $600 a year to begin with. If they went into a financial or commercial office outside of the Civil Service, they would not receive more than that amount to start with, in fact, in financial offices, they start young clerks at a less amount than $600 per annum. Nevertheless, on account of the conditions which have prevailed, especially since the outbreak of the war, we have thought that we should give an increase especially in the lower grades of the service, that is to say, in the third division, and we have raised the minimum from $500 to $600 in that division and also in respect to messengers, packers and sorters. But, we have gone farther than that. We have provided that every one in these two classes may be granted an increase for the present fiscal year of $100; that is to say a messenger or clerk in the Third Division who is now getting $500 a year would be advanced to $600 a year, which is the minimum in each of the classes now, and in addition he would receive this year $100, if worthy of it, and the statutory increase as well. In some cases there will be an advance from $500 for the fiscal year to $750, which is a very substantial increase, being fifty per cent over the amount at present paid. I am inclined to think that the measure deals fairly and justly with the situation which my hon. friend has in view, namely, the high cost of living and its bearing upon the salaries especially of the lower grades up to $1,000. We were more interested in these than in those above $1,000 because the pinch comes in respect to the lower grades. On the whole, I am hopeful that this will meet the conditions that exist to-day fairly satisfactorily.

Mr. BOULAY: Why not put it up to $1,200? I see no reason why, because every member of this House knows that under conditions which are prevailing to-day, it is impossible for a man to support a family on less than $1,000 a year.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Does my hon. friend suggest that instead of the minimum of $600 we should fix the minimum at $1,000.

Mr. BOULAY: No, it would be all right to start at $600 but you should increase it by $100 a year and the increase should be made statutory and not subject to the recommendation of the deputy minister or the chief of a branch because sometimes the poor fellows may not get it at all. Then, as it is now, they would only increase at the rate of $50 a year. If they had the expectation of being able to go to $1,200, it would encourage them to stay in the service and perform their duties faithfully. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance said that those in the Third Division were not as highly qualified as those in the

Second Division. If I am not mistaken men require to be well qualified before they are admitted to the Third Division. I see by an examination paper set for admission to the third division that some very hard questions are put and it requires considerable ability to pass the examination for admission to this division. Those who are admitted are pretty well qualified to do any kind of work in the department. It may be that, with regard to some kinds of work, they may require a certain amount of practice and instruction before they become proficient, but on the whole they must have more than ordinary qualifications to secure admission to this division. I think it would be nothing but fair to hold out to them the hope that they might go to $1,200 by increases of $100 yearly without reference to the recommendation of the deputy head or head of the branch. If they are subjected to this condition there may be half of them left aside each year, if the chief of the branch does not want them increased but they will have to support their families and live just the same as those who have been fortunate enough to secure an increase in their salaries.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has stated very clearly the case for the lower grades in the Inside Service and I can only second his remarks. As regards the salaries of $500 or $600 paid to messengers in the Inside Service, I would appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) to seriously consider the position of these men. I have received a batch of letters from mostly all the messengers in Ottawa and I believe they present a fair case. Really, with the cost of living as it is in Ottawa to-day, a man having a family of two or three children cannot possibly face the conditions of life. I have here some figures which were published in one of the papers of this city as to the increase in the cost of living showing how the family budget has soared within the past four years. This statement is based on statistics collected by the Department of Labour and it is based on the average prices in about sixty cities in Canada. In April, 1914, the family budget was $7.51 per week while in April of this year it had risen to $10.77 and with the addition of coal, wood, lighting and rent, the total reached $17.34 per week. The price of commodities has soared to that figure. Everybody in this House knows that. Therefore, as His Majesty's Government must be carried on, the Government, without being unduly generous, should at least be fairly liberal. I am not one of those who say that because a man is in the Civil Service, having chosen to enter it, he should receive privileged treatment. But, as you are carrying on His Majesty's Government, it is only natural to expect that you will deal fairly and generously with the employees of the Government. With reference to this question of the salaries in the Inside Service, I appeal on behalf of the man who is at the foot of the ladder; I am not speaking for those in the higher grades; they can well take care of themselves. Some years ago my hon. friend the Minister of Finance introduced, or promised to introduce, a Bill to deal with the Civil Service and I told him that he should not confine himself to the Inside Service but that he should have some regard to the Outside Service. The host of Government employees who have congregated in the city of Ottawa and who are employed in the large public buildings should not alone be considered. You have in every city, town and hamlet of the Dominion faithful employees of His Majesty's Government. I must give due credit to the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) for, in his recent interview with representatives of labour, promising to deal generously with the employees of his department in the Outside Service and I think he has dealt with them quite generously and liberally. I also approve of his action in promising that he would give preference to returned soldiers.

I take the Post Office Department because I am more familiar with that department than with any other. The misfortune of the Post Office Department since 1911 has been that its principal officer, the Postmaster General, has been so often changed that the poor sorters and the poor railway mail clerks have been completely forgotten. Let us hope that in the near future there will be more permanency in that department, and that its employees will be looked after in a proper way. I again appeal to my hon. friend, and I say to him that he should not confine his efforts to deal fairly with the Civil Service to the Inside Service only, but should extend those efforts to the Outside Civil Service.

Let me read the petition which undoubtedly was sent to other members of the House by the railway mail clerks who have been clamouring for the last five or six years for an increase of salary. This memorial was sent to my hon. friend the ex-

Secretary of State, the Hon. Mr. Patenaude. It was addressed to him as Postmaster General, as he was simply locum tenens in the Post Office Department. It is dated April 25 and is as follows:

"Hon. E. L. Patenaude,
Postmaster General, Ottawa.

Honourable Sir,—

At your request, we are here representative of the Railway Mail Clerks operating railway postal routes east of Sudbury, nine divisions, totalling approximately eight hundred clerks, to lay before you our claims to have the Provisional Allowance, an allowance long enjoyed by our western brethren, extended to the clerks of the eastern divisions.

The necessity of immediate assistance is indeed pressing, owing to the fact that living conditions have increased so much in the past few years, so much that we who are of fixed salaries find them inadequate to support us in comfort, indeed if present conditions continue living will fast become burdensome. All wage-earners in commercial life have had their salaries adjusted from time to time to meet these conditions. In proof I will quote you a few necessities taken from the February issue of the Labour Gazette, published by the Department of Labour for the provinces of Eastern Canada. Food stuffs have increased since 1910 51 per cent., light and fuel 21 per cent., clothing 80 per cent., hotels and restaurants 75 per cent.

We feel that in asking for the Provisional Allowance we are not asking for an increase in salary. The clerks of the western divisions have enjoyed this allowance for over thirty years, owing to the excess cost of living over the east. Conditions have changed in the past few years, until at the present time living conditions are on a parity throughout the Dominion.

We feel that we are now $300 behind our brother clerks of the Post Office staff. In 1914 a Bill passed the Commons and Senate raising the Post Office Clerks' annual increment from $50 to $100, after $800 had been reached. A similar Bill unanimously passed the Commons granting Railway Mail Clerks the same consideration. This Bill, unfortunately for us, was rejected by the Senate owing to its being connected with legislation of a contentious nature. The same standard of education is required to enter either branch of the service and it is beyond our powers to imagine why we, who labour longer and under more trying circumstances, are expected to perform our daily duties for so much less remuneration.

In view of these several facts we respectfully ask that the Provisional Allowance of $15 per month be extended to the Railway Mail Clerks who are not at the present time enjoying this consideration; that Bill No. 147 of May 4th, 1914, to amend the Post Office Act be re-introduced and that it be made retroactive; namely that the annual increase to Railway Mail Clerks be $100 instead of $50, and that the maximum salary be made $1,600. This last clause to be added to the Bill in order that all clerks be benefited.

We have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servants,
The Committee."

This is the case as presented by the railway mail clerks. They ask, first, that the provisional allowance which is granted to the railway clerks in the western divisions be made applicable also to the eastern divisions, and I think that they are absolutely justified in this request. Second, they ask that the Bill giving them a better emolument, which was introduced in 1914, and which was withdrawn because it was connected with something of a contentious nature to which the Senate objected, be re-enacted, with a further suggestion that a clause be added giving a maximum salary of $1,600. The railway mail clerks of Canada perform a most valuable and a most dangerous duty, and as a result of the danger connected with their constant travels from one end of the country to the other during the cold weather of winter, their health is more often impaired than that of the every day officer in any department. The medical men in the House will bear me out in the statement that they are obliged to carry insurance policies, which, of course, everybody should have.

Mr. EDWARDS: At a higher premium.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Of course, yes. For those considerations, I plead with the Minister of Finance to kindly consider the case of the railway mail clerks. Not only the railway mail clerks, but the clerks in the Post Office, the sorters, the letter carriers and the postmasters in the country, are deserving of further consideration. The additional work which is imposed on the mail carriers on account of the extension of rural mail delivery system should also be taken into consideration. I know that this means an additional expenditure, and I generally plead for a reduction in expenditure; but there is a noble expenditure, there is a necessary expenditure, it is expenditure which affects His Majesty's servants. I again ask my hon. friend to enlarge the scope of his Bill and not to restrict it to the Civil Service at Ottawa.

It is a mistake to think that the whole Civil Service is centered here in Ottawa. The Civil Service extends from one end of the country to the other, and I daresay that the outside civil servant in the distant hamlet, or vilage of Canada, is obliged to know more and has to take more responsibility than the man in Ottawa who has at his disposal the advice, the experience, the wisdom of his superior officers. In view of the higher cost of living—let me repeat those figures, they are startling, but they are not less true. Foodstuffs have increased since 1910 by 51 per cent; light and fuel, 21 per cent; clothing, 80 per cent; hotels and

restaurants, 75 per cent, surely the Government ought to take into consideration these facts and figures, and act accordingly.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am pleased indeed to express my concurrence in the sentiments uttered by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). There is no doubt that at the present time the high cost of living should in fairness be taken into consideration fixing the salaries of those in the Civil Service.

While the farmer has been paying more since the war started for many of the things which are absolutely necessary to the carrying on of his business, he is getting more for his produce. The wage-earner and the labourer have plenty of work at higher wages than formerly. The persons who get no relief are those who receive fixed salaries. Food costs them more than it did before, and they have no other means of providing for their needs than the fixed salary. Consideration should be given to that class of the community. Ottawa is not the only place where foodstuffs are higher than they were before the war, nor is it the only place where men and women are engaged in the Civil Service. I should be the last to say that no consideration should be given to the civil servants in Ottawa. But, applying my remarks to both sides of the House, I think that the reason why more consideration has been and is being given to the Inside Service at Ottawa than to civil servants outside is because several thousand of them in Ottawa have votes and exercise their franchise when elections come on. On the other hand, in a given constituency elsewhere in the Dominion, practically only a few persons who exercise the franchise are engaged in the Civil Service. In all fairness, more consideration should be given to men in the Civil Service, outside of Ottawa.

My hon. friend has referred to the couriers and the country postmasters. Since the inauguration of parcel post, the work of the country postmaster has enormously increased, while his remuneration has not increased proportionately. The burden bears still more heavily upon the couriers, who sign contracts for four years. Four years ago there was no parcel post system. Many of those who had been carrying mail had made a considerable amount of money by carrying parcels at 5, 10 and 15 cents each. In this way they added to their salaries; and no doubt they took that into consideration when they made their tender. Then the system of parcel post was inaugurated, and the couriers are now obliged to carry a much larger number of parcels without any added remuneration. In many cases they have been obliged to use a heavier or larger rig than they formerly used, perhaps using two horses instead of one, thus adding to the expense of carrying on their work without the compensation of increased remuneration. This is absolutely unfair. I brought the matter to the attention of Hon. Mr. Pelletier when he was Postmaster General, and he agreed that prevailing conditions were unfair to the couriers and to the country postmasters. The late Hon. Mr. Casgrain also agreed with me in that respect. Nothing, however, has been done in the matter.

I think that more consideration should be given to the railway mail clerks also; I thoroughly agree with what the member for Rouville has said in that regard. The duties of these officials require them
4 p.m. to work during long hours. Their occupation is considered by the insurance companies to be more or less dangerous, and if they take out insurance they have to pay an extra premium because of the extra risk. These men are not getting the consideration from this Government that they should receive in the matter of their salaries.

The hon. gentleman to my right (Mr. Boulay) has made some remarks with regard to the clerks in the Third Division. Any third class clerk has the right to fit himself for a position in the Second Division. I do not agree with all that my hon. friend has said in regard to these clerks. Opportunities for the advancement of young men and women in our country are plentiful; they need not enter the Civil Service unless they wish. It is in the interest of Canada that men and women who enter the service should take pains thoroughly to qualify themselves for the duties which they are called upon to perform in that service. I am glad that a number of university graduates are entering the service; I would like to see more of them in it. Persons who enter the Third Division should be sufficiently ambitious to fit themselves for the examination of the Second Division and qualify for a higher salary. For this reason I have no fault to find with the salaries set forth in the Bill which apply to this class of the service.

Let me again ask the Government to take into consideration the salaries paid to civil servants outside of Ottawa, and to the claims of the couriers on rural mail routes and of the country postmasters.

Mr. J. A. M. ARMSTRONG: As one who was unfortunate enough to spend three or four years in the outside Civil Service, I wish to associate myself with the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in asking that the Government give favourable consideration to any requests in the matter of remuneration made by members of the outside Civil Service. I do not say a word against increases in the inside service; I am quite sure that they are well merited, and if I made any suggestion at all it would be that the increases should be greater.

I should like to say a word or two on behalf of the railway mail clerks and of the railway mail service generally. Railway mail clerks carry on a very hazardous work, taking their lives in their hands every day. Their pay is not at all commensurate with the work that they perform. They have to have the knowledge of a postmaster; they have to rely entirely upon themselves, having, as the member for Rouville has pointed out, no superior officer from whom they may obtain direction or assistance. I am not in agreement with certain action taken by a former Postmaster General in connection with the qualifications of railway mail clerks. Under the old order of things, a man had to pass a qualifying examination before receiving his permanent appointment. Hon. Mr. Pelletier changed that, and provided that by passing the preliminary examination a man could be permanently appointed to the railway mail service. He would then get his increases up to $1,000, where he would stop until he passed the qualifying examination. I cannot understand by what process of reasoning one can come to the conclusion that after a man has spent so many years of his life in learning work of that kind, he should stop at the thousand dollar stage until he has learned again many of the things that he forgot after he left the public school.

The hon. member for Frontenac also mentioned the mail carriers, and I would like to say a word or two in their behalf. The whole system of paying mail carriers is wrong, and I would not permit contracts of that kind to be let on tender at all, because there are many cases where a man could be saved from his own foolishness in tendering too low. In any constituency in Canada where the Government throws open a small mail contract for local competition, for some reason or another, many people think that a dollar secured from the Government is worth five dollars from any one else, and they will tender far below a reasonable rate. After they receive a contract, the trouble for the member starts; he is immediately deluged with petitions and requests for more remuneration, but unfortunately the law of the land does not permit the Government to give them that. The mail service of Canada should be standardized and so much per mile allowed according to the nature of the country to be travelled—I am speaking now of land travel per mile—so that every man would know, when he started, how much he was going to receive. In that way he would not be subjected to unreasonable competition by some one who might wish to put in a tender for work about which he knows nothing.

I also wish to say a word on behalf of a branch of the Railway Mail Service, known as the transfer class. I do not know whether this matter has been brought to the attention of the minister or not, but there is a class of men working in the transfer business at salaries that are a disgrace to this country. Any one going to Toronto between six and eleven o'clock at night will find officers of the Post Office Department hauling heavy trucks of mail from one train to another, working like slaves, for a salary of $2 a day. No man can possibly live on such a wage, and it is the duty of the Government, as a matter of ordinary humanity, apart altogether from the question of common sense, to see that that branch receive a reasonable wage.

Mr. MARCIL: On several occasions deputations of mail carriers in Montreal have waited on me at my residence and have laid before me their grievances and copies of petitions sent to the minister in charge of that department pleading for an increase in salary. The case of the mail carriers, of the hardships they are suffering and of the faithful service they give, are well known to every hon. member. In this instance the petition which I received was similar to the one which was forwarded by their confrères in the city of Toronto with whom they were working in harmony. I promised these men I would say a word in their favour, and I have done so now.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This is not the only action which the Government is taking or purposes taking with reference to the Civil Service. I explained the other day that this was an amendment to the Civil Service Act which relates to the In-

side Service at Ottawa, which, for some reason, comes so far as salaries are concerned under the supervision of my department. Take the case of contracts referred to by the hon. members for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) and for North York (Mr. J. A. M. Armstrong). Those can be dealt with without any change in the existing legislation if, in the estimation of the minister, it is proper for them to be dealt with, and most of the cases which have been drawn to our attention this afternoon in connection with the Outside Service can be dealt with without any change in existing legislation. When the Bill was before the House recently I stated that in the Supplementary Estimates provision would be made for whatever increases were regarded as necessary by the ministers of the several departments in connection with the Outside Service. I drew to the attention of the House that to-day, without any further legislation the Minister of Customs, to take one case, can and does frequently recommend to the Treasury Board an increase of fifty dollars or $100 per year in the case of officials in his department outside of the city of Ottawa, that is to say, in the Outside Service. It is similarly proper for the Postmaster General to provide in his Estimates a lump sum which would be available for the purpose of granting certain increases in his department in the Outside Service. Similarly with regard to the Outside Service of the Department of Inland Revenue, and also with regard to the Outside Service of the Department of the Interior or the Department of Public Works. All that this legislation does is to amend the Civil Service Act relating to the Inside Service. As I say, it is not the only action which the Government has taken, is taking or purposes taking with respect to the Service as a whole. The reason why I am not attempting to deal with all those is because legislation is not necessary for the most part, and because they are under the jurisdiction of other ministers. Many of the observations which have been made this afternoon, and which, of course, are quite relevant to the discussion of this Bill—I find no fault in that regard—might be made more usefully when the Estimates of the ministers in question are under consideration in this House. Then the ministers who are immediately connected will have the views of the members and can take in their Supplementary Estimates such action as may be necessary to meet the situation drawn to their attention.

Mr. LALOR: Although, as the Minister of Finance has stated, that probably another time than the present would be more opportune for discussing this matter, I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without mentioning one class of civil servants with whom I am particularly well acquainted. I refer to the officers of the border at Fort Erie, Bridgeburg, and Niagara Falls. The salaries that those men are receiving are a disgrace. The immigration officers on the trains, a splendid class of fellows, who put in long hours, intelligent civil servants and good citizens, are working on a salary of $800 to $850 a year and maintaining their families at the places I have mentioned, where the cost of living is probably higher than in any other part of Canada. I think in the Immigration Department the salary of $800 or $850 a year is permanent without any increase, and these men with the present high cost of living and high rent are having a hard task in trying to maintain their families, and they should receive more money. I am glad the Minister of Customs is in his seat, and I trust he may remember the officers of his department at the boundary line. I believe there is a general feeling on both sides of the House that these civil servants should receive higher salaries than they are receiving at the present time. We hear talk of coalition in Canada at this time. This is a case on which we should have coalition; we should all agree that there be no criticism in future as to increased expenditure for salaries in the departments, and that we should give these men higher salaries in order that they may live in comfort.

Mr. VERVILLE: Every one admits that it is necessary that salaries should be increased because the cost of living is increasing. It matters very little how much you give a man to live on; the question is how much he can buy with that money. The Minister of Finance should take steps to check the present increase in the cost of living, and then perhaps the salaries he may give some of the officials will be worth while. Otherwise, in two or three months from now those increases that he may grant will make no difference to the recipients, because the rise in prices will be greater than the increase in salary. The remedy, I believe, lies in preventing an increase in the cost of living, and I would ask the minister to look at that end of the line as well as increasing the salaries. He should certainly take into account the high cost of

living when providing for the salary increases.

Mr. DEVLIN: There is considerable anxiety on the part of a number of employees of the Inside Service relative to subsection 30. It will not benefit, for instance, those who have not passed any qualifying examination, and it appears there are quite a number of employees in this class. Perhaps the minister would make a statement clearing the matter up.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I stated some time ago in reply to my hon. friend from Bonaventure that the maximum of the Third Division has been increased by $100. Any employee in that class, if thought worthy of an increase, can go up to $1,300 by annual increases of $50.

Mr. DEVLIN: Even if he has not passed any qualifying examination?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, provided he is in that division. In this Act we are not exempting from qualification those who had not passed a qualifying examination previous to the Act of 1908, or were not otherwise qualified under the legislation of that day. We have thought it proper, however, to exempt from the necessity of taking an academic examination those who were qualified under the Civil Service Act of 1908. We did not feel warranted in going further than that. If there are any in the Third Division who were in that division prior to the coming into force of the present Act, and who have not passed the qualifying examination or were not otherwise qualified under the legislation of that day, the only way in which they can qualify for promotion to the Second Division is by taking the examination provided for under the existing Civil Service Act, or by being specially named in the Estimates. I could imagine a situation—I have no particular case in view—in which it might be impossible for some excellent clerk to pass the examination qualifying him for the Second Division, and where it might be proper for the minister to name him in the Estimates; in other words, to place him in the Second Division by naming him. In that case clerk would not have to pass an academic examination. Objections might perhaps be urged to that course. I have no particular case in mind, but it seems to me there might possibly be cases in which this might fairly be done.

Mr. DEVLIN: I have no doubt the minister is aware that a number of returned soldiers are greatly concerned as to the exact position they would occupy in the service if they were taken into it. Would a returned soldier who had previously been in the Civil Service, and who had been on active service at the front for two years, be put at the minimum of his class?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Speaking from memory, I think he would be subject to the present Civil Service Act; there may be an Order in Council relating to the matter, but I do not recall it at the present time. Of course, it would be open to the minister to name such an official at a certain salary, but I do not see how the soldier could be exempt from the provisions of the Civil Service Act relating to entrance to the service, unless he was specially named. If the returned soldier were qualified to enter the Second Division he could enter it, of course; but if he was not qualified I should say that he would start at the minimum provided by the existing legislation. I am not quite positive about that, because some Orders in Council have been passed relating to returned soldiers, but that is my opinion offhand.

Mr. DEVLIN: There is a feeling among the returned soldiers that the men who have been on active service at the front for two years should be allowed the yearly increase given to the men at home. For instance, if a soldier had spent two years at the front and in the ordinary course of events would have received a yearly increase of $50, he should be on the same footing with those who have remained at home and should be given an increase of $100.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I am in sympathy with practically everything that has been said in connection with this Bill. As I understand it, though there may be members of the Outside Service in the city of Ottawa, the bulk of the Outside Service are outside of this city.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are outside civil servants in the city of Ottawa; for instance, officers in the Post Office and the Customs Departments.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Yes, but when speaking of the Outside Service we are thinking more of those outside the city of Ottawa. It was of these employees that the hon. member for Frontenac was speaking, when he said, whether rightly or wrongly, that not so many votes were affected. Personally, I think the Outside Service outside the city of Ottawa should receive a little more attention than the Outside or Inside Service in the city of Ottawa. I have been going around the different departments for a good

many years, and what I am going to say does not apply merely to this Government, because I was a member of the House for a long time during the late Administration. There is no doubt in my mind that the Inside Service at Ottawa is over-manned. There are undoubtedly men and women clerks in the different departments at Ottawa who are overworked and have to return to the office in the evening; they are not being paid the salary they should receive. I have always taken the ground that any man who works, whether he be labourer or clerk, should receive good wages; that has been a principle with me in my own business. But I do think that this matter of getting into the different departments in the city of Ottawa is overdone. There are boys and girls here who are in the service rather for recreation and to have a little pocket money—and in saying that I think I know exactly what I am talking about. Now, I want it clearly understood that I am not including in my remarks any one who is necessary to the efficiency of the service, but it is a very nice thing to be in the service and get your pay every month. I am confident that if there were a weeding out of those who watch for five o'clock to come, there would be quite a reduction in the Inside Service here.

Now, I wish to refer to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid). He is a good fellow. In my constituency I have about six or seven customs officers. We have to have them. They get $800 a year. Nearly every one of them has no other source of income and is expected to live on that $800. It is impossible; it cannot be done. Yet I have been very unsuccessful in my applications to the Minister of Customs to have the salaries of these men increased. They should be increased. It may be said that in some cases these officers are not necessary. That may be true in some towns; but when there are only six customs officers in a constituency as large as mine, I do not think the service can be said to be overmanned. These men have been paid $800 a year as long as I have known anything about it, and there has been no change in spite of the increased cost of living.

Now, I wish to say a word about the carriers of the rural mail. In Ontario and Quebec, and also I presume, in the Maritime Provinces, rural mail has been a success. I am a great advocate of the rural mail system. What we are trying to do as representatives of the people is to make the country a place in which people will wish to dwell. We have been talking for many years about "back to the farm," and I am a great believer in that doctrine; the farm is a good place, and it is our duty to make the farm as attractive as possible. There are several things that have aided very much in making country life more attractive. One is the telephone, and another is the rural mail. People to-day, especially in these stirring times, are intensely interested in getting a daily paper and in getting the mail. But what has been my experience in trying to establish rural mail routes? I have established very few. Why? The farmers are quite willing to supply the boxes—that is a matter of about $4 each and it is about all they are asked to supply. Then comes the question of carrying the mail, and when it comes to that I find myself up against the real thing. I cannot get men to take that position—and that is remarkable enough, when you think of it; you can't get men to take a Government job.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Even with tenders?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: With tenders, or without tenders. I do not know the exact figure, but there is a certain percentage given to the carriers in the western provinces in addition to what is paid in the provinces that are more thickly settled. But I cannot get men to carry the mail throughout the country; and that is why there are in my constituency so few rural mail routes. Some one suggested to-day what I thought was a good idea, that this should not be by tender, but that a proper scale should be fixed. In eastern Canada your dwellings are more along certain lines and are close together, but where, as in my constituency, you have men living on a half-section or a quarter-section, the rural mail delivery is more difficult.

So, there are two classes of men in my constituency to whom the Government is not paying living wages to-day; one class is made up of the customs officers, and the other of the man carrying the rural mail. I do not know whether this is the right time under the rules for this discussion, but it is a good time for me to get in my kick about these people. I want the Government to take these men into consideration and give them what they deserve.

Mr. FRIPP: My attention has been called to what appears to be an injustice under this measure to a certain class in the Third Division. The committee is aware that the object of the legislation is to improve the situation of those in the lower

grades, and to give them a living wage. When the Bill was under consideration the other day, I was under the impression, and I think the committee was also, that the majority in the Third Division would be benefited by section 3. But the benefits of that section are confined entirely to those who have passed the qualifying examination before 1908. I am astonished to find that there are 450 men in the Third Division who were not called upon to pass the qualifying examination, and who will be outside the scope of this Bill. They have been in their several departments for nine years or more, and are just as well qualified for departmental work as those who have passed the qualifying examination. It seems to me we ought to make all the men in the Third Division who are certified to by the deputy minister eligible for advancement to the Second Division, and not confine it to those who had passed the qualifying examination. Otherwise these men, many of whom are married, will be left without any redress under the provisions of the Bill. There is a further class in the Third Division to which I wish to refer. Under section 4 of the Bill any person in receipt of a salary of less than $1,000 may be given an increase of $100 in order to bring him up to $1,000. I am told that there are 392 men in the Third Division who will not benefit by this provision, because they are receiving between $1,000 and $1,200. It does seem to me that less than $1,200 a year for these men, ninety per cent of whom are married, is absolutely inadequate for their livelihood under present conditions. I would like to have this section include men who are in receipt of salaries up to $1,200, thus giving them the additional $100 from 1st April last. These are two objections to the Bill brought to my notice which I think are worthy of being brought to the attention of the committee before the Bill is passed.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I have no desire that any civil servant in Ottawa should receive less than a living wage. I have had reason to ascertain the exact number in the service of the Crown in Ottawa, and I find that that number is nearly 12,000, and the aggregate annual pay nearly $12,000,000. I have no hesitation in saying that the service here could be reduced by ten per cent and be much more efficient that it is now. This saving of a million and a half a year to this country, which is now paid to those who render no efficeint service to the state, would produce results, I think, that are very much to be desired.

There are not only too many civil servants in the employ of the Crown in Ottawa but there are too many inefficient civil servants in the employ of the Crown. There are too many efficient civil servants in the employ of the Crown outside of Ottawa who are being insufficiently paid. In the city in which I live, and I am not accustomed to taking that as an example, but it illustrates the conditions that prevail in western Canada; I found last year a graduate of Queen's University, a woman who had graduated in Arts with honours who was in the service of the Crown receiving the magnificent sum of $55 per month in one of the public departments. There are many men and women in western Canada receiving $50, $55, $60 or $70 per month. I had a letter to-day from a letter carrier who, with his wife and family, is endeavouring to keep the wolf from the door on the magnificent sum of $65 a month. I had another communication yesterday morning from a soldier who has returned from the present war wounded and who is now in the service of the Crown receiving $75 per month and supporting himself, his wife and family. On every occasion on which I bring these matters to the attention of the responsible ministers, they always point out that we are in the midst of a war, that the Minister of Finance, who is very much burdened with the necessity of providing money to carry on this war, cannot provide money to meet the demands—the reasonable demands—of the servants of the Crown. If you can find money to increase the pay of the 12,000 civil servants in the city of Ottawa—all of whom will not receive increases of pay—but if you can find money to pay them a living wage, then I submit that the people who are out in the country living under circumstances much more difficult, where it is more expensive, must be heard and their case must be dealt with. This is what I submit to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. If he can find money for those who are included in this measure, I submit that he can find money for the servants employed in the Department of the Interior. If he can find more money to be paid to the members of the Inside Service who are being dealt with here, he can find money to pay the servants in the Department of Customs and the Post Office Department throughout the country and the money can be found by taking the Civil Service in this city, putting it upon an effi-

cient basis, which means that it can be cut down ten per cent, thereby increasing its efficiency and proficiency, and the money thus saved can be used to pay a living wage to those who are working for $50 and $55 per month. That is my opinion and it sets forth what I believe to be the duty of the Government at this moment. I know of nothing that is so much calculated to bring the Government into disrepute, to make for bitterness and strife, to create a feeling of animosity against constituted authority and the creation of those socialistic tendencies that are manifesting themselves in the state in an alarming manner, than the absolutely inadequate salaries that are being paid to the servants of the Crown outside of this city. I say that after a careful study of the situation and what I have learned in relation to Calgary applies with equal force to other places. I see my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) in his place now. I was in Edmonton not long since and a number of gentlemen connected with the service of the letter carriers and mail clerks spoke to me and asked me if I would lend my influence, such as it was, in support of my hon. friend from Edomonton in an effort to increase the pay of these men. That is the position as I understood it.

Further, it is my view that in the West we have a peculiar grievance in relation to the pay of the members of the Civil Service. The cost of living, according to the statement which my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) read, has increased fifty per cent over what it was a few years ago. In the West there is an increase of more than that, and no man with a wife and family in these times can pay rent, pay for the cost of food, educate his children and decently clothe them on $55 a month. He cannot do it; it is impossible to do it, and I do ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who has brought in this Bill that affects only the Civil Service in Ottawa, to remember those less fortunate servants of the Crown who are serving in the capacity of clerks in the custom house, mail sorters or letter carriers, or servants of the Crown in great departments like the Department of the Interior, or in outside work, as some of them are, carrying the mails in country districts, and in country post offices. I would further remind him that after all a living wage for every man and woman who serves the State is, in the judgment of those who have formed an opinion from a careful investigation of the subject, one of the surest and best indications of a really advanced state. There can be no decent civilization in the state if men and women are struggling to keep body and soul together, not knowing where the next day's meal is coming from while thinking for the whole people at only $50 or $60 a month. It is impossible. Think of that young lady who gave four years of her life to acquiring an academic education and taking honours at Queen's University working in the Department of the Interior at Calgary for $55 a month. Under these circumstances what inducement is there for anybody to get an education in the State? It is perfectly absurd.

Another essential is I think that men and women should be treated on an equality in relation to the pay they get, having regard to the service they render. A difficulty that is often met with is that the pay is based on the number of years of service without any regard whatever to efficiency. I find that a man, having worked twelve years in the service, gets a salary that is based upon annual increases, while the man who is giving twice as much service to the State is getting only $600 or $700. There must be payment of salaries on the basis of real merit and work. What commercial institution keeps a man in its employ and pays him a salary because he has been so many years in its service without regard to his work or to what he is worth to that institution? Nobody does that. Would my hon. friend the Minister of Finance when he was manager of the National Trust Company, keep a clerk in his employ, pay him $1,000 a year and increase his pay annually by $50 or $100 altogether regardless of his efficiency while another man who had come into the service and who was of equal ability would only get $700 or $800? I cannot believe that he would. Then, it should not be done in Ottawa any more than in any other place. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) quite properly pointed out the reason why. It is important, even in times of war, that we should take stock of the situation, and taking stock of the situation the Minister of Finance and his colleagues should discuss the whole matter, make an adequate survey of the situation and determine the number of men and women that might be dropped from the service because they are inefficient. That is suggestion number one. If he determines how he can cut down the number of people who are working for the Crown because of inefficiency, he can then determine to what extent he can increase.

the salaries of those who remain having regard to their efficiency and the work they are doing.

I want to tell this House something that was done in this country during the last six months. In a great department in the public service men and women were working together. They were all being paid the same amount—$60 per month. The head of the department said: "I am not satisfied that these people are all worth the same money; therefore, I propose to establish a merit system and I will fix, first of all, what I regard as the minimum amount of work and then I will provide that at the end of the month for an increase in the salaries of my employees based upon the measure of work they have done during the month and the accuracy with which they have done it. Well, the result was that two or three of the employees are still getting the minimum pay but the most of them stimulated by the desire to increase their pay, have shown such proficiency that they are now getting as much as $10 per month more than they were getting at the start. Why cannot that be done in the public service? How do railways deal with their men? They do not pay two men the same salary because they may be working at a particular job. They deal with them on the basis of merit, and I do this afternoon ask the Minister of Finance and his colleagues once more to remember the men and women who live outside of Ottawa and who find themselves dependent upon the salary or wage that the father earns, a wage which is wholly inadequate at this time to keep body and soul together and to clothe the children so that they may attend school in town, village, hamlet or remote country. This state even in war can do nothing better to show that, after all, our every day civilization is in keeping with that for which our men are striving overseas, than by seeing that those who serve the state in a civil capacity are paid a reasonable wage for the work they render to the State, and which, in its way, although not as important, is just as essential as the military service given by our men overseas.

Mr. NICKLE: I desire to add my plea to that of the hon. member for Calgary and the other hon. gentlemen who have spoken in reference to the inadequate pay given to the civil servants outside of the city of Ottawa. I am not given to discussing these questions from the point of view purely of my own riding, but there have been for years very large classes of civil servants in my riding, employees of the Penitentiary, the Customs, the Inland Revenue, and the Post Office Departments. I would direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that by an Order in Council passed some little time ago it was represented that the Government was desirous that returned soldiers should be given a preference when making appointments to vacancies that may occur in the Civil Service. Two weeks ago when I was home, a temporary employee waited on me and told me that he was receiving the munificent sum of $2 a day to maintain himself, his wife and child. With tears in his eyes he told me that he could not keep body and soul together. In the Kingston penitentiary the guards or keepers get, I think, $900 a year. My good friend from Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) has drawn attention to the fact that members of the Outside Service in the West cannot exist on the remuneration they are receiving. I would direct his attention to the fact that the men receive $100 a year more than in the East for similar service in the penitentiaries branch on the ground that it costs more to live in the West than in the East. But if my good friend will study the statistics showing what it costs to live in Ontario to-day as compared with the West, he will find that the cost of living in most of the cities in Ontario has increased more rapidly than it has in the West, so that to-day in Ontario living costs quite as much as, if not more than, in the West. These men connected with the penitentiaries have positions of great responsibility and trust. We expect them to be honest; we desire them to keep from trafficking with the convicts. But how can you expect adequate service from men who are not being paid sufficient to keep body and soul together? I know that some of these men are going behind in their family housekeeping expenses at the rate of from $5 to $15 a month, without taking into account what it costs to clothe their families and to pay medical expenses. What is true as to the officials of the penitentaries is equally true as to the officials in the other departments of Government. I urge upon the Government, and particularly upon the Minister of Finance, that if they can find money to increase the remuneration of those in the Inside Service in Ottawa they should also remember those in the Service outside of Ottawa who are equally entitled to consideration. If returned soldiers who may be appointed to these positions are to obtain adequate remuneration, the minister must find some way to meet the situation, or the public service will be

neglected and people will have to find a fresh outlet in civil life for their activities.

Mr. BOULAY: I have listened carefully to the remarks that have been made, and I do not want to annoy the Minister of Finance by my remarks.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Go ahead, I am glad to hear you.

Mr. BOULAY: Of course this may not be exactly the right time to talk about the Outside Service because later there may be some provision, as the minister explained, for that class of employees. I concur in the remarks of those who have spoken in favour of that class. It is certain that they are not paid salaries commensurate with the present high cost of living. I wish particularly to insist upon better treatment of those who are in the lower grades of the Inside Service, particularly the Third Division, subdivision B. I am not of the opinion of my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) when he says it is very easy for a man of that class to qualify and pass from the Third Division to the Second Division after a certain number of years. I have been all my life a very good scholar, and I think he has been also, yet he would be in great trouble to pass an examination of that kind, and I also——

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Hear, hear.

Mr. BOULAY: —and go into the Second Class of the Civil Service. When a man has been in the Third Class of the Civil Service and is over thirty years of age, he is in no position to go to work and pursue a new course of study to fit himself for the qualifying examination. So if a man is to spend all his life in Subdivision B of the Third Class I feel that the Government should see its way clear to give him a sufficient wage to enable him to support himself and his family. I know men in Ottawa, married men, who are getting $650 a year, and surely they cannot make both ends meet. Some of them tell me that every year they have to borrow. I know these men personally. I know that they do not spend one cent needlessly or extravagantly; there is no waste in their households; nothing is spent in liquor, and yet when they come to the end of the year they are obliged to borrow money. These men are the class whom we must carefully look after. I do not want to say anything against the high-class people who are paid high salaries, they are paid enough; they look out for themselves. But I think that the Government and the Minister of Finance should raise the maximum salary in Subdivision B of the Third Class to $1,200 and give an increase of $100 a year without obliging men to go before the Governor in Council to get it, sometimes to see it refused in case it does not suit the deputy head or the chief of the branch to recommend the increase. These men are worth something or they are worth nothing. If they are no good let us drop them from the service right from the start; but those who are good should be well paid.

Mr. CHABOT: I think that the Bill to amend the Civil Service Act now being considered in committee is a fairly generous one. I think that the Minister of Finance is entitled to a great deal of credit for the time and care he has taken with it, especially at this time, when his parliamentary and his national duties must be both numerous and onerous. Speaking for the Civil Service of Ottawa, I think I can say without much exaggeration that it is composed of men and women who are equal to the tasks which they have to perform. They are both energetic and conscientious, and willing to do their duty to the best of their ability. I will admit that there may be cases of inefficiency, but on the whole the Civil Service of Canada, and particularly of Ottawa, is one of which this country has no reason to feel ashamed. I desire to say that what is especially gratifying to me in this Act is the fact that the academic examination prescribed under the Act of 1908 as to qualifying one for promotion from the Third to the Second Division has been done away with, because I always looked upon that examination as a hardship and a cruel measure. I would ask the minister if it would not be possible to repeal in subsection 2 of section 26 the following:—

And who had theretofore passed the qualifying examination.

I think that many men, without passing the qualifying examination, have fitted themselves, by their experience and the acquirement of efficiency in their work, for promotion from the Third to the Second Division. Is it possible to make the statutory increase in the lower grades $100 instead of $50? A man receiving a salary of $600 has to wait eight years before he reaches his maximum. He is, therefore, badly handicapped, especially if the cost of living continues to increase. Is it the intention of the minister to grant the regular statutory increases to men in the service who have gone to the front? I think that when those men come back they should

receive any increases which they would have received had they remained in Canada and performed their duties as civil servants. The least we can do for them is not to let them suffer under any discrimination because they have gone to the front to perform the most patriotic work that a Canadian can be engaged in during this crisis in our history.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Those who are on service overseas will receive the statutory increases which they would have received had they remained here. In other words, they will find themselves when they return in at least as good a position as they would have occupied had they remained here and got the advance from year to year. As to whether all those in the Third Division could be rendered eligible for promotion upon the certificate of the deputy, I think not; for the reason that it would practically destroy the basis of the present Civil Service Act. The present Act is based on what is known as the merit system; it provides for examination as qualification for promotion from the Third to the Second Division. The amendment provided in section 2 is designed to remove what was clearly an injustice to those who had passed the qualifying examination under the legislation which existed prior to the coming into effect of the Civil Service Act of 1908. But those who were legislated into that division by the Civil Service Act of 1908 or came in since, came in with their eyes open and subject to all the conditions imposed by that Act, among which was the passing of an examination to qualify for entry into the Second Division. I do not believe it would be wise to destroy the basis of the legislation of 1908. If that legislation is unsound, it should be repealed, but we should not create an anomalous situation by allowing those who passed no examination either before or since the passing of the Act to be eligible for promotion to the Second Division. By this legislation we are giving decided advantages to those at present in the Third Division, and to messengers, sorters and packers. We had it in mind that those receiving less than $1,000 were especially in need of assistance at this time. To those receiving less than $1,000 we are giving a bonus of $100. In addition, the minimum of each of the classes is advanced from $500 to $600, so that a messenger, sorter or packer or a member of the Third Division who is now receiving $500 will be advanced to $600, and will receive, in addition, a bonus of $100, together with the annual statutory increase of $50. That is to say, a messenger who is receiving $500 will receive for this year $750, an increase of 50 per cent. Moreover, we have provided for an increase in the maximum from $1,200 to $1,300. Those who have reached the former maximum of $1,200 and cannot qualify for promotion to the Second Division, can go on to $1,300, whereas under existing legislation they are stopped at $1,200. We think we have met the situation fairly so far as the Third Division is concerned. In order to do this, a very considerable expenditure is involved. When this matter was under consideration the other day the member for St. John asked for a statement as to the cost of the increases authorized by this legislation. I had a statement prepared to meet his request. I find that the total annual increase in expenditure will be, in round figures, $290,000. That is a very substantial annual increase in respect of the Inside Service at Ottawa. It is not too much, but, at the same time, it is substantial. As I said the other day, we must bear in mind the public outside and the salaries which they obtain. In the Third Division a number of young women and young men, some of them not specially trained, many of them stenographers, obtain larger salaries than are paid outside. I made it my business in connection with this Bill to make inquiries of some of the leading law firms in Toronto as to the salaries paid to stenographers and clerks. I found, of course, considerable difference in the salaries paid, but I am able to say as a result of my inquiry that the salaries paid stenographers in the Civil Service at Ottawa are equal to if not greater than those paid to stenographers in law offices in the city of Toronto, many of whom work much longer hours than those in the Civil Service. While we desire to be fair to the Civil Service, we must at the same time bear in mind our duty to the general public. I believe that the public are prepared to pay the members of the Civil Service proper salaries, especially those in the lower grades; but I do not believe that they are prepared to pay them larger salaries than are paid to persons possessing similar qualifications who are engaged outside the Civil Service and who work as hard as, if not harder than, those in the Civil Service.

5 p.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister was good enough to lay on the Table the Order in Council to which I have referred relating

to the Civil Service. It is dated May 29, 1917, and is as follows:

> The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, advise that all Orders in Council passed since the outbreak of the war relating to Civil Service pay to civil servants who have already enlisted do have no effect and be void in the case of those members of the Civil Service who join the military forces of Canada either by voluntary enlistment or otherwise from and after the date hereof.

Can the minister inform the committee why a discrimination is made against those who voluntarily enlist after May 29?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think that the reason is obvious. Prior to the date in question, the Prime Minister had announced a measure of compulsory military service. It is to be pointed out that the members of the Civil Service who are liable to military service under that measure have had all this time to enlist, and if they have not enlisted, nor offered to enlist, there would seem to be no good ground why they should be paid their full Civil Service pay if that civil pay exceeds their military pay, as distinct from those outside who will be compelled under the Compulsory Service law to serve at the rate of pay provided for in the military forces. I think I can say as to those members of the Service, who are eligible for military service and who offered to enlist prior to the announcement of the Prime Minister, that the Government would be prepared to deal with them by special Orders in Council, so that they might be put in the position of those who actually enlisted before the declaration of the Prime Minister. I think that would be only fair, because I know of some cases in the Civil Service where officials have desired to enlist, but for some ground of public interest, principally because the service they were rendering was of such a character that their services could not well be dispensed with in the public interest, they have been prevented from enlisting. I do not believe there are many of those cases; but I believe there are some, and I know the Government would be prepared to deal with them on the same basis as those who have enlisted and actually gone forward. But as to those who, during all these three years, being eligible for military service, have not come forward and enlisted, it would seem to me to discriminate in their favour as against the outside public if now, being compelled to enlist, they were given the pay which they have as civil servants and which might be fifty per cent in excess of or twice as great as the pay of those who are not members of the Civil Service and who enlist under the provisions of this measure.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have noticed in the United States that one of the great objects which those administering the law for selective conscription have in view, is to induce those who are drafted to believe that they are not in any way treated as inferior to those who may volunteer. I think that should be the object of the Government in this country. It ought not to be said to any member of the Civil Service that he is degraded in any way or that, simply because he was taken, if this law passes, under a selective conscription, he occupies an inferior position to that which he would have occupied if he had enlisted voluntarily. If this legislation should pass, the Government should strive in every way to make the young men understand that there is no distinction as between the two classes, and that they are not to be treated as inferior to those who have already gone to the front. But this Order in Council is not limited to those who are taken under selective conscription; it is extended to those who may voluntarily enlist subsequent to the 29th of May. It might well be argued that the intention of the Government was to discourage voluntary enlistment prior to the coming into force of the legislation relating to conscription. What the Government is doing in this regard is on a par with what they did with reference to Col. Blondin and General Lessard. Those gentlemen went down to the province of Quebec—very late, I admit. General Lessard is a man who one would have supposed would have been sent very early into that province; he is the man to whom my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) two years ago recommended should be employed by the Government to go into the province of Quebec, but quite recently he did go to Quebec with the Postmaster General, and the Postmaster General has stated publicly that voluntary enlistment has succeeded very well, and that if the same methods had been pursued earlier in the war, the young men of Quebec would have rallied en masse to the colours. But instead of waiting for word from General Lessard and Col. Blondin, immediately upon the return of the Prime Minister conscription was announced, and those gentlemen immediately stopped recruiting, because apparently Col. Blondin understood that it was not the desire of the Government that voluntary enlistment should proceed any further.

Whatever may be the fate of the Conscription Bill, the Government should not have stopped for one single moment in the direction of voluntary enlistment. Every encouragement should be given to our young men in all the provinces, including the young men in the Civil Service, voluntarily to enlist, and there are many people in this country who believe that, if the proper encouragement had been given to all our young men to enlist and proper methods been pursued they would have enlisted in very large numbers, and that possibly compulsory service might not have been necessary at all. I for one am very sorry to see the Government, immediately upon the return of the Prime Minister, bring into force this discriminatory Order in Council under which it is proposed to treat the young men in the Civil Service who may enlist subsequent to the 29th of May in a very much less favourable manner than they have treated those who have enlisted prior to that date. The unfortunate result is that men in the Civil Service will be divided into three different classes. We shall have one class of enlisted civil servants who receive both their civil pay and their military pay; we shall have another class who will receive their military pay and the difference between their military and their civil pay, and then we shall have a third class who will receive only their military pay. Another discriminatory result follows. Those Orders in Council which have been passed previously provide that their positions will be available for the enlisted civil servants when they return from the front. That provision has been wiped away by this Order in Council. Throughout the country we find that employers of labour have offered to retain their positions for their young men who enlist; many of the largest business houses and many of the banks have done the same thing. They do not discriminate; we find no obstacle in the path of enlistment dating from the announcement of this conscription measure; but today as previously during the years since the war has begun, these employers are prepared to treat their young men in the same generous and liberal manner. But this Government says to the young men in its employ who may offer to enlist after the 29th of May: You will be treated in a very much less favourable manner than those who have volunteered before; not only will your pay be reduced, but when you return after you have served your country, possibly maimed and wounded, you will find your positions filled by young men who have not volunteered for the front, and you will be obliged to seek occupations amongst strangers. I say that is not fair; it is not wise, it is not in the public interest, it is not giving proper encouragement to the young men of the Civil Service who still continue to volunteer for the defence of the flag.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: I concur with the remarks which have been made by my hon. friend from St. John, but I rise more for the purpose of directing the minister's attention to a special case. I regret that the Postmaster General is not in his seat, because he might have been able to give me the information which I sought in vain when his estimates were before the House just prior to the adjournment for the Prime Minister's visit to England. The Postmaster General, or in his absence the Minister of Customs, had an item passed by the House creating a new Assistant Deputy Postmaster General. Some years ago, when I was in charge of the department, I appointed a young man who had been secretary to Sir William Mulock. He was one of the best officials that the Post Office Department ever had, but as very often happens with the best men in the Civil Service, he accepted a position outside at a better salary, where the intelligence he displayed in the performance of his duties was better recognized. Then I appointed in his stead a young man who had been my private secretary. He was then Captain Verret, one of the best officers in the Canadian Militia, and a member of the Governor General's Foot Guards. At the opening of hostilities he enlisted with an Ottawa regiment, and immediately went overseas and into the trenches. He has been there since the beginning of the war, has been promoted from captain to major, and only the other day I was proud indeed to read in the papers that he had received from the hand of His Majesty the insignia of the Distinguished Service Order. Major Verret is now at the front and there is nobody here to look after his interest in the department. He was certainly a very good official, highly respected and very popular both in the East and in the West, always accessible, and very genial with all the members of the House of Commons who had occasion to do business with the department. Suddenly, in the third year of the war, after exposing his life on several occasions he is much surprised to learn that another Assistant Deputy Postmaster Gen-

eral has been appointed. I do not say that he has been appointed in Major Verret's stead, but I cannot see why another Assistant Deputy Postmaster General should have been appointed during Major Verret's absence. I do not begrudge Mr. Fowler his appointment. I happen to know him. He is a very good official, although he has not had the long experience of Major Verret. I have told him personally: "I know you are an excellent officer. You are spoken of very highly by the public, but I object to Major Verret being treated in such a high-handed way in his absence, after he has served his King and country on the battlefield for over two years." I have been unable to get an explanation why another Assistant Deputy Postmaster General was appointed; it may have been that he was needed, and if so, I have no objection to the appointment of Mr. Fowler, none whatever. But what I should like to know is this, and I happen to know that the question is agitating the mind of Major Verret on the battlefield. I dare say that everything possible will be done to promote those men in the Civil Service who return from active service at the front; I think everybody will agree that that is their due. But what I am particularly anxious to know is whether Major Verret, on his return, will be promoted in the department if a vacancy occurs, or will the appointment of another Assistant Deputy Postmaster General have spoilt his chances of promotion? Mr. Fowler is a very able officer, but so is Major Verret, and he has been at the front since the beginning of the war. Should a vacancy occur in his absence, or when he returns, will the Government give him credit for the service he has rendered to the state and promote him? I sincerely regret that the Postmaster General is not in his seat. I did not raise this question when his estimates were before the House just before the two months' adjournment, because I did not want to embarrass the Minister of Customs, who had charge of the Post Office Estimates, but now the Minister of Finance is here, perhaps he will give me the assurance that the absence of Major Verret will not prejudice his chances of promotion should a vacancy occur.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry I have no information with respect to this matter. I have a rather faint recollection that my hon. friend raised this question some months ago, but as it did not concern my own department, it made no impression upon my mind. I recall, however, that I did make some inquiry about it, rather casually, and I think I was informed that the appointment my hon. friend refers to was not in the stead of Major Verret. Further than that, I can make no statement, but I would suggest that my hon. friend raise the question where it might more properly be raised—although it was quite proper for him to raise it now—namely, when the Estimates of the Postmaster General are again under consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May we expect the Postmaster General to return to the House? There is a rumour that he is coming back, but has not yet taken his seat because he is occupied elsewhere. If the hon. Minister of Finance can give me assurance on this point, I will be content.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Postmaster General is on military duty, but when his Estimates are under consideration, either he or an acting minister will be present. The hon. gentleman can raise his question then.

Mr. BOULAY: In answer to my remarks in favour of an increase of pay to those in the Third Division, the hon. Minister of Finance stated that there were a great many stenographers in that class who are paid more highly than similar workers are paid in commercial offices. Would it not be possible to make provision in the Bill for a special scale for the stenographers? I understand that the work of the stenographers is not so hard as the clerical work generally, and it is a kind of work that is done usually by girls who have no one to look after but themselves, and who consequently do not need as large salaries as the heads of families do. If the only objection is that which the minister has stated, I think a special class should be made for the stenographers, and they should be removed from the third class entirely.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Arts and Agriculture—Towards the encouragement of cold storage warehouses for the better preservation and handling of perishable food products, $50,000.

Mr. NESBITT: There is a good deal of discussion nowadays about the cold storage houses. It is alleged that they buy up food products and carry them unnecessarily, thereby unduly increasing prices. There

was a time a few years ago when, I think, it was absolutely necessary for the Government to encourage the system of cold storage, but now it has become a large business. To what class of cold storage concerns does this vote go?

Mr. BURRELL: This item was held over at the instance, I think, of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) after we had quite a discussion on the whole cold storage question, and pending information as to the point the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) had reached in the inquiry which he is now carrying on. I took the matter up with the Minister of Labour and learned that he had collected most of the information and expects soon to be able to lay a full report on the Table. In view of the fact that until that report is laid on the Table, the Department of Agriculture will make no new regulations, on the subject, I thought probably there would be no objection on the part of my hon. friend to the passing of this item. I cannot do any more in the matter. In answer to my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) I may say that subsidies will be given as hitherto. Only one subsidy will be given in a district, and on certain condition. The plans and specifications must be accepted by the department; ample space must be afforded for public cold storage; and the rates must be under control of the department. On these conditions thirty per cent of the cost of construction is given in payments spread over five years. We have not been giving many subsidies and have rather intended not to give more during the war. Besides, as a matter of fact, the country has been pretty well covered and the accommodation of the public in regard to cold storage provided for. Formerly this vote was $200,000, and now it is down to $50,000.

Mr. NESBITT: I suppose the minister takes care not to encourage the establishment of cold storage houses where they are not needed for the public?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes. And besides we do not give the subsidy to any body without assurance that ample room for public cold storage will be provided.

Mr. NESBITT: That is, space where the public can store goods on paying certain rates? Somebody suggested the other night that the charge for cold storage was very high. I think it was said that eggs were charged for at the rate of 12 cents a dozen. Did the minister look into that? I thought the statement absurd but I did not have the knowledge to refute it.

Mr. BURRELL: I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend the exact figure but it cannot be that. It may vary a little in different localities. As a matter of fact, our officers look over these rates very carefully and if there is the slightest complaint on the part of the public, or if the rate charged seems to be exorbitant, we have the power to reduce the rate, and we have exercised it. I think you will find that the rates are those generally accepted by the trade.

Mr. NESBITT: You would not have the power of reducing the rate charged by a private cold storage?

Mr. BURRELL: If it is a cold storage to which we give a subsidy.

Mr. McMILLAN: Is it the intention of the Government to have the duty removed from oleomargarine coming into Canada?

Mr. BURRELL: It is not a question of duty, but there is a provision on the statute book prohibiting the manufacture or importation of oleomargarine. The Government has had this question under consideration, we have had a very voluminous correspondence but I am afraid I cannot give my hon. friend any satisfaction.

Mr. MARCIL: The statement has been published that this question is such a controversial one that the Government intend to submit it to the judgment of the House. May I ask the minister if that is the intention?

Mr. BURRELL: Quite naturally, anything that is brought up in the way of legislation is submitted to the judgment of the House. This subject like a great many others, would probably be elucidated by being aired. There has not been, as far as my knowledge goes, anything like a controversial discussion about the matter recently. There was during the winter. I could not give my hon. friend any satisfaction as to what the Government may or may not do.

Mr. McMILLAN: I think this is a question that requires serious consideration at this time because we know that people in towns and cities are in a very serious condition. Labouring men and poor people are finding it very difficult to get along because of the high cost of living. I live in a dairy country and ninety per cent of the people I represent are farmers who depend upon dairying entirely. I would have been quite prepared to have supported any measure

brought down by this Government to allow the importation of oleomargarine during the continuance of the war that poor people might at least have oleomargarine to put upon their bread instead of being obliged to eat it dry. But the price which has been fixed for cheese in this country has been disappointing to myself and to most of the farmers. If the Government had arranged to have a larger price fixed for cheese, say about 25 cents, we could have afforded to have advocated the admission of oleomargarine for the benefit of the labouring people and anybody else who chose to eat it. But I believe it would not be fair on account of the low price of 21¾ cents fixed for cheese to be sold to the British Commission. That price only means between 19 and 20 cents a pound to the farmers. In considering the price of farm products we must take into account the high cost of everything that the farmer is obliged to use. A self-binder that he used to buy for $130 now costs $165, and many other articles, including cream separators, wagons, and implements generally, have gone up from 10 to 25 per cent, as well as the feed that he has to buy for his cattle. Last year our cheese averaged 19 cents a pound, and it will be about the same this year. On account of the high cost of everything that the farmer has to buy I think the Government should have arranged a higher price for his cheese. He should get three or four cents a pound more for it. If the Government had secured such a price we could have allowed the poor people in the towns and cities to have used oleomargarine.

Mr. NESBITT: I have had some more resolutions from a number of dairymen's associations in Southwestern Ontario in reference to the inspection of cheese at Montreal. They want inspectors appointed for the district west of Toronto, which is a very large and important cheese-making district. I do not want to weary the minister with something that he cannot control, but I think that he might possibly have some control over this question and arrange this matter satisfactorily to the dairymen of southwestern Ontario. I understood from the buyer that they were paying more for cheese on the other side than they are on this side. He was buying in Illinois and Wisconsin and he told me he was paying more to the cheese factory there than he was paying on this side.

Mr. BURRELL: For export?

Mr. NESBITT: Yes, because he talked to me about being able to get vessels in New York when he could not get them in Montreal.

Mr. BURRELL: I have already directed the attention of the commission to this subject which my hon. friend has brought before me. I have had one or two letters along the same line. Obviously, although my hon. friend may be pretty nearly right in saying that I could bring this to the attention of the commission, it is not desirable for me to be butting in in the way of trying to control their operations. I am very glad to bring anything of this kind to the attention of the commission, and I am quite positive that they will do their best to solve all these questions in such a manner as to eliminate all possible friction that can be eliminated. I would like to say to my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McMillan) that if he could know all that is taking place, which he cannot, because necessarily there are confidential communications to a certain extent between the British authorities and myself, I am sure that he would agree that everything possible, in so far as this Government is concerned, has been done in this cheese business to try and get the fullest attention paid to the interests of the producers of this country. But, it is not a question of what we have done. We could not say to the British authorities: You must pay so-and-so for the cheese you get in this country. All we could say to them was that we wanted them to give the fullest consideration to those points which my hon. friend has raised. One contention of the hon. gentleman I quite admit, namely, that the cost of production to the farmers has gone up, and that conditions are not what they were. We have pointed out in the strongest way to the British authorities that if they are desirous of securing the export of the surplus cheese in Canada for the use of the army and the population of Great Britain, it is necessary for them to remember that they must give such a price as would induce the people to manufacture cheese and not turn the raw material in other directions. We pressed that on them strongly and persistently. With regard to the other point that the hon. gentleman raises, this also was remembered, and I think it is most desirable that a state of things should not exist—I do not think it will exist—under which the American exporter will be able to pay a larger price for cheese than they are paying in Canada and

export at a larger figure to the Old Country than the figure at which they are buying through the commission. I have already brought that point to the attention of the British Commission, and I shall be very glad to emphasize it further.

Mr. NESBITT: My information is not gossip, you know; it is absolutely direct.

Mr. BURRELL: No. Of course, my hon. friend knows that the local conditions will always vary. It does not follow that because local prices in the United States may be higher than here, the export prices are higher. The export price usually has been the same, because the cheese from the United States has formed only one per cent of the exportable cheese of this continent. It is a bagatelle compared with our own cheese. The price of our cheese has been the ruling factor in the export trade, and I think it will be in this case also. I know that the shipping question has been a very difficult and acute one. I understand from the British authorities that they have not been making any discrimination. It is quite possible that now and then when a boat sailing from New York missed a load of munitions, or something of that kind, they filled up with cheese, but I do not believe they make a practice of taking cheese from American ports and not from Canadian ports. We have taken every conceivable step to get the fullest justice done to the producers of this country, while at the same time giving the British authorities all the cheese we could.

Mr. McMILLAN: Does my hon. friend expect that the price fixed by the British Board of Trade will remain the same throughout the season, 21¾ cents f.o.b., Montreal?

Mr. BURRELL: It is not a matter over which I have any control or in reference to which I could make any positive statement. I can only say that I understand the British Commission had instructions to buy for a fortnight, but apparently the price was left open. I earnestly appealed to them to fix a price as high as possible, and it would be very desirable not to lower that price. If the conditions warrant it, as they may later on towards the fall, the price might be increased, but, so far as we are concerned, we will do all we can to see that the price is not lowered.

Mr. STEELE: My understanding is that no cheese manufacturers in this country are compelled to sell their cheese through this channel.

[Mr. Burrell]

Mr. NESBITT: Who else would they sell it to?

Mr. STEELE: I do not see why a cheese dealer should go to the United States and pay a higher price for cheese there and ship via New York if he could buy in this country at a greater advantage to himself.

Mr. NESBITT: They could not bring it in here.

Mr. STEELE: They could ship Canadian cheese through New York just as easily as they could American. So I think the instances which the hon. member for North Oxford gives have been special and exceptional cases. I think it would be well for our cheese manufacturers to fully appreciate the difficulties of the situation and not pay too much attention to a campaign which seems to be put up in Ontario to discourage farmers and get them dissatisfied with what has been done by the British Government through its commission. They are being told that they will have to wait a long time for their pay. As I understand, there will be no great delay, the cheese will be paid for on presentation of warehouse receipts. They are told that hooping with steel hoops will cost much more. I understand that will be paid for by the commission, and not taken out of the producers. In fact, it is simply transferring the British market from the Old Country to Montreal, and the producers of cheese in this country will be delivering their cheese to the British Government at Montreal instead of to the dealers in England and Scotland. I am sure that the farmers and dairymen will be very well satisfied with the regulations when they understand them. As to the price, prices are never high enough for some people, and it is a question whether 21¾ cents is high enough; but so far as the regulations are concerned, I do not think there is any reason why the farmers and producers should feel dissatisfied.

Mr. NESBITT: The friend of whom I spoke is a cheese buyer not only in Canada but in the United States. He has a firm in the United States as well as in Canada, and is a very large buyer. He knows exactly what he can do without my hon. friend (Mr. Steele) telling him anything. He has been in the business a number of years, and is just as anxious to pay a price to the Canadian as to the American cheese makers. As a matter of fact, for some reason, he could pay a higher price to the American than to the Canadian producer,

and he could get space for all the cheese he wanted to ship through New York and could not possibly get any space from Canada at that time, and that was only a week ago last Monday night. My friend absolutely knows his business, there is no possible question about that. There is no discussion up with us as to delay in getting paid for cheese. There is a little longer delay because it has to be delivered at Montreal whereas the ordinary cheese buyer on our markets pays for the cheese the day it is delivered, inspects it at the factory and pays for it when it is delivered. It is quite possible that the minister can secure some arrangement under which the cheese will be inspected in the West. If that is done, from what I have heard, it will do away largely with any complaint with reference to the British Government taking over this cheese. As to the price, I have not the slightest hesitation in thinking that if they do not get the cheese at the price they will pay more for it. They will pay the price to get it, that stands to common sense. However, 21½ cents, or 19 cents to the factory, is a pretty fair price at this time of the year. It is more than the price at this time last year. Therefore, I do not think the producers are suffering in that way. If the farmers will not send the milk to the cheese factories, then the British Commission will have to pay a price that will induce them to send it to the cheese factories, that is all there is to that.

Mr. OLIVER: We are on the item in regard to cold storage. The minister suggested that this item should pass, but that later on the Minister of Labour would lay on the Table certain information. I do not know of what value the minister suggested this information would be in connection with this discussion. It is obvious that the question of the handling of the food products of the country through the cold storage warehouses is a matter of most pressing and enormous interest, and it struck me when the statements were being made by the Minister of Labour as to the methods of collecting information, that those methods were entirely inadequate, and liable to be entirely misleading in their results. The subject is one which is entirely beyond the mere consideration of an item in the Estimates of the Minister of Agriculture. It is a national question, and I take the liberty of asking the minister what opportunity we shall have of dealing with these reports when the Minister of Labour lays them on the Table.

Mr. BURRELL: There will be an opportunity of discussing them later in the session upon going into Committee of Supply. I quite admit that the question is far-reaching and that it is not tied down to the passing of this item, to which I am sure hon. gentlemen do not object, because its purpose is to fulfil contracts that have already been entered into. Under the Order in Council which was passed, the Minister of Labour had ample powers of inquiry. I do not know the details, but I understand that a very full investigation has been made, power having been secured to examine witnesses under oath and to take compulsory steps if the answers or statements made were unsatisfactory. I believe that they have very full information as to prices, amounts, qualities and every condition relating to the storage of food products. What I meant was that under the Act which we passed some time ago we shall be in a much better position to frame our regulations after we shall have obtained and analysed the information secured in this way by the Minister of Labour. I think that there would be an apportunity of discussing the whole question.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend has suggested that the question could be taken up on going into Committee of Supply, or on some other occasion after the report shall have been laid upon the Table. While that does offer an opportunity for a certain amount of discussion, it does not give such an opportunity for an interchange of views in regard to the matters dealt with in the report as is afforded by a discussion ir committee of an item of the Estimates. I do not wish to delay the minister's Estimates, but I am anxious that we should have the fullest opportunity for discussion and consideration of this report when it is laid upon the Table. Unless it is a matter of urgency, I would respectfully ask the minister to allow this item to stand until the report is produced and we shall have had some opportunity of considering it with a view to discussing the question, in the light of the report, with the freedom that pertains to discussions in committee.

Mr. BURRELL: Of course, I do not know when the report will come down, but I have no desire to press the item. If it is the wish of the hon. member that I should do so, I have no hesitation in letting the item stand.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Mr. MACDONALD: Have any definite arrangements been made by this Government with the Imperial Government and the Government of the United States with reference to the proportion of the aid which Canada is expected to give to Great Britain and the Allies in connection with food supplies of various kinds? In the Imperial House of Commons statements have been made by under-secretaries in answer to questions as to the reliance of Great Britain and the Allies on the continent of North America for food supplies, and I understand that some arrangements have been arrived at by the United States as regards quantities and other details. Has anything been done by the Canadian Government, and if so, along what lines.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not think there have been any special arrangements. The matter has been discussed from time to time. I do not think anything clear-cut has yet been evolved in the United States, because the Government are waiting for powers to deal with these matters. They are asking for rather strong powers and making their general arrangements, and when they secure those powers, it is anticipated that, as far as feasible, we shall work in co-operation with them. I do not think that I can say anything more definite than that at the present time.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am rather in the dark as to matters that may impinge upon the realm of diplomacy, but the necessity of furnishing to Great Britain and the Allies supplies, not merely of wheat and flour, but of other kinds of food, is apparent. From time to time, some of the home authorities have declared that the assurance of food supplies is essential above everything else. The statement has been made in the Imperial House of Commons as to understandings having been arrived at with the executive of the United States, and that executive have submitted to Congress a Bill asking for certain definite powers in reference to it, no doubt on the basis of some general understanding. Has the Canadian Government arrived at any such understanding?

Mr. BURRELL: Except in a general way; there is nothing that I would be able to tell my hon. friend of a definite character at the present time.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Arts and Agriculture—Exhibitions, $50,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some months ago I called to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is always kind and genial, a project of reciprocal exhibitions between France and Canada. About two years ago, the French Government sent to America a commission composed of business men and some members of the House of Representatives. That commission was headed by Mr. D'Amours, deputy of the Department of Landes, France. Mr. D'Amours, I believe, was the vice-president of the commission on trade in the French Parliament. That commission visited all the business centres in the United States and then came to Canada. I was present in Montreal at various gatherings which were convened for the purpose of explaining the object of that commission. The French Government had in view the development of better trade relations between the outside world and France. As the president of the commission, Mr. D'Amours, truly said: We do not wish to be surprised by peace as we have been surprised by war. He published broadcast in the United States and in Canada what statistics he had in his possession as to the trade of France previous to the war with Germany, which trade could be transferred to America, and notably to Canada. He gave a list of different articles which could be bought in Canada as cheaply as in Germany. Let me give one instance. He stated, much to the surprise of the merchants, manufacturers and business men who were present, that all of the asbestos bought by the French manufacturers or by the French Government—and it represents a very large quantity—had been imported from Germany, while Germany imported nearly all the asbestos from Canada. He said: "Our commission merchants were in Berlin whilst they should have been in Canada." After the visit of the commission, a delegation of business men was invited to visit France and to tour the principal industrial centres. That delegation was composed of the members of the Boards of Trade of Montreal, Quebec, and Toronto. The president of the delegation, was, I think, Mr. Woods, president of the Toronto Board of Trade. That delegation went into all parts of France. Senator Beaubien, who has taken a very lively interest in this matter, accompanied the delegation at his own expense, and on his return he published a very exhaustive report of what the delegation had seen on the other side. The correspondence is in the hands of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and it is made clear that we can very

materially increase our trade with France. What struck me in discussing this item of exhibitions is this:

Senator Beaubien and Mr. Woods were approached while they were in France by officials of the French Government and by representatives of the boards of trade of the larger cities, such as Lyon, Bordeaux, Havre, Rouen, and Marseilles, and a plan was evolved for a train exhibition of the products of both countries. If the Canadian Government could arrange with our traders and manufacturers for an exhibition of our staple products and samples of our industrial work the French Government agreed to equip a train to display the goods, running, let us say, between Havre and Marseilles, and to pay all the expenses. Trains of this sort have been formerly used in Canada, giving our people an opportunity to become acquainted with the natural and industrial products of the country. The French Government, on the other hand, agreed that if the Canadian Government would equip a similar train to run through our provinces from ocean to ocean, they would arrange with their manufacturers for a similar display of French products and manufactured goods. It was hoped that by this plan the trade of both countries would be fostered and greatly encouraged. I do not know whether the Minister of Trade and Commerce has consulted with the Minister of Agriculture about this matter, or whether he has come to any decision, but in view of the conditions that will arise in the post-bellum days I think it would be in the interest of both countries if this excellent idea were carried out. We have at the present time a very important and very large trade with France, and there is no reason why it should not be developed and maintained, especially in view of the revelations that were made by the French Commission when they visited this country, and which showed such glaringly foolish transactions as the purchase of asbestos in Berlin by French consumers when it could have been easily procured in Canada, which produces such large quantities.

The minister has been successful in the last two exhibitions in which Canada participated, and I think if he would give some thought to this project of the French Government and of the French Chambers of Commerce he would render a great service to the business men of this country. It may be that when the Estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce are up I shall enlarge upon this subject, because I have copies of some very interesting and illuminating correspondence between business men in France and Senator Beaubien and Mr. Woods. Our duty at the present moment is certainly to do as much as we can to win the war, but we must not lose sight of what is to happen after the war, and one of the chief duties of the Government, it seems to me, is to prepare to capture trade during the period immediately following the war. We will need wider markets, and what better foreign market is there than that of France? I think if an exhibition train of this sort could be equipped and put into commission it would render a very great service to the business men of this country.

Mr. BURRELL: I have a very fair recollection of what transpired in the negotiations to which my hon. friend has alluded, in which, though my department was not directly concerned I took a very sympathetic interest. I cannot say just how far the negotiations went or whether the matter was definitely dropped or not. I know, however, that it was taken up in some detail, and that some of the circumstances are as my hon. friend has described. The matter was discussed at some length, I believe, by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, because it would naturally be done largely under their auspices, or at all events the merchandise would be collected for the train by their machinery, and that would involve a great deal of preparation. I stated that if the project came to any definite conclusion my department should be glad to help in any way in connection with our own exhibition work, although it was entirely out of our line to deal with a train of this sort. I rather think the project was dropped, whether by mutual agreement or not I do not know, on account of the terrific pressure of the war, which made it inadvisable to go on with the scheme. That is my understanding, but no doubt the Minister of Trade and Commerce will be able to give my hon. friend a fuller explanation.

Mr. BOULAY (translation): Mr. Chairman, I take the opportunity afforded me by the discussion of the item now before the House to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to an anomaly in the administration of his department. I have no doubt but that the grievance is one of long standing, but, after all, that is no reason why the question should not be brought to the notice of the minister.

The Department of Agriculture is one of the most important in the Civil Service, and

it seems to me that it would be proper to appoint to the higher offices men who speak both official languages. This is not the first time that I broach the subject; I even recommended for appointment as veterinary surgeon in that department a thoroughly competent man from the province of Quebec, but the minister sidetracked my proposal, though admitting the undoubted importance of having officials conversant with both languages.

In a letter dated 14th May last, he said:

> In regard to the other letter, dated 24th April, I have noted carefully what you say. It would, of course, be a pleasant combination of qualities if an officer not only had the highest technical knowledge, but also a free command of languages, but thorough competence is, of course, essential in the discharge of duties of a technical and important character. Nor, I fear, would it be possible to appoint him to any important position under the Veterinary Director General. I may say that Dr. Telmosse, many years ago, failed to pass the necessary examination at the Veterinary college in Chicago, to which a number of Canadians were sent for this purpose.

In that paragraph, the minister recognizes the importance of having officers with a free command of both languages; he even hints that it is essential and of this I have evidence in the county of Rimouski. Some four or five months ago an officer of the department came into the county. He was quite well qualified for his duties, but the people of the province of Quebec, who do not understand English, could derive no benefit from his extensive information; yet his salary is provided by the people of the province of Quebec just as much as by the people of the other provinces. He came to attend a farmers' convention, but could not address those present.

I fail to see why the Department of Agriculture could not find men having the necessary technical knowledge and likewise familiar with both languages. From the statement of the minister one would infer that nobody could be found in the province of Quebec with the proper qualifications for positions of that nature. Judging from the list of the high salaried officers in the Department of Agriculture, it would appear that the French-Canadians are systematically excluded; out of nineteen employees, there is only one French name; to make sure, I had better read the list:

G. F. O'Hallaron, Deputy Minister	$6,000 00
Lt.-Col. Jarvis, Asst. Dep. Minister	3,600 00
F. Montizambert, Director General of Public Health	5,000 00
F. Torrance, General Veterinary Superintendent	5,000 00
J. A. Ruddick, Dairy Commissioner	4,000 00
G. H. Clark, Seed Commissioner	$3,650 00
P. E. Ritchie, Registrar of Trade Marks	3,600 00
P. K. Doherty, Canadian Commissioner of International Institute of Agric.	3,400 00
J. H. Grisdale Director of Exper. Farm	3,300 00
John Bright, Live-stock Commissioner.	3,300 00
W. J. Lynch, Chief of Patent Office	3,200 00
F. P. Shutt, Assistant Director of Exp. Farms	3,200 00
W. T. Macoun, Dominion Horticulturist	3,100 00
D. Johnson, Fruit Commissioner	3,100 00
George Hilton, Chief Veter. Inspector	3,000 00
C. G. Hewitt, Dominion Entomologist.	3,000 00
C. E. Saunders, Dominion Cerealist	2,800 00
Felix Charlan, Chief of the Tobacco branch	2,800 00
Herbert Arkell, Assistant Live-Stock Commissioner	2,800 00

Therefore only one French-Canadian of nineteen employees, while the French element in the Dominion, according to the census of 1911, aggregates, I think, 28 or 30 per cent of the whole population; the proportion would likely be greater to-day. It does occur to me that the French-Canadians should be represented in the Department of Agriculture in proportion to their number. Then there is the further necessity that the higher officials of that department ought to be able to impart the information they possess to the farmers of Quebec as they do in the other provinces, so that there might be no discrimination.

This latter consideration alone should have been sufficient to induce, not only the present incumbent but previous ministers—because I believe the grievance is of long standing—to remedy the situation. It would be nothing but justice toward the French-Canadian people and a benefit to the farmers. We need the technical knowledge of those experts, whose salaries we pay not for the sole advantage of the English-speaking communities but for that of the French-Canadian farmers as well.

Since conditions have not improved, I deem it my duty to draw the attention of the minister to that matter, as I have done in this House for some years; my object in discussing the matter publicly to-night is to bring it to the notice of the minister, that he may take the first opportunity of remedying that grievance and granting us the fair treatment to which we are entitled and which would work to the benefit of agriculture. It is in the Gulf district especially, where the climate is not as favourable as might be to the success of farming operations that it is essential that the people be instructed in the best method of tillage. But how can those officials give the information to men whose language they do not understand?

I think I have said enough to convince the minister that for all those reasons we

are entitled to fair treatment and, if he has not caught my meaning, I am quite willing to repeat briefly in English what I have just said in French.

Mr. BURRELL: Had my hon. friend (Mr. Boulay), who speaks English very well, addressed the committee in that language, he would have made himself more intelligble to me, and I should have been able to follow him with greater clearness, because I am not, I regret to say, so well acquainted with the French language as I might be. I understood him, however, to make a general argument to the effect that all the higher officials of the departments should be able to speak the two languages. He enumerates quite a number of our officers, but of those he named a considerable number speak French very fluently. Dr. Montizambert, for instance, would be able to follow my hon. friend no matter how long he might speak French, and he would be able to reply to him with absolute clearness in that language. Mr. Doherty, Mr. Grisdale, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Charlan, also, are very familiar with the French language. In fact, Dr. Grisdale, who occupies the very important position of Director of Experimental Farms—I understood my hon. friend to say that agriculture was not receiving the attention it should receive from the Federal Government, in that officers who do not understand French are sent out to address the public—could go before an audience of French-Canadians and address them in their own language with absolute facility. So, I cannot altogether plead guilty to the hon. gentleman's accusation. Perhaps he had better tackle some other minister.

Mr. BOULAY: But we do not see those who talk French.

Mr. BURRELL: That may be because they are there when the hon. gentleman is not at home, but officers who speak French visit his section of the country with fair frequency. It is true that we have not so many technical officers in the service as we should like to have who understand French thoroughly; but I would point out that in this country the most highly- trained agricultural students are, unfortunately, not graduated from the colleges in which French is the language.

This Government has probably done more to strengthen the agricultural colleges of Quebec than all preceding Governments. The hon. gentleman may or may not know that for the last four years, under the Agricultural Instruction Act, we have given $20,000 to Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, and also to Oka College, for the express purpose of strengthening the staffs and equipment of those French Canadian colleges, in agriculture, in order that they may turn out more highly equipped students, whom we would gladly employ. But I am bound to say, and without prejudice in the matter, that no one who knows thoroughly the science and practice of agriculture would say that either of the institutions I have mentioned could turn out half as many practically trained students in agriculture as an institution like the college at Guelph. In our work we must have men who not only have a practical knowledge of agriculture, but who also understand the scientific basis of their calling; and for this class of men we have to look almost entirely to such institutions, and largely to the institution at Guelph. With the work we have been doing for the last four years we hope in future to have a larger choice of men. We hope to continue that work for some years to come, if we stay in power; and even if, to the misfortune of the country, we do not stay in power, the succeeding Government, whatever it may be, I am sure, will not upset the work done under the authority of the Agricultural Instruction Act.

That work will still go on. When that work comes to fruition and when these educational institutions are sufficiently strengthened that they will turn out a large number of young men who will not only understand the French and English languages but who will be thoroughly equipped in scientific agriculture, if I am in charge of this department, I will be only too glad to secure the services of such men. But, in the meantime, I must frankly say I have great difficulty in getting hold of men who thoroughly understand both the French and English language. I do not know that this has any special reference to the item under discussion which is our exhibition work. In connection with this work, I might say that we have not very much of a staff but we have no less than three men who are on the permanent staff who are French-Canadians and who also have a thorough acquaintance with the English language. As to the work of the commissioner, I confess Col. Hutcheson does not understand French, or to a very slight extent, but, although I did not appoint him, and although he was appointed by the late Government, I am bound to say that if you were to search from one end of Canada to the other, I do not think you could conceivably find a man who could take Mr.

Hutcheson's place in connection with exhibition work. He has been in the service for sixteen or seventeen years. Not only by his marvellous natural capacity for exhibition work, but also by his long experience in international exhibitions, he has achieved an almost unrivalled supremacy in connection with big international exhibitions. To such an extent is this the case that when I was in San Francisco two years ago at the dedication of our building there—the most magnificent building that some of us had ever seen—I was given a luncheon by the president and directors of the Panama-Pacific Exposition at which Col. Hutcheson was present. If my hon. friend had heard the terms in which these gentlemen spoke of the extraordinary ability and efficiency of Col. Hutcheson as commissioner, I think he would have been more than satisfied that it would be almost impossible to get any man in this country who would be equally capable in that class of work. I am glad to bear this testimony to Col. Hutcheson to-night because he is a man who is no longer young, he is 71 or 72 years of age, he has been quite ill lately and I regret very much to say that in the position in which he is placed he is not eligible for superannuation as he would have been were he in the Inside Service. The department and the country owe him a great deal for the extraordinarily efficacious work that he has been doing in the last three years and for the great success which he has had at San Francisco and San Diego where our exhibition elicited the unstinted admiration of the people of the United States. If it had not been for the war that exhibition would have attracted very much more attention but, as it is it would have attracted very much more attention and would have done a work for Canada that perhaps in point of usefulness, could not have been excelled.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hold no brief to defend the Government, but on this occasion I must say that what the hon. gentleman has just stated is true from beginning to end. As regards exhibitions, Colonel Hutcheson is certainly the best officer that Canada has ever had. He has organized our exhibitions abroad. Colonel Hutcheson is known in every country in the world—in Japan, where he organized the Osaka exhibition; in Italy, where he organized the Milan exhibition; in Belgium, where he organized the Brussels exhibition; in England and in the United States. Colonel Hutcheson has, in fact, had an influence in advertising Canada that no man can imitate. As regards the question of the dual language, there is associated with him a gentleman named Mr. Hains; he has an English name but he is as French as the hon. member for Rimouski or myself.

Mr. BURRELL: Mr. Girardot.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, a French-Canadian from Essex county.

Mr. BURRELL: Mr. Turcotte.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, Mr. Turcotte. I have met them all at two or three exhibitions in Europe. No blame can be laid at the door of the Minister of Agriculture. I have written to the minister very often in French, and he has answered me in French. As regards the last officials mentioned by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay), Mr. Montizambert, Mr. Charlan and Mr. Grisdale, they all speak French very fluently.

Mr. BOULAY: Where are these Frenchmen—we never meet them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you ever spoken with Mr. Grisdale?

Mr. BOULAY: Yes, he certainly speaks French.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know many named Ross in Rimouski, and they do not speak English.

Mr. BOULAY: If they speak French, how is it that we see nothing but English names on the list?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know many Scotch people, who, despite their names, do not speak English. These points are really not worthy of my hon. friend. I am thankful to the Minister of Agriculture for the publication of the Gazette Agricole, a French publication which is spread broadcast in our province, and which contains most useful information for our farmers. This is a precedent. This paper has been published for the first time under the direction of my hon. friend, and so, if the minister does his duty towards my fellow-countrymen in Quebec, and if he is spreading intelligent agricultural knowledge among them, it is not fair to come and say: "Why ignore the French?" At the experimental farm, where our habitants from Quebec come in contact with the department, we have a French secretary. He was appointed by Mr. Fisher. In addition, there are many French officials in the department. It is not at the door of the Minister of Agriculture that a complaint of this kind should be laid.

Mr. BOULAY (translation): I am rather taken aback by the statement of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) that there are many officials in the Department of Agriculture who speak French fluently Time and again, I personally called at the offices of Mr. John Bright, but could not get myself understood except by an humble stenographer. Out of a dozen employees that I found therein, not one knew any French. I think that in a service as improtant as that presided over by Mr. John Bright, there should be some officers with a knowledge of French. Let the hon. member for Rouville make any denial he cares, the fact remains, unaccountable for me, that of the gentlemen mentioned as having a good command of French, all but one bear French names.

I wrote to the department and recommended to different positions certain French-Canadians who bear French names and in every instance the reply came that the applicants were not qualified. Judging by the answers given to questions which I placed on the Order Paper, I find that only from French-Canadians are those qualifications required. I will quote some of those questions and the answers:

Q. Was the late John Bright, Live Stock Commissioner, a graduate of a Canadian university?—A. No.

Q. If so, what was his degree, the name of the university and in what year?—A. Answer under 1.

Here is another regarding Dr. Torrance:

Q. Is Mr. Frederick Torrance, Director General Veterinary of Canada, a graduate of a Canadian university?—A. A graduate of McGill University, with the following degrees: B.A. in 1878, D.Sc.V. in 1890.

That is twenty-seven years ago, and solely from McGill University. I think the gentleman I recommended to the minister was a graduate of Laval University. I should consider the degrees conferred by a French institution in no way inferior to those conferred by an English university; but the gentleman for whose appointment I applied was turned down, because, I was told, he had failed to pass the examination of the Chicago Veterinary College. I don't see that Dr. Torrance was required to take that last examination. His degrees, obtained as far back as 1878 and 1890, were found quite sufficient. Veterinary science, as any other science, is improving from day to day, and I think that diplomas conferred by Laval University at a recent date must have as much value, to say the least, as those obtained at McGill University in 1878 and 1890.

I say this with some feeling, because, after all, here are the French-Canadians being systematically debarred from appointment in the Department of Agriculture under the pretense that the applicants of that nationality have failed at some examination of the Chicago Veterinary College.

I know whereof I speak. Take the case of Mr. Fixter, one of the officials. He is a splendid gentleman, quite qualified I am sure. I met him in the county of Rimouski where he came to lecture. He knows his work well, but he has no knowledge of French whatever. So he had to take about with him men who certainly have not his experience, and the farmers of my county, being unable to understand his lectures, derive no benefit from his learned disquisitions.

Mr. MORPHY (North Perth): I understand that new regulations have been promulgated by the department presided over by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, and from information I have received, it would appear that these rules will entirely disrupt a lifelong practice in regard to the manufacture, boxing and curing of cheese in Western Ontario, and I believe also in Eastern Ontario. In the county that I have the honour to represent we have a very large number of cheese factories. In one township of that county alone there are nine factories within the confines of the township and four on the border or, in other words, Elma, a township of 67,000 acres, contains within it nine factories, with four on the border, serving the patrons of these 67,000 acres, or a factory to every 5,000 acres, which is probably one of the most densely covered cheese manufacturing districts in the country. The practice of the farmers there has been to manufacture and cure their cheese and box and ship them f.o.b. at the nearest station, where they have been paid their money. My correspondent points out that the new regulations promulgated or approved by the minister involve, among other things, the question of price, the present establishment being 21¾ cents per pound. The gentleman who writes to me points out that he met the commission in Montreal a few days ago and was furnished with a copy of the rules, and while I am not a practical expert on cheese, I adopt the objections that he raises, so that the hon. minister may, if he feels inclined to do so, consider them, and if there is an injustice, remedy it. He says that the rules are entirely unfair to Western Ontario cheese manufacturers and that they put the factory men at a great disadvan-

tage; and more especially is it a disadvantage to the dairyman himself, the man who makes the cheese. And that man who makes the cheese is not an individual unit; he is there by thousands, engaged in an industry which is of moment to-day when the question of food products is a live issue. We are all asking the farmers of the country to produce and produce and produce again; that is the cry that has gone forth. So I submit that under these circumstances the Government should be inclined to facilitate production and make the pathway of the real producer easy. My correspondent claims that the rules are entirely framed for the benefit of Montreal produce dealers and against the best interests of the farmers who produce the cheese. That is rather an alarming statement, in these days when we are asking the farmers of the country to do their best. He says that under the new rules cheese has to be inspected, weighed, coopered, and such like in Montreal. For fifty years cheese has been inspected, weighed, coopered, and manufactured at home in the factories of the farmers I represent, and what justification the minister can have for disrupting the policy of a lifetime, changing the whole current of trade, making the farmer send his cheese to Montreal, there to be prepared for export when he has been in the habit of doing it at home, I should like the minister to tell me.

Mr. EDWARDS: How much cheese from Western Ontario goes to Montreal?

Mr. MORPHY: I cannot give the figures, but from the complaint made here by this man, who is an expert in the business, it seems to be alarming to him. I cannot answer that question, but I know that in one section alone in my county in an ordinary year there is about three-quarters of a million dollars worth of cheese produced; that is an average crop produced and sold in one district, so that it is a very big industry.

Mr. EDWARDS: It might be sold out of one township, but my information is that for a number of years comparatively little cheese from west of Peterborough has gone out of this country by way of Montreal.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman may be right or he may be wrong.

Mr. WEBSTER: He is right.

Mr. MORPHY: When a cheese expert like my hon. friend from Brockville says he is right, I am satisfied he is right; but whether he is right or wrong makes no difference in my case. The practice of the past may change to-morrow. Conditions are upside down, topsy turvy, and when a man of the reputation of Thomas Ballentyne, of Stratford, recognized as one of the big men of the cheese industry in Canada, one of the expert men, one of the largest exporters, writes me that the conditions are alarming, it is my duty, representing that county, to place the facts before the minister. He says that cheese will be inspected in Montreal. For a lifetime it has been inspected at the factory at home. Does the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) say that that is not true?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: Why?

Mr. EDWARDS: Because it is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. MORPHY: It is an easy thing to say that. The hon. gentleman will probably put my correspondent and me right when he speaks to the question. In the meantime, I accept the facts as stated by a gentleman such as the gentleman who has written to me, who says:

> The rules that have been promulgated will necessitate all our farmers having to wait until this grading at Montreal is done, which would mean considerable time.

This would cause a disrupted condition among the farmers of the county.

He says further that they

> Suggested to the Commission that one man look after the inspection in Western Ontario. And in this event—

And I ask the minister to pay particular attention to this—

> —the cheese could all be shipped to our different warehouses at Stratford, Ingersoll, Woodstock and London, and the grading done there.

So that the factory men would then be paid in the course of a very few days for the shipment of their cheese. He says that possibly this matter has been submitted to the Minister of Agriculture, but he has no assurance as to what the minister is going to do about it. He says that the matter should be rectified, as it means that the farmers of Ontario will suffer the disadvantage of a considerably lower price than those of eastern Ontario. I notice that the member for Frontenac and the member for Brockville, both from eastern Ontario, for some reason seem to be perfectly satisfied, whereas western Ontario seems to be very much dissatisfied. Is it because the eastern Ontario cheese is shipped green?

Mr. WEBSTER: No, it is because the western men are hard to please.

Mr. MORPHY: Is it because western cheese is shipped in perfect condition, free from shrinkage? Is it because it is of a very much finer quality than that produced in eastern Ontario? This letter proceeds to say:—

> It means that our western farmers will have to suffer considerably less prices than Eastern Ontario, because it may be necessary for our western dealers to open up warehouses in Montreal.

If these rules and regulations compel the western dealers to open warehouses in Montreal—indeed, they would, in fact, be forced to do so—thereby causing the farmers of western Ontario additional expense, the mere mention of the fact should cause the minister to look into it and see that this is prevented.

The writer says, also, that one of the results will be the double handling of the cheese. Any one who knows anything about the handling of products in large quantities, having regard to the cost of transportation, knows that it costs money. Double handling simply doubles the cost, and the result is a great drawback to all concerned and a tendency towards the lessening of production. The farmers will be driven out of the cheese business if the minister does not make such regulations as will encourage rather than discourage the making of cheese. The writer says that the double handling of the cheese would be necessary because they would have to be sent to the warehouses to make up carload lots of 500 boxes. In other words, the cheese would have to be centered in these places, which would be distributing points. The cheese would have to be brought there instead of being put on the car at the nearest station to our factory, and then sent to a central warehouse so as to make up a carload lot. From there the cheese would be rehandled and shipped to Montreal. Mr. Ballantyne points out that the matter was taken up by the Western Ontario Dairymen's Association at Woodstock on June 6, and that the dairymen are up in arms about it—rebellious, indignant. He says that the matter will come up in my county this week, at Listowel, which is the biggest cheese board in western Ontario. I think, that I am within my rights and privileges when I ask the minister to look into this matter. May I ask the minister—I asked the question yesterday, but did not get an answer—whether he consulted the Association of Dairymen of Western Ontario before these rules were framed and promulgated? Did he consult the farmers who make the cheese? Where did he get his information? Did he rely upon some big interests in the city of Montreal, entirely ignoring the farmers of western Ontario? I do not say that is so, but there is a suspicion that that was done. Either that occurred, or the rights of the man on the farm were overlooked—the man who raises the milk that produces the cheese which is the subject of this discussion. I ask on his behalf that the minister give this matter careful and intelligent consideration, in the hope that the people of western Ontario will get that justice to which the honourable nature of their calling entitles them.

9 p.m.

Mr. BURRELL. The department has framed no new regulations upsetting the channels of trade, or anything of that kind. I could not for a moment, as Minister of Agriculture, undertake to control or supervise the work of the commission or suggest or dictate to the cheese commissioner. It would involve endless difficulty and dispute, and would have no satisfactory results.

Mr. MORPHY: Who is responsible for the creation of this board?

Mr. BURRELL: It is true that we, with the British Government are, in a sense, responsible. From the fact that between the British Government and ourselves a commission was appointed to secure surplus Canadian cheese and to arrange the matter in a satisfactory way, it does not follow that I am in a position to control the commission. It is obvious that I could not do so. As a matter of fact, if the British Government had adopted the plan of sending men out to buy such cheese as they could transport across the ocean, very much worse conditions might have arisen. We asked them not to eliminate the ordinary machinery of the cheese trade, pointing out that this machinery is complicated and adapted to the conditions connected with the manufacture and sale of cheese in Canada, and that to deal with the matter through another system would have a tendency to upset things. This cheese board, therefore, is communicating with all the interests concerned. We have nothing to say about the price. The British Government decided what price they could afford to pay. We understood that they did not expect to pay more than 19 cents, which was the price they paid New Zealand. We made such arguments in the matter as my hon. friend himself would probably make,

and they finally adopted the price of 21¾ cents. The commission is making such arrangements, by the adoption of regulations or machinery, or whatever you like to call it, as will secure that cheese f.o.b. Montreal, in grades that are practically known to the trade, in order that the British Government, while getting it in the simplest and easiest way, will do no injustice to any part of the community. There is, of course, no obligation to sell; there is no compulsion in any shape or form. I shall be very glad indeed to have my hon. friend's remarks as they appear in Hansard sent to the Cheese Commission, with the request that they give his remarks their particular attention and do what they can to obviate any difficulty and to prevent any friction of this kind.

Mr. WEBSTER: I think that the friend of the member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) in Stratford is taking the position of the spoiled boy. Mr. Ballantyne has been an exporter of cheese from the western part of Ontario. To-day he finds that it is impossible to get a quotation for contract rates across the ocean to Liverpool. I think the Commission is right in the way that it decided to do business. Any man who has been in the trade as long as Mr. Ballantyne has is quite capable of inspecting cheese; the same may be said of any man in his employ. Speaking generally, one may say that no poor cheese is being manufactured to-day in Canada, because the man who makes poor cheese is driven out of business. We in Canada profess to make the best cheese in the world and I am proud of our reputation in that respect. If Mr. Ballantyne is dissatisfied with the report that he gets from the inspector at Montreal, all he has to do is to go there and look after his own interests, just as I do and just as many other men do. I am satisfied with the work of the man who inspects this cheese each week. I try to be in Montreal each week during the operations of the cheese trade and I am satisfied that the cheese is properly inspected. That has been the situation in regard to cheese inspection during the past two years.

Mr. STEELE: Should a cheese buyer in Western Onario buy his cheese as first grade and ship it as first grade, is there any likelihood that there will be any change in it when it reaches Montreal?

Mr. WEBSTER: None at all. The only possible trouble that could arise would be if he shipped it in a very high temperature in an exposed car. If he put it into a refrigerator car at Stratford, it would be in good condition when it reached Montreal.

Mr. STEELE: There is practically no change in policy?

Mr. WEBSTER: No. Mr. Ballantyne has been able to do away with the difficulty of coopering. All the cheese that went to the British army was formerly taken out of the cheese box and put into a square case bound with two iron bands.

Mr. MORPHY: All that can be done at Montreal.

Mr. WEBSTER: It can be done more easily at Stratford. There are two iron bands now put around the cheese box.

Mr. MORPHY: Our cheese is not so strong as to require that.

Mr. WEBSTER: The hon. gentleman speaks of all the storage facilities of this country. The situation is simply this: No other city in America has as great storage facilities as has the city of Montreal. In that city you can have goods stored at any temperature from fifty degrees down, and that is why the commission is going to take advantage of those storage facilities. In regard to the weights, why should not the commission in Montreal get sixteen ounces to the pound just as any other dealer receives? That is the situation. These questions have all to be considered by the commission, and I must compliment the Minister of Agriculture on the businesslike manner in which the commission has handled this very great industry.

Mr. GLASS: I have received to-day two communications from cheese organizations in my district in western Ontario, but the only objection raised is as to the need of inspection being confined to Montreal. I presume that it is the general custom to collect the cheese at centres to which suitable side shipments are made to make up carloads, and I would like the minister, if the matter is worthy of his consideration, to bring to the attention of the commission the fact that certain objections are raised in western Ontario, and to see if any means can be found to facilitate the inspection of cheese at central points of shipment. That would give satisfaction to the cheese manufacturers in my district.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I wish to get some information from the minister in regard to a matter that does not properly come under this item. I think it would properly fall under item 45.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not know what my hon. friend is going to speak about, but if he can confine his remarks to an item that comes up it would be desirable, because we are wandering all around this item. At the present moment we are discussing an item on exhibitions.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: My remarks would more properly fall under an item that has already been passed, but when the item was brought up I was absent through no fault of my own, but on account of illness, and I shall be obliged if the minister will give me the information. Some years ago the farmers in Prince Edward Island were greatly troubled in regard to a disease called powdery scab that was alleged to be amongst our potatoes, but during the past two years we have heard very little about it, and during the last year we have heard nothing about it. Has the disease disappeared, or partially disappeared, or is there any danger of its coming back? If it has disappeared it is important for the farmers to know that. Are any steps being taken to prevent its recurrence?

Mr. BURRELL: I cannot tell my hon. friend if that disease has disappeared, and I very much doubt that. We did entertain very great apprehensions as to the ravages of powdery scab, and in the Botanical Division of our plant pathologists are still working on it. Fortunately, it did not prove as serious as was anticipated, and I think that by better methods of cultivation and by a better selection of seeds, we are having it eliminated. I will call my officer's attention to the matter and give my hon. friend information in regard to it.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: It was stated at a conference that met at Washington that this disease was very widespread in the Maritime Provinces and particularly Prince Edward Island. If it has disappeared, I think it would be the duty of the department or the minister to bring that fact to the attention of the proper authorities in the United States, and to take whatever steps may be deemed advisable to have the embargo that was imposed against our potatoes removed.

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend is under a misapprehension. I took that matter up personally with the authorities at Washington and went into it very thoroughly. We had that embargo lifted some time ago, adopted a position which would allow any of our potatoes to come in as long as they had not more than a certain percentage—I have forgotten the exact percentage—of disease, including powdery scab and other diseases of less importance. Therefore, there has been practically free importation of potatoes into that country for some time past. We advise the United States authorities from time to time of conditions in this country.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: As I understand the matter, potatoes have to be inspected at the point of shipment?

Mr. BURRELL: No, at point of entry into the United States.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister understands that no person in Canada could undertake the risk of shipping potatoes to the United States with a possibility of having them rejected, because the expense of bringing them back to Canada would mean the loss of the shipment. The regulation is of no practical value.

Mr. BURRELL: Oh, yes.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Unless we could secure a regulation to have our potatoes inspected at point of shipment, or unless the American authorities would be willing to accept a certificate from Canadian officers, it would be impossible to carry on the trade.

Mr. BURRELL: Is my hon. friend aware of any rejections having occurred in the East?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: No person could undertake to ship potatoes under those regulations.

Mr. BURRELL: Probably there have been half a million or a million bushels of potatoes shipped into the United States this year; in fact, there has been a complaint that too many potatoes have been shipped out of this country into the United States. The United States are not going to give up the power of examining goods that come into their country, but they are carrying out that regulation in a broad way. Unless the potatoes are in such a badly diseased condition as not to be a credit to Canada to be shipped out of the country, there is no trouble at all, and with the exception of a very few shipments which should not have been made to any market, there has been practically no trouble, and out of the enormous quantity of potatoes that have been sent out this last year from the East, so far as I know, there has not been a single rejection.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister may be correct in regard to shipments from New Brunswick, but I know that no shipments have been made from Prince Edward Island except when the potatoes have been purchased by citizens of the United States who have come to the province to buy them. The risk otherwise would be too great.

Mr. BURRELL: As excellent potatoes are grown in Prince Edward Island, there should be no difficulty.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Unfortunately the United States people got the information that our potatoes were diseased, and that has been a great hindrance to the trade.

Mr. BURRELL: We will do all we can to alleviate the trouble.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The difficulty arose through information being given to the American people which was not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. OLIVER: What exhibition work is going on at the present time and what is in prospect?

Mr. BURRELL: We have practically closed up our exhibition work. The Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco closed a year ago last January. San Diego was holding an exhibition at the same time called the Panama-California Exposition, and they were exceedingly anxious for us to exhibit there. Delegations, including the president, came down here twice from San Diego, but we decided that we could not exhibit in both places. As the war was on and there would be no travel in Europe, but a great deal through Southern California, they decided to keep the San Diego Exposition going for another year. They had a large guarantee from the city of Los Angeles to help them financially, and they finally made such an exceedingly generous offer that I felt we would be justified in accepting it. They gave us the finest building in San Diego, paid for the transportation of the whole exhibit from San Francisco to San Diego, and gave us free light, free water, and guards for the exhibition as well. Under these conditions we moved the exhibit to San Diego, where it has been seen probably by three or four million visitors. The exhibition was kept going until last March when, as there were no other big international exhibitions in sight, although we did have a proposition to go to Washington and to another place which would have involved very heavy expense, we came to the conclusion to pack up the exhibit and store it at Ottawa.

Mr. OLIVER: What is to be the expenditure under this vote?

Mr. BURRELL: It is for the payment of the staff and the transfer of the exhibit to Ottawa. It is a very large exhibit, and will cost a considerable amount to pack up and transport.

Mr. OLIVER: I think there has been an annual grant for a Dominion Exhibition?

Mr. BURRELL: That is a separate item for a Dominion exhibition in the big centres of each province. It was Nova Scotia's turn this year, but as their buildings had been taken over for military purposes, and on account of the dislocation caused by the war, they decided not to hold the exhibition, and we are not asking for a vote this year.

Mr. OLIVER: The exhibition staff will be disbanded?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

For renewing and improving Canadian exhibition at Imperial Institute, London, and assisting in the maintenance thereof, $5,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the minister tell us what this is about?

Mr. BURRELL: I have not seen the exhibit for a long time, so I cannot tell my hon. friend much about it. I think each Dominion contributes so much to keep the exhibit going.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Imperial Institute has been criticised in the English press and declared to be of no value whatever. Every now and then some body of men on the other side of the water develop some fad, get an organization going, and come on the overseas dominion for grants to run some exhibition that is of no interest to the general public. It may be a club or an exhibit of this kind. Unless there is some real merit in this Institute, I do not see why we should spend this money, especially in war time.

Mr. BURRELL: I am not disposed to dispute very much what my hon. friend says; I am not enthusiastically defending this Institute. It is to some extent a matter of sentiment, and we have been asked to keep up our share of the maintenance expenses.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who runs it, what is it about, and what is its genesis?

Mr. BURRELL: I think it was started towards the end of the reign of Queen Victoria, with the idea of exhibiting some of the natural resources and products of the

great dominions beyond the sea. Lord Strathcona was very keenly interested in the Institute, I believe.

Mr. MACDONALD: I remember when I was on the other side some years ago, I could not find out anything about this place. I think the minister will find that it is run by a coterie of some gentlemen with a fad of their own, to which they wish the dominions to contribute. I saw a very strong criticism of the institute in an English newspaper last winter, which pointed out that it was of very little use.

Mr. BURRELL: I shall be glad to make further inquiries about it.

Health of animals, $570,000.

Mr. McCOIG: A year ago when a similar vote was under consideration by the House I drew the attention of the Acting Minister of Agriculture to the fact that the different stock dealers and abattoir companies were extorting from the purchasers of all hogs a commission of one-half of one per cent for inspection. The impression went out that this was the Government inspection fee. The acting Minister of last year gave me the assurance that the department would look into the matter and see that this unfair practice was stopped. I have here a statement of Dunn and Levack, a live stock firm in Toronto, for stock sold to Mr. Ferguson, of the township of Raleigh, and at the bottom it says, "Inspection on hogs one-half of 1 per cent." This practice is followed by the stock merchants of the country, as well as by the abattoir companies. A statement I have here shows that the number of hogs purchased and sold in Canada for the year ending March 31, 1916, was 2,363,693, which at the average price of hogs for the year, would amount to about $59,000,000. The number of hogs condemned was 6,582, which, at the average price of $25, would represent a value of $164,000. One-half of one per cent on the value of the hogs purchased in that year would amount to $290,000. This is the amount collected by the abbatoirs. So there was a clear gain to these different concerns of over $125,000. This amount the abattoirs and commission purchasing houses have extracted from the pockets of the farmers. And, even though we should admit their right to take the whole of the $164,000, they clearly have no right whatever to this extra sum. Feeling that the department is anxious to have this matter rectified, I would suggest to the minister that it would be only fair to take it up with these different concerns. If they are going to continue to rob the public as in the past, it might be advisable for the department to take over the hogs that are condemned at a price and compel the abattoirs to cease altogether this unfair charge. I should be glad if the minister would give this his most serious attention and, if possible, find some means to stop the unfair practice that is going on.

Mr. BURRELL: This matter has come to our attention once or twice before, but I shall be glad to take it up again. It is easy for these concerns, of course, to make up the statement in the form my hon. friend has mentioned, but it has a misleading effect so far as the owner of the hogs is concerned, because it leads him to think that they are transferring to him a charge that they have to pay to us. But that is not the case, because we do not charge them for inspection, for that service is maintained at the public expense. What they do, of course, is to try to recoup themselves for the amount of condemnations for which they receive no compensation. And in the practical working out of the system, it is extremely difficult to identify the hogs. But these concerns have no business to put it in a misleading way, nor have they the right to make a charge under a misleading heading in order to cover their losses.

Mr. McCOIG: Would it be possible, if they continue making this charge against the producer, to provide for it in some way in these Estimates? It seems most unjust that the abbatoirs should reap a harvest in this unfair manner. If there is any way by which the department could compel these companies to cease this way of operating, I feel satisfied it would meet with the hearty approval of the producers throughout the country.

Mr. NESBITT: Was there much animal disease in the country last year—much cholera among hogs or glanders among horses? Or what were the principal troubles?

Mr. BURRELL: The situation as to the disease among our herds is very much better than it has ever been before in the history of the country. In glanders, whereas in 1913-14 the sum of $34,000 was paid for compensation for animals slaughtered, this has gradually worked down until last year we paid only $20,709. Hog cholera, which four years ago cost us $61,000, and the following year $190,000, we have cut down to the lowest point in the country's experience

—$27,000, involving the destruction of 4,400 animals. Dourine, with which we had great trouble in the West—hon. members from Alberta will know about it—cost us at one time $48,000, later $32,000; and now it is down to only $3,900 for the killing of 32 animals. This means that the disease is practically under control. Altogether, so far as all these scheduled diseases go, the country never was in a better condition than at present.

Mr. NESBITT: I congratulate the minister and his department on that happy condition. I understood—I do not now recall the source of my information—that the minister had circularized the country to the effect that he was paying some compensation for the slaughter of cattle affected with tuberculosis.

Mr. BURRELL: Two or three years ago we took up the question of bovine tuberculosis, in the hope of reducing it, if not eradicating it completely. It is a very difficult subject, as the hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt) knows. We passed regulations by which we could take up with any of the municipalities, which number over 5,000, the question of trying to eliminate tuberculosis in the herds that supply the dairies of the cities. We took it up in this way, because we thought the first step to be taken should be to protect the people in the cities who—especially the children—are rather helpless in regard to contaminated and infected milk. But the only city that went into this work thoroughly was the city of Saskatoon. The authorities of that city took advantage of our regulations. These regulations provide that the city must have a sanitary inspector of the dairies, to compel conformity with the conditions we have laid down as to the space to be allowed for each animal, the light, ventilation, and so on. Then we would, from time to time, subject the cattle to the tuberculin test and destroy reactors or separate them, giving their owners certain compensation. The difficulty was that the compensation was not quite enough. We found that it would be more helpful towards the desired end if we increased the amount of compensation so that men owning infected cattle would not be so much afraid to come in and take advantage of our inspection. Also, we made provision in reference to the herds that were not entirely free from tuberculosis, that the milk might be sold so long as it was pasteurized, as pasteurizing eliminates the possibility of transmitting the tuberculosis from the bovine to the human form. Under these regulations, passed a couple of months ago, we expected to have a number of municipalities take up the work in conjunction with the department and regulate the business as in Saskatoon, where they have brought the whole thing down to less than two per cent.

Mr. NESBITT: What amount is allowed for each animal now?

Mr. BURRELL: We allow $40. Before that we allowed one-third of the maximum valuation, which is $60. Afterwards we raised it to two-thirds, and, as the owner has the salvage, he may realize the full amount.

Mr. GLASS: It is unfortunate in the interest of the public health that municipalities did not more generally avail themselves of the assistance which the Government afforded towards eradicating tuberculosis among the herds in their several districts. What method has been adopted of acquainting the municipalities which are eligible for assistance under this Act of the changed conditions? I think it has been evident in the past that while the Government has attempted to lend assistance, that assistance has not been attractive enough to encourage the municipalities to take any interest in it, largely by reason of the inadequate compensation. The conditions having been changed during the past month or two, I would think it very important, if the municipalities are to avail themselves of the assistance offered by the Government, that they should be properly acquainted with the conditions.

Mr. BURRELL: Not only were the regulations published in the Gazette, but we also circularized the medical health officers of all the municipalities.

Mr. NESBITT: In addition to the municipalities, do the department take it up with individual farmers? Will they pay compensation to an individual farmer if he takes that means of ridding his herd of tuberculosis?

Mr. BURRELL: That is a very big undertaking to start at the present time. The best we can do at the present time is to deal with the municipalities. If we started with individuals it would become a tremendous task. That would be the most practical step in the education looking to the eradication of bovine tuberculosis in Canada, but no country in the world has adopted it. If we were to make it com-

pulsory for the province of Ontario alone we would get into enormous difficulties.

Mr. NESBITT: My suggestion was not that you should make it compulsory, but suppose you let is be known to individual farmers that you would pay an indemnity of, say, $40 for each animal slaughtered, the farmer would report cases themselves. I understand that the department still supplies tuberculin to individual farmers who send for it?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: In that case the farmer might take it up himself if he knew he would be compensated for the cattle he would have to slaughter. I do not mean that the department should use compulsion. But, as you know, a great many cattle that are affected with tuberculosis are sold for what are called canners and cutters. I do not know that that is a very nice thing to make bully beef out of, but still there are a great many cattle of that class picked up by drovers and sold to the canning factory.

Mr. BURRELL: Of course, the tuberculous cattle that my hon. friend is referring to would be condemned in the abattoir although they would not be if they were sold to the ordinary butcher. The provinces and municipalities cannot disassociate themselves from responsibility in this matter because they have power, with ourselves to deal with the question locally. We supply tuberculin to test animals to any farmer who wants to find out if he has tuberculous cattle. It is quite true that we have not paid compensation for the reason that if we started that we do not know where it would end. In British Columbia the Provincial Government took it up as a domestic question and they passed an Act providing for the inspection, slaughter and compensation of animals. It is open to any province, or any district, to do it, but it would be a task of tremendous magnitude to go as far as my hon. friend suggests. We have already taken one step forward and I do not say that we will not take another.

Mr. NESBITT: There must be some way of getting around the inspection. My hon. friend says that cattle affected with tuberculosis would be condemned at the abattoir?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: As a matter of fact, the cattle are shipped to the abattoir.

Mr. BURRELL: They are condemned.

Mr. NESBITT: The drover is like the rest of us; he would not continue to buy cattle liable to be condemned, and which would entail loss. The drovers do buy such cattle and they ship them to the abattoir.

Mr. BURRELL: The percentage of cattle condemned is of course not so large as the case of hogs.

Mr. NESBITT: Only the parts affected are condemned?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: Part of the beast might pass inspection and the part that is affected would be condemned?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Mr. McCOIG: Has the serum treatment been used by the officers of the department as a preventitive against hog cholera, if so, has it proved satisfactory, and can the minister give the committee an idea of how many hogs have been treated during the past year and what saving was made?

Mr. BURRELL: It has been very satisfactory. The saving to the department would probably be about $35,000 last year as a result of applying the serum treatment to contact hogs. In a district in which hog cholera has broken out we condemn those affected with the disease, treat the contacts and if necessary they are slaughtered on the premises.

Mr. EDWARDS: Have steps been taken to prevent the feeding of garbage to hogs unless the garbage has been treated?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes, I would say to my hon. friend that in the last two years the majority of the outbreaks of hog cholera have been directly traceable to the feeding of uncooked garbage. In the United States, where they inoculate altogether and do not slaughter as we do, it has been found that a hog may be immune and yet he may be absolutely a carrier of disease. If uncooked garbage containing the germs of the disease are fed to hogs it will transmit hog cholera and in the majority of cases we have found it directly traceable to the feeding of uncooked garbage. Last year we framed regulations providing that no man should feed uncooked garbage, or if he did, he would run the risk of having no compensation at all. That has had its effect. We have gone a little further and now we have instituted a system of licenses so that no man can feed any garbage of this kind unless he is licensed and the officers of the department

see that that man is properly equipped with cooking apparatus so that he will be able to cook all the garbage.

Mr. NESBITT: Does the minister's department look after it in Ontario?

Mr. BURRELL: Everywhere.

Mr. NESBITT: We need not depend on the Ontario Government?

Mr. BURRELL: No, we do it everywhere throughout the country.

Mr. NESBITT: I know some people who feed garbage without any cooking.

Mr. BURRELL: We do not make it operative against the farmer on his own premises but it is applied to the garbage that is collected from hotels and places of that kind.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has anything been arranged with regard to the removal of the embargo on cattle shipments to England, of which the Prime Minister spoke a short time ago?

Mr. BURRELL: We have no official information. The Prime Minister took it up with the authorities in England and had very satisfactory assurances. All I know is what I saw in the press a while ago, that they did for the first time admit that there was no disease in Canada that warranted them in continuing the embargo on the ground of disease. They admitted that frankly. But my recollection of the press item was that it was not a practical question at this time because it would be hardly possible to import any cattle from Canada inasmuch as they were trying to keep down their herds in Great Britain on account of the demand for cereals of all kinds for human consumption.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do they admit that the disease never did exist in Canada? I have read in the life of Sir Charles Tupper that on one occasion he went to Liverpool and proved in the presence of experts that there was no such thing as pleuro-pneumonia in our cattle.

Mr. BURRELL: I think they admit it now.

Mr. GLASS: What steps are taken to enforce the regulations with respect to this important matter of the feeding of uncooked garbage? The regulations are good if they are properly enforced, and I presume that some method has been adopted to meet that need.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Mr. BURRELL: As a matter of fact, we have been too short-handed to carry out, in as comprehensive a way as we should like, the inspection of this garbage feeding. We are doing the best we can, keeping a very close watch and prosecuting in some cases and much has been accomplished. I have now under consideration the strengthening of that service by the employment of men who are not veterinaries to do educational work.

Mr. NESBITT: Does the minister operate through the local veterinary surgeons, or has he his own inspectors?

Mr. BURRELL: Our own inspectors.

For the administration and enforcement of the Meat and Canned Foods Act, $325,000.

Mr. NESBITT: There is an increase in that vote.

Mr. BURRELL: The increase is due to the normal expansion of the packing business in Canada. The business steadily increased last year and, as my hon. friend knows, directly a packing establishment is able to carry on interprovincial or export trade, its operations must be conducted under the inspection of our department. The increase in that work practically accounts for the whole increase in the item.

Mr. NESBITT: You keep the officers in the packing establishments without expense to the packers?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Publications Branch, $30,000.

Mr. NESBITT: I would suggest to the Minister that he take steps to give wider distribution to the publications of his department, particularly those showing the results of successful experiments and of good business practice, in regard to stock raising, and other branches of farming.

Mr. BURRELL: The Publications Branch as it stands at present is a connecting link between the Department of Agriculture and the public. By its operations the agricultural community and all interested are provided with the annual and other reports of the several branches, as well as with the pamphlet booklets, circulars, leaflets, and similar publications issued under the auspices of the department. During the past few years, the system of distribution has been improved and the volume of circulation much increased. A little time ago each branch of the Agricultural Department issued its own publications and

paid for them—ran its own show, as it were. These have all been consolidated now under a special branch, the Publications Branch. Until the present system was organized in 1912 each branch distributed its own publications. The lists were small and much of the addressing was done by hand. These lists, involving French and division lists numbering twenty-seven, included about 150,000 English and French names. The lists have been since that consolidated, reclassified and developed until upwards of 306,000 people are receiving our bulletins, and are directly reached by the information afforded by investigation, research and study at the experimental farms and the livestock, dairy and other branches. The classifications now include subdivisions so arranged that the applicants are sent publications on the subjects desired and only these.

There is no use in sending them to any one who will destroy them or not put them to good use. Under a system of combinations, it is arranged that when a publication, such as Seasonable Hints, including information on several branches of agriculture, is sent to all the mailing lists, one copy only is addressed to one person. The lists are maintained on metal stencils from which envelopes are addressed by machinery that handles from 20,000 to 25,000 addresses per day. Great progress has been made in reaching the farmers of the country. Application cards showing the subjects embraced by the several mailing lists are sent to the farmers on rural routes and made available to visitors at fairs and exhibitions. These cards are mailed also to those who apply for publications and who are not already on the lists. From these sources many applications are received and classified as required. The following table indicates the growth of the lists and shows the number of publications mailed during each of the five past fiscal years:

	No. on Lists.	No. of Publications.	No. Mailed.
1913..	168,292	48	1,450,000
1914..	178,000	59	1,069,433
1915..	202,000	46	1,806,454
1916..	240,000	66	3,091,345
1917..	306,200	62	3,206,718
Total in five years..			10,624,040

That will give the hon. gentlemen an idea of how we are trying to push this work. It is not all easy, but we are getting on very much faster than a great many people realize. In addition to the publications that are sent out as I have stated special publications are sent to those who ask for them.

For the development of the live stock industry, $700,000.

Mr. NESBITT: What steps is the minister taking towards the development of the live stock industry?

Mr. BURRELL: Development is taking place along a great many lines. For instance, two years ago we inaugurated a plan of giving assistance to fairs. The live stock interests were exceedingly anxious that the Government should supply a large amount of money for the establishment of a large central live stock show, along the lines of that held from time to time in Chicago. They came to us with a proposal that would involve an expenditure of $250,000 or more. We looked into the matter carefully, and I told the various delegations that before we would undertake to do anything it would be necessary that the live stock interests throughout the country should be harmonized. That is, they should agree upon a method and upon a place where the proposed fair should be held. The further they went the more difficult it became to reconcile the different interests concerned. Having regard to our geographical conditions, naturally it was difficult for them to agree upon a central place for the holding of the exhibition. Finally it seemed that the whole project would break down, and as we were convinced that it was desirable to assist the development of the live stock industry, we laid down a plan under which any exhibition that had given a prize list of $5,000 for the utility classes of live stock in a previous year should get a grant of $2,500 to assist that feature of the fair. We agreed to give half the amount of their prize list in the previous year, limiting the amount to $5,000. Speaking off-hand, about twenty or thirty fairs throughout the country took advantage of this provision, which has been operating during the last three years, and still continues. Owing to the war conditions, and, in some cases, to the buildings being taken up by the military authorities, some of the fairs have found it difficult to continue their work. We are trying, however, to encourage it; we do not think that it should be dropped. This year we are reducing the amount which must have been given in prizes on a previous year, with a view to giving more assistance to the winter and spring shows, which are confined to the exhibition of the utility classes of live-stock. Probably we shall reduce the amount to $2,500, so that any livestock fair, which, in a previous year, gave prizes amounting

10 p.m.

to $2,500 will receive another $2,500 to assist that feature of their show. This applies to those shows which have no other attraction than that of livestock, and which do not strongly attract those members of the public who are not interested in livestock.

Mr. NESBITT: It is rumoured that the department sometimes sends stock to various localities to encourage the breeding of better animals, and that sometimes this stock is not used for breeding purposes. I heard the other day about somebody who was ploughing with a bull that my hon. friend sent out. Has the minister ever heard of anything of that kind being done? Is there much buying of sires for localities and giving them to those localities free?

Mr. BURRELL: Without dealing with this special case mentioned by my hon. friend of a bull ploughing—although that is very good work in these days—we did establish about three or four years ago—and it was work in which Mr. John Bright was very much interested—the practice, for improving the herds of Canada, of the department purchasing pure bred sires, and then when associations were formed to undertake the maintenance and care of the animals, we would lend them to them under certain regulations which were promulgated by the department and assented to by the associations. Under that policy which has been under way for about three years—this is the fourth year—we have distributed throughout Canada more than 3,000 animals, that is, bulls, stallions, rams and boars. There were about 1,200 bulls altogether. A great number of these have gone to outlying points of the community or to backward portions of the various provinces where the herds have been of a very poor class, where inbreeding has been practised, where scrub bulls have been running around at large and all that sort of thing, so that the livestock industry of those particular sections, instead of being built up on sound, progressive lines, has been the reverse. If I had time, I do not think I would have difficulty in showing that this work has been immensely appreciated throughout the country, and that it has done an immense amount of good. The hon. member can quite understand that, in the distribution throughout all parts of the country of 3,000 animals, during a period of three or four years, in certain parts of the country where the people are not intelligent there is some difficulty in having the regulations lived up to. It is true that in the province of Quebec, to which the hon. member probably alludes, in the case of one or two associations we did have a little trouble where the people were particularly ignorant and did not appear to understand the regulations. These associations, for instance, bind themselves to provide a caretaker who should look after the animal and keep it in proper condition, and they are to pay him for his services. A few of the associations forgot to do this; the caretaker would have the animal, and, as it was not being paid for by any body, he would become careless and would not pay any attention to it at all. In that way we did have some difficulties, but we are getting them all cleared up, and the percentage of them is so infinitesimal in proportion to the number of animals sent out throughout the country that it is hardly worth while considering.

Mr. NESBITT: You send the animals out under certain regulations?

Mr. BURRELL: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: Is the department concerned with some horse breeding association from which we frequently receive circulars?

Mr. BURRELL: No.

Mr. NESBITT: It was supposed that the King had recently sent a horse out to some association either here or in Montreal.

Mr. BURRELL: I think my hon. friend is probably alluding to the National Bureau of Breeding in Montreal. Some years ago we did assist that bureau very considerably, and my hon. friend and some other hon. members may remember a strong discussion that took place in this House about three years ago in which our action and the work of the bureau came in for a good deal of criticism. The year after that we ceased giving assistance to the bureau, and we instituted a different system, partly by establishing this policy I have referred to in the purchase and distribution of stallions, and partly by assisting the horse breeding associations or clubs which we are now keeping up and developing on much stronger lines. If any association of farmers who are interested in the horse question club together and form an association under certain rules, and want to secure the services, for instance, of a first-class horse of any particular breed, and the man who owns it may say: Well, it is not to my interest to keep a horse of this kind here because you

people will not pay enough for service, then we come to their assistance and pay up to 40 per cent. The services of the department in that way are being taken advantage of to a very great extent. Last year about fifty associations availed themselves of our assistance, and we thought that was a better way of putting the matter on general grounds than of assisting a particular bureau.

Mr. GLASS: Has the minister before him the distribution of those horse associations by provinces?

Mr. BURRELL: I cannot give my hon. friend that information by provinces, because we have it only by the different breeds. I will get the information for him.

Mr. NESBITT: Does the minister ever send out thoroughbred stallions to those associations.

Mr. BURRELL: We do not lay down any regulations as to particular breeds; we give the associations the opportunity of taking what breed they want. Only two thoroughbred associations have availed thmselves of the 40 per cent offer in regard to assistance.

Mr. NESBITT: Would the minister send me the regulations governing those horse breeding associations, and also the regulations governing the fairs?

Mr. BURRELL: I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. COPP: What class of associations are they—agricultural associations?

Mr. BURRELL: No, they are formed for this special purpose.

Mr. COPP: Who is responsible for the forming of them—the farmers themselves or the department?

Mr. BURRELL: They can form associations themselves. This is the outline of the scheme:

The farmers of any district, wishing to work for the betterment of horse breeding by encouraging the use of sound, individually excellent, pure bred sires, may form a Breeders' Club for the purpose of hiring a pure bred stallion to travel their districts for the benefit of the members. This club, by organizing under and adopting the constitution and by-laws, and conforming to the various rules and regulations governing this grant, may participate in the Federal assistance given to such clubs as hereinafter set forth:

1. The club shall guarantee the stallion owner a definite number of mares at a certain service fee per mare, said mares to be in good breeding condition, and not affected with any contagious or infectious disease.

2. All stallions named by clubs for the purpose of securing Government assistance must be submitted to an examination by an authorized veterinary surgeon.

3. The secretary of the club shall forward to the Live Stock Branch, with the regular application, a list of its members, also a copy of the memorandum of agreement signed by both parties interested. This agreement shall not become binding until approved by the Live Stock Commissioner.

4. The minimum service shall be not less than twelve dollars.

5. All service fees shall be collected by the club.

6. Payment of service fees shall be made as follows: One-third of the service fee for each guaranteed mare shall be paid by the club to the stallion owner at the end of the service season.

7. The remaining two-thirds of each service fee shall be paid when the mare proves to be in foal. That is to say, the remaining two-thirds shall be paid for only such mares as prove to be in foal.

8. At the end of the service season the stallion owner shall furnish the Live Stock Branch with a sworn statement setting forth the number of mares bred to his horse and the name of the owner of each.

9. The Live Stock Branch shall pay the club an amount equal to 40 per cent of the total amount paid at the close of the service season on the full number of guaranteed mares, on receipt of the stallion owner's statement and of a properly audited and sworn statement signed and declared by the president and secretary.

10. The Live Stock Branch shall pay the club a second grant equal to 40 per cent of the amount paid to the stallion owner on the total number of mares that prove to be in foal, that is 40 per cent of two-thirds the service fee paid for each mare that proves to be in foal, on receipt of a properly audited and sworn statement signed and declared by the president and secretary of the club.

Mr. ROBB: Is it the policy of the department to pay the same contribution towards racing or trotting stock as for general purpose horses?

Mr. BURRELL: We make no distinction between breeds. There was a suggestion at one time that we should contribute more for thoroughbreds with the idea of encouraging the raising of remounts, but we have got it down now to a basis of 40 per cent for all breeds, and it remains for the associations to specify the particular breed they want.

Mr. COPP: If an association in an outlying district wants a thoroughbred sire, have they to send for it or is the horse shipped to them?

Mr. BURRELL: I do not want my hon. friend to confuse the two things. In the first place we are ourselves buying and distributing pure bred stallions, and associations are formed to maintain and take care of them. But this is another form of

assistance, by which people who form clubs can get any individual animal they desire, we assisting by paying 40 per cent of the service fee.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to discourage the minister in his efforts to improve the live stock of this country, but there have been brought to my attention certain conditions bearing on the one principle of assistance that he mentioned which I think it is only right I should bring before the minister. When the Government undertakes to supply thoroughbred sires, either cattle or horses, they to a large extent debar local enterprise. It may be said that it is not a matter of concern to the Government whether local enterprise is encouraged or discouraged, but when the Government undertakes to meet the needs of the country in this way, it is absolutely necessary that the stock so furnished should be of a satisfactory character. It is not a benefit to the country for the Government to provide sires of anything but the highest class. By providing sires that are not of a high quality, they at one and the same time deter home enterprise and fail to build up the stock of the country in the way that is desired. I am sorry to say that my information is that in too many cases sires of inferior breed, both cattle and horses, have been sent into different parts of the West. I do not wish to make an allegation, but I think it is only right that I should repeat to the minister what has been said to me, that in the judgment of the parties who made the statement the purchase of these inferior animals was, in a large measure, a matter of straight graft, that the breeders of the inferior stock were getting an undue advantage at the hands of the Government, and that the localities in which these inferior animals were distributed were not receiving the benefit that was in contemplation by the Government in the instigation and carrying forward of this policy.

The second system of assistance that the minister has described to the House is, of course, directly in the line of encouragement of local enterprise—an enterprise, I would say, of a high class. Wherever that arrangement can be made I think it would be more beneficial, both directly and indirectly, than for the Government itself to send in the stock. I thought it was only right I should acquaint the minister with the statements that were made to me. I have no personal knowledge of the matter, but I can assure him that the statements

were made to me by men whose opinion I could not very well gainsay, and I think it would be well for him to make very careful inquiry in future transactions of this kind, both on account of the direct and indirect effect, namely, the failure to produce the class of stock desired, and the discouragement of local enterprise.

Mr. BURRELL: I am very glad to hear any suggestions from my hon. friend. I am quite sure he understands that I am cordially in sympathy with what he states to be the objects of this work. He suggests that we might be barring out local enterprise. When we established this policy it was laid down as a fundamental principle that we should not attempt to do this work in any district where we should be competing with private owners of animals. In any district where private owners had animals available for that part of the country we did not think it was our function to send in an animal of the same type. This scheme of assistance was primarily designed to supply those districts that had great difficulty in getting pure bred sires, and were using scrub stock. Of course, it is not possible, in distributing 3,000 animals, to get satisfaction in every individual case, the human equation being what it is in buying and selling and arranging matters of this kind. I have no doubt that mistakes have been made, but I do not think there have been many. I am quite sure I could give abundant evidence as to the general satisfactory character of the work that has been accomplished. I should be very glad, indeed, if my hon. friend and any other hon. member would bring to my attention any such opinion as he has touched upon tonight, for I think the best service that can be done to any department is to point out any weaknesses that may exist, in order that the minister may strengthen them. I have no idea at all of encouraging mistakes, or graft, or anything of that kind. I shall be only too glad to have cases of this kind brought to my attention, in order that I may have them traced up and see that they do not occur again.

Mr. OLIVER: It was with that view that I brought the matter to the minister's attention. Not that I wish to interfere or bring any charges, but merely that he should be on his guard against such an occurrence. I would not have it understood that I have made these remarks to discourage local enterprise or to lead in any way to the support of local enterprise against the action of the department. I was merely making a general statement that the

action of the department must necessarily have the effect of deterring, not preventing, local enterprise.

Mr. NESBITT: Now that my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has mentioned it, I would remind the minister that there is always a certain amount of gossip to the effect that the department buys sires of various kinds that are not up to standard, because of political favouritism, paying big prices for them, and sends them out in different sections of the country. I do not know anything of that kind personally, so I am not making any accusation by any means; but I join with the hon. member for Edmonton in warning the minister that that would be a bad thing for the department.

Mr. BURRELL: I frankly admit it, a very bad thing.

Mr. NESBITT: I quite believe that the minister himself would not encourage anything of that kind. As to the other system of encouraging the grouping of farmers to buy really high-class horses for a neighbourhood, I think that is an excellent idea. But, so far as heavy-draught horses are concerned, in our section we do not need any encouragement of that kind, for we have as good as any the world produces in all classes of heavy horses. In former years, in our section of the country, when race horses were more generally bred there, we had a better class of saddle horses than at present. That is why I put my question with reference to the thoroughbred. I am sorry to see the thoroughbred to a great extent passing out in many sections of the country. The thoroughbred crossed with a sound mare, not too heavy a mare, produced, to my knowledge and experience, some excellent saddle horses; and it is a pity they are going out. But, I suppose, the gasolene thoroughbred does away with them to a great extent.

Mr. McCREA: The department has a representative at Sherbrooke buying thoroughbred horses for the Government. Is it the intention of the Government to continue that system of buying horses?

Mr. BURRELL: We are largely dropping out of that phase of the work, for the reason I have mentioned—that we are giving more attention to encouraging farmers' associations in the use of good horses.

Mr. McCREA: I have been asked by some of our people for information which I could not give. I have heard rumours—I do not know whether they are true or not—that a large number of horses have been bought, many of them of inferior quality, and distributed to the farmers on certain conditions, but that the farmers did not find them profitable and consequently returned them. If my information is correct, a large number of these horses were collected and last fall sent to a lumber camp to be used all winter, and were returned in no very good condition this spring. I see by the Auditor General's report that Mr. C. N. Lester has drawn from $1,200 to $1,500 for the keep of horses. If the Government are spending money for horses for breeding purposes, they should buy proper horses, and they should see to it that those horses are not used for purposes other than that for which they were bought. A horse that has passed the winter in a lumber camp, where they try to get out of him all the labour they can, does not come out exactly fit for service in the spring. Can the minister tell us whether Mr. Lester has been collecting these horses and taking care of them, and, if so, what does the Government propose to do with it.

Mr. BURRELL: From personal knowledge, I know nothing about the matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCrea) can understand that a very large number of animals are bought throughout the country. It will occur in the case of some associations that the animals will not be well taken care of—that occurs even in the case of private ownership, and these associations do not always live up to the spirit of their obligations. In such cases, and where the animals are in bad condition, we gather them together and have them taken care of, and, in some cases, sell them. I do not know as to the facts of the case to which he has referred, but I shall be glad to look into it and get for him such information as I can. I can only assure him that nothing of the kind to which he refers has been encouraged by the department, nor do we want to see anything but the best returns for the money spent.

Mr. CROMWELL: A good deal has been said about the Government's policy of distributing thoroughbred livestock throughout the country. I do not think that anything has been done by any Department of Agriculture that has so stimulated the livestock industry as this policy adopted by the present minister. In our section the farmers have received a great benefit, and in the outlying districts particularly the livestock has been greatly improved. If you

were to go through districts to-day which you had known five years ago, you would see a great improvement in the quality of the livestock. There is no doubt that in some cases, as my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) well knows, the condition of horses or other animals may be such that they will need to be taken in, so to say, for repair. I would assume that that is the reason why these horses were with Mr. C. N. Lester. With so many horses distributed to all sections of the country, there has to be some place to take these horses when they are not in a condition for breeding purposes. I would assume that that was the reason why Mr. C. N. Lester's stable was used for that purpose. We have four horses in Compton and they have all proved to be splendid successes. They are doing a great deal of good and not interfering with any private enterprises, as was suggested by the hon. member for Edmonton. They have been placed in districts where there were no other good sires of particular breeding available. Consequently as I say, they have done a great deal of good. The same would apply to other pure bred sires, bulls, rams and boars. As far as the county I represent is concerned, they have derived a great deal of benefit from this particular policy and I would favour an extension of that policy until it would attain the result of placing pure bred animals in every district in this country. The western part of Canada needs it just as much as eastern Canada. Farmers, particularly in the newer districts, may not be able to go out and buy pure bred sires, or, if they are able, they may neglect to do so. If they neglect it, a policy like this is bound to encourage the greatest industry that the country has—the livestock industry.

Mr. McCREA: Mr. Chairman, I am not disposed to criticise anything that the Department of Agriculture can do for the benefit of the farming community. I am something of a farmer myself and I know a little about livestock. If the Government is going to buy pure bred stock, it should be of the very best quality. No other kind is worth anything either to the individual or to the Government. The next thing necessary is to take care of it. If it is true that these horses were sent across the line to a lumber camp, that is not proper care to fit them for the purpose for which they were bought. I am interested as a member of this House in seeing that the country gets the best results that can be got from the money spent and I wanted to draw the attention of the minister to the information that had been placed in my possession that these horses have not been properly taken care of, and that they are consequently not fit for service. This is the time of year when they should be doing some good if it is going to be done, instead of being kept herded up in Lester's barn. It is up to the Government to see that they are not put to uses that would unfit them for the purpose for which they were bought. I am not saying that it is a fact that they have been but that is my information and I have been asked to ascertain from the minister whether it is true or not.

Mr. BURRELL: I will be glad to get the information and send it to my hon. friend.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: There is no question but that if you are going to carry on farming successfully the live stock industry must be regarded as the very foundation upon which you must largely depend. It is a great compliment to the minister and his department that so little criticism has been heard with regard to the distribution of male animals. At the time when they branched out upon this policy, I thought they were liable to get into no end of trouble because of the difficulties that confronted them and because of the fact that advantage might possibly be taken of the department notwithstanding that they might exercise every safeguard. I think the fact that even under these circumstances no definite charge of mismanagement has been made is a great compliment to the department. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) have stated that they have heard of certain things having taken place but they are not sure of their information. If something of that kind has occurred I should think that somebody would have seen fit to make the case so strong that these hon. gentlemen would be able to assure the committee that these grievances did actually exist. They both say that they have heard of these things but they cannot vouch for them. I would not be surprised if in many instances irregularities had crept in, when you realize that thousands of animals have been placed throughout the country.

Exception has been taken in regard to the quality of the stock that has been distributed by the department. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat says that it should be of the very highest standard and other hon. members have argued along the same lines. When the best ani-

mals of a breed are selling for five or ten times the sum that you have fixed as the limit of the price that you can pay you cannot expect to get the choicest animals. In outlying districts, outside of the settled portions of the older provinces, people of limited means anxious to get a good, serviceable animal, even if it is not of the very highest standard, but one which their means will enable them to use, will be glad to avail themselves of this policy which has been adopted by the department.

With regard to the exception that was taken by the hon. member for Edmonton that this policy bars out local enterprise, I must say that I hardly agree with him. I do not believe that where these animals are to be had with any degree of convenience there will be any competition. As far as the county I represent is concerned, I do not know of one single male animal that has been placed in the county while this Act has been in force and consequently there is no bar to local enterprise. But I do know of many people in the newer districts who are anxious that the Government should supply them with these animals. In regard to the matter that was brought up by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, about these horses that are placed with this man, Lester, he is not absolutely certain of it, but taking it for granted that what he says is the case, it is quite possible that something of the kind may have happened. There is a possibility of people unloading on the department animals that are not good stock getters, and I do not know but that possibly you will find that some of these animals have been placed in a lumber camp. They could not be put in a better place, if properly taken care of, and you will find that next season you will have a very different result from that which you would have had if these horses had been kept in idleness and had been hampered. I have not the slightest doubt that there will be instances of that kind where horses will be unloaded on the department by some dealer who is not honest and fair in his dealings. I have known many of the most experienced horsemen in our province to be taken in time and time again in this respect, and if that is the case I can easily conceive of instances where the department would be deceived also. I admit that for the very best class of animals this does possibly not meet the situation, but it is owing to the low prices that are fixed. When private breeders are willing to pay from $5,000 to $10,000 apiece, and the department will pay only $150, it is useless to expect to get the very best animals. The very fact that no charges of any very serious nature have been brought against the department is a great compliment to the men who have had this work in hand. They must have exercised very careful supervision over that work or there would have been great dissatisfaction.

Mr. NESBITT: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the department is limited to $150 for a sire?

Mr. BURRELL: I think my hon. friend was referring to bulls. We raised that to $200. It is $600 for stallions.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think it was $150 some time ago. I know that in Edmonton a bull was sold for either $8,000 or $10,000, so that hon. members will see the wide disparity in prices.

Mr. OLIVER: I want to go as far as the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) in accepting the administration of the Minister of Agriculture as being conducted in the very best faith, so far as he is concerned. I cannot conceive any reasonable minister desiring to do anything but what is best for the country, that being for his own credit and the credit of his department. My remarks were not intended as a charge against the department or founded on a supposition of maladministration of any kind; I was raising a point of policy as to whether the department should in its effort to improve the stock be willing to pay higher prices and thereby get a higher quality of animal. I made my argument for the purpose of impressing on the department the desirability of putting in only the superior animals. The public concern is in getting a good animal. I thought it was fair that the department should consider that there was not only the direct effect in the quality of the stock coming from the animal brought in, and the indirect effect of naturally deterring local private enterprise. I hope my remarks will not be construed as being in any way a reflection on the department, but that they will be taken as a fair suggestion that, in pursuance of the policy, the standard of the animal should be raised rather than lowered, and that care should be used to see that the standard is kept up, whatever price is paid.

Mr. BURRELL: I quite appreciate the spirit of my hon. friend's remarks, and I am largely in accord with what he says. He will understand that there is danger in

giving anything like a free hand to officials of the department to go out and buy animals. My hon. friend knows the influences that would be brought to bear, and with the best intentions, they might make blunders for which we would receive great criticism if we went to either extreme. I should also say that in the purchase of bulls, although we are limited to $200, while you cannot get the very fine points in an animal for which a dealer might give a big figure, the animals which we purchase are examined carefully both by veterinary surgeons and Mr. Hamer, who has a thorough knowledge of the subject, and on the whole we would get a strong, sound, useful type of animal of the particular breed. When we consider that many of these animals go to districts where they depend on scrub bulls, the improvement is so great that great good will be done.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the maximum amount that the minister pays for boars and rams?

Mr. BURRELL: I think the maximum for boars is $40, and for rams, $35.

Mr. NESBITT: Surely you cannot get a good ram for $35?

Mr. BURRELL: That was the price last year. It may be necessary to increase it.

Mr. NESBITT: I am afraid the price is altogether too low. We will not condemn the minister if he raises it.

Mr. OLIVER: Has any of this registered stock—cattle, horses or hogs—been sent to the outlying districts of the constituency which I represent? There is the Grande Prairie settlement, the Spirit river settlement and the Peace River settlement. I know that something has been done in this respect in the Grande Prairie settlement, but I am not sure as to the others. Then there is the High Prairie settlement, on the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway; a much smaller, but a very excellent settlement. I do not know whether anything has been sent there or not.

Mr. BURRELL: I suppose it would be expensive to get them in there.

Mr. OLIVER: There is railroad communication, High Prairie is on the way to Grande Prairie Then there is the Falher settlement, on the same railway, and the Swan River settlement. I should be glad to know what has been done in the matter of sending pure bred stock into these settlements.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Mr. BURRELL: I shall be glad to send my hon. friend the information.

Mr. OLIVER: There is also the settlement of Fort Vermilion, which is about 300 miles down the Peace river from the terminus of the railroad at Peace River town. The importance of the settlement may be judged by the fact that this spring several carloads of wheat were brought by steamer via the Peace river from this Vermilion settlement and shipped over the railroad to Winnipeg. This settlement, therefore, may fairly claim the attention of the department, if it has not already done so. With direct rail and steam communication, it is possible to reach it now as it was not in previous years.

Mr. MACDONALD: What are, briefly, the rules of the department in regard to the distribution of these animals?

Mr. BURRELL: I will send my hon. friend copies of the pamphlets which contain the general rules and directions. These animals are sent, for instance, to new settlements and to districts which are isolated or are a long distance from privately owned sires, making it difficult to obtain them. The people form an association among themselves under general rules laid down, and we engage to send them any sire of any particular breed that the majority may want. They must undertake to maintain it and keep it in proper shape.

Mr. MACDONALD: To what extent is that system applied in Nova Scotia?

Mr. BURRELL: Between 200 and 300 pure bred rams have been distributed in that province during the last four years; nearly 20 pure bred boars, and 43 pure bred bulls.

Mr. MACDONALD: I had in mind a case where animals were sent to a district which was not isolated.

Mr. BURRELL: At first they were sent only to districts which were absolutely isolated, but it was found advisable to send them to other districts where they were badly needed, provided they did not interfere with privately owned sires.

Mr. GRAHAM: There may be considerable discussion on the next item, along the line of what is being done for greater production. I would suggest that this item pass, and that the next two be left for another sitting.

Mr. BURRELL: All right.

Progress reported.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Burrell the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Wednesday, June 13, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

CENSUS OF MALE POPULATION OF CANADA BETWEEN THE AGES OF 20 AND 45.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I desire to lay on the Table 50 copies of a Census of the male population of Canada between the ages of 20 and 45.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Might I suggest that several copies of this be printed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no objection to that, but I would point out that 50 copies have already been laid on the Table.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There have been a good many requests by mail for copies of this census.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Militia informs me that a large number of copies in the form of those already laid on the Table will be supplied.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CONFEDERATION.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved:

That the report of the Special Committee appointed to consider and report upon the arrangements which should be made for the celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the foundation of this Dominion, presented on the 31st day of May last, be adopted, and that Rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto, and that the same be printed forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

OLEOMARGARINE.

Mr. MARTIN:

1. Is the Government aware as to whether or not the Labour Club of Montreal submitted to the City Council of Montreal a resolution in favour of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada?
2. If so, has the attention of the Government been called to the matter by the City Council of Montreal?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to take action in this matter?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Any announcement on this subject will be made in due course.

DR. J. A. McDONALD, JR.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has Dr. J. A. McDonald, Jr., of St. Peters, N.S., been in the employ of the Militia Department at any time since September 1, 1914?
2. If so, did he hold a commission, and what rank and rate of pay did he have?
3. How long has he been in the service of the Department of Militia as medical officer, and what is the total amount that he is receiving for his services?
4. If not employed by the Militia Department at the present time, when did his services terminate?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. No.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

DR. B. A. LEBLANC.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has Dr. B. A. Leblanc, Arichat, N.S., been in the employ of the Militia Department at any time since September 1, 1914?
2. If so, did he hold any commission, and what was his rank and rate of pay?
3. How long has he been in the service of the Department of Militia as medical officer, and what is the total amount that he is receiving for his services?
4. If not employed by the Militia Department at the present time, when did his services terminate?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.
2. Lieutenant, rate of pay, $3 pay of rank, 75c. field pay, $1.50 subsistence allowance.
3. Appointed 28th February, 1917. $304.50, March 14th to May 10th, 1917. Granted leave of absence without pay from May 11th to June 1st, 1917.
4. Answered by No. 3.

WILLIAM C. NICKERSON.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Has William C. Nickerson, of Clark's Harbour, N.S., been employed by the Government of Canada in any capacity during the years 1915, 1916 and 1917?
2. Has said William C. Nickerson been employed as special recruiting officer for the Canadian Navy or for the Dominion Overseas Forces?
3. If so, how long was he employed in such work, and how much was he paid for the same?
4. Is he now in the employ of the Government?
5. If so, in what capacity and at what salary?

Mr. HAZEN:

1, 2 and 3. During the winter of 1916-17 William C. Nickerson was a member of the local committee at Clark's Harbour, acting under the Nova Scotia Provincial Naval Recruiting Committee. The members of these committees gave their services gratuitously, and a detailed record of the actual time they were engaged in recruiting work has not been kept.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

GAUDIOSE FAGUY.

Mr. LACHANCE:

1. Was Gaudiose Faguy suspended or dismissed from the Customs Office in Quebec? If so, when?

2. What were his duties?

3. If dismissed, what was the reason of his dismissal?

Mr. REID:

1. The services of L. G. Faguy were dispensed with from March 1, 1917.

2. Clerical service in Warehouse Ledger Keeper's office.

3. Services dispensed with in view of his unsatisfactory services.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Between what points on the Canadian Northern Railway Line west of Edmonton are the rails to be taken up to be placed on the Grand Trunk Pacific Line?

2. Between what points on the Grand Trunk Pacific Line west of Edmonton are the rails of the Grand Trunk Pacific to be replaced by rails of the Canadian Northern Railway?

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What was the total expenditure connected with agriculture by the Federal Government in each of the fiscal years from 1904-05 to 1916-17, inclusive?

2. How much money was set apart by the Agricultural Aid Act of 1912 to assist the Provincial Departments of Agriculture to improve and extend their work?

3. How much of above amount was given to each province, and what was acomplished in each province as a result of such assistance?

4. How much money was set apart by the Federal Government under the Agricultural Instructions Act of 1913, and under the provisions of the said Act what amounts were respectively allotted each year to the several provinces?

5. What is the general purpose of said Act, and to what extent has that purpose been made effective in each province?

Mr. EDWARDS:

How much money was given by the Federal Government in iron, steel and other bounties, (a) previous to 1896; (b) from 1896 to October, 1911; and (c) from October, 1911, to March 31, 1917?

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. BOULAY:

1. How many immigrants into Canada, English or otherwise, have obtained employment in the Civil Service, inside and outside, since the 1st of July, 1914, to date?

2. How many of them are exempt from military service?

Mr. LACHANCE:

1. Who are the employees who have received increases in salary or bonus in the Customs Office at Quebec on the 1st of April, 1917, or since that date?

2. What is the date of the appointment of each of them, the amount of their several salaries, and the date and amount of increase or bonus received by them since?

Mr. LACHANCE:

1. How many battalions of infantry left Canada with the First Contingent?

2. What is the number, and what are the designations of the different units of artillery which left with the First Contingent?

3. What is the number and the designation of the different medical corps which left Canada with the First Contingent?

4. What is the number and the designation of all the other units which left with the First Contingent?

5. What are the names, rank and duties of the supernumerary officers who left with the First Contingent?

FORM FOR PRESENTING PETITIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) yesterday expressed a desire that I should make a statement with respect to the precise form in which petitions should be drawn, his request having particular reference to a number of documents purporting to be petitions which have recently been handed in.

While it does not seem to me essential that petitioners should use exact or uniform words, it would appear that the practice has invariably been to require substantial adherence to a form which has long been recognized.

Bourinot, 4th Edition, at page 234, lays down the rule and provides the precedent which should be followed, the first requisite being that every petition should commence with the superscription "To the Honourable The House of Commons in Parliament Assembled." Thus properly addressed and the subject-matter of the petition being in order, it would still be irregular to receive such a document without a prayer. The practice in the British House of Commons would appear to be substantially the same. May, 11th Edition, at page 525, says: "Without a prayer, a document will not be taken as a petition; and a paper, assuming

the style of a declaration, an address of thanks, or a remonstrance only, without a proper form of prayer, will not be received."

I have examined a number of the documents referred to by the hon. member. They are not addressed to the House either in form or in substance. The reference, if to anybody, would appear to be to the Council of the City of Montreal. They contain no prayer. It would appear, therefore, that these documents are not in form and cannot be received.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The word "prayer" has two meanings, but I suppose in this case it means a request.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not the religious meaning.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO SECOND READING OF BILL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I should like to say to my right hon. friend that I propose to go on with the Military Service Bill to-morrow unless he has some objection, which, of course, I should be glad to consider.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: To-morrow will be too early for our side of the House. I was going to speak to my right hon. friend to-day about fixing a date for the second reading.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my right hon. friend objects, we will not take up the Bill to-morrow, but I hope when he discusses the matter with me, the second reading will be fixed at the earliest practicable date.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

OVERSEAS EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the Prime Minister be good enough to furnish the House with a statement showing the number of enlisted men who are now in France, the number in Great Britain, and the number in Canada. I mean those who are effective.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not quite sure whether it would be proper to do that, having regard to certain military considerations. I will consult the Adjutant General of the Staff and I shall give any information that may be permitted.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 42, to amend the Chinese Immigration Act, Mr. Roche.

Bill No. 68, to amend the Civil Service Act, Sir Thomas White.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions.—Steam service between Canadian Atlantic ports and Australia and New Zealand, $140,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is in the hands of the same company as before, the New Zealand Shipping Company.

Mr. CARROLL: Are these contracts being carried out at present?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Some of them are not being carried out to the full. The difficulty of getting vessels is very great and requisitions are frequent. Therefore, sometimes a month is intermitted. We simply pay at the rate provided for each voyage which is completed under the conditions fixed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: From what port do they sail, and to what ports in Australia and New Zealand?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: From Montreal and St. John once monthly, and they have the right to touch at three or four ports in Australia before going on to New Zealand.

Ocean and mail service between Canada and Great Britain, $1,000,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is there any change in this service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This service is carried on as last year by the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services. They cannot give what was contracted for when we entered into the arrangement for the renewed and strengthened service. Such vessels as are approved of, and as can be kept on the route under the changes constantly going on owing to requisition are used. The vessels which have carried on the service during last year and which are relied upon at present chiefly are the Missinabie, the Pretorian, the Grampian, the Metagami, the Scandinavian, the Scotian and the Corsican. These vessels run in speed from 14 to 15 knots. The service is conducted on a different plane from that originally designed. It is known only at the last moment that such and such a ship will sail, and the

Post Office has to pick it up, generally getting sufficient notice to enable it to forward the mails. Last year the service was performed entirely by boats of the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services, that is, by the old Allan and Canadian Pacific boats. This year, owing to the confused conditions and to the fact that two other lines have come back into the Canadian trade with good boats—the White Star Line and the Cunard—we pay so much a trip and take the best vessels of these three lines that offer. The White Star Company have two, the Megantic and the Canada which are very good vessels. The Cunard Company have one or two good vessels and the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services the other vessels. We pay exactly the same rate as we paid last year but on the trip or half trip basis.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you, on the whole, the same quantity of tonnage as before?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not the same amount of tonnage as before the war but a good amount. This year we expect to get two mails each week.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The ports are the same?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: Has the delivery of the mail been fairly good?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Steam service between Canada and Cuba, $25,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Was that service performed last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, nor was it performed the year before but it has been allowed to stand because if it becomes possible to continue it, it is a good service for the Maritime Provinces.

Steam service or services between Canada and Newfoundland, $70,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is the same service as last year and at the same rate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The same company?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The same company.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is a broad statement—between Newfoundland and Canada? Where is that service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The contract for service is from Sydney to Port aux Basques, but the same company sails additional boats from Louisburg to St. John direct. They did so last year and they intend to do so this year. We have contracted for a daily service between Sydney and Port aux Basques connecting with the railway to St. John.

Mr. McKENZIE: This company do not appear to be able to perform the service between North Sydney and Port aux Basques. We excuse them because of the difficulty they have had in getting ships but I suggested to the minister that before they start a new service from Louisburg to St. Johns the department should insist upon them performing the first service. There is a railway line between Port aux Basques and St. Johns and if there is a good line maintained between Port aux Basques and the end of the Intercolonial railway at North Sydney there will be a good service. Before they start a new service, which is rather an unnecessary one, from Louisburg to St. John, because I do not know what particular trade they are going to get, they should improve the present service. Last year and the year before, it was not unusual to see 100, 75, or 50 cars standing on the wharf, waiting for transportation and the excuse was that they had no boats. I call this to the attention of the minister and I would suggest that he should insist upon the company doing as much as possible to supply a fairly good service between Port aux Basques and North Sydney before they try to get boats for what would appear to be an unnecessary service.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is entirely within the option of the company. We have no orders to give in that respect. Our contract for service is between Port aux Basques and Sydney. The vessels are not diverted from that route to the service between Placentia and Louisburg. The company have other vessels for that service. I mentioned it to show that the same company, which was performing the service between Sydney and Port aux Basques, were making occasional trips between Louisburg and Placentia. Originally the boats were excellent ones but were both taken off the route a year and a half or two years ago. One was taken by the Allies for work in northern Russia and I think the other was sold to the same power with the consent of the Government as they seemed to be needed by Russia. The vessels which were on a year ago and which are on now had a bigger cargo carrying capacity than the original boats. Freights are going and they go every day. Mails are being carried and they are being carried every day. The quality, appearance and passen-

ger accommodation of these boats are not quite so good as those of the boats that were previously on. For this diminution in character a reasonable deduction is made from the amount of the subsidy.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not suggesting that the minister should make any deductions because I believe it is very difficult for the company to get boats and the service is a very good one and is affording great facilities for trade between Newfoundland and Canada via North Sydney. The minister says the service is from Sydney. It is not from Sydney and if it is so on the books of the minister's department it is a mistake. The service is from North Sydney.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is from Greater Sydney.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, the commercial metropolis of Eastern Canada.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Quite so.

Mr. McKENZIE: We must aim to get other facilities in connection with this trade as well as supplying the boats, or encouraging the company to supply boats. There are several other things in connection with the trade that the ministers who perhaps should look after them, are neglecting. The building of a wharf possibly belongs to the department of Public Works and taking it over and looking after it is possibly the duty of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but to afford facilities for trade, it would seem to come under the direction of the Department of Trade and Commerce. If these other ministers should try to get clear of their responsibilities in this matter we must look to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. At North Sydney, where connection is made by steamboat between Canada and Newfoundland and where the Intercolonial ends, the wharf is absolutely inadequate for the business which has to be handled there. The buildings on this wharf come right to the edge on one side, so that there is berthing accommodation for only one steamer. A steamer lies there every day so that there is no room for fishing vessels to transfer their cargoes to the railway cars at this wharf, and they are obliged to go to a private wharf and have the fish trucked to a railway car. Then complaint is made that the railway arrangements are such that only one car can be handled at a time. We have a magnificent harbour, and it would be very easy to extend the wharf so as to give sufficient berthing accommodation for all vessels. I brought this matter to the attention of the acting Minister of Railways last year, but nothing has been done. I know it is useless to bring it to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as he simply collects wharfage on wharves that have been completed. I therefore urge the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), whose duty it is to see that facilities are provided for our people to carry on trade and commerce, to urge his colleagues to provide sufficient money to make proper acommodation for the carrying on of business by our people.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I noticed the other day a newspaper statement that a large increase had been made in the subsidy for this steam service to Newfoundland.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The information is not correct.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the subsidy paid that company five years ago compared with that paid to-day?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The subsidy is as stated here. The vote is $70,000. Five years ago, that is 1912, we paid $31,874. In 1915 it was $48,000, and this year about the same.

Mr. LEMIEUX: So that the statement is correct?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In speaking of an increase, I thought it meant a modern increase, not one of ancient years. One very important difference is that formerly this company was paid in addition $30,000 as a postal subsidy. That is not now paid, and it is now a daily service.

Mr. CARROLL: Is this service to Louisburg something new, or the occasional trips to that port during the winter months?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think this is winter's months trips.

Steam service between Canada and the West Indies or South America, or both, $340,666.66.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the minister any figures to give us as to the treaty with the West Indies? Has there been an increase in our trade as a result of the treaty?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, I think I may say there has been a very satisfactory increase. In 1912, the value of cargoes of Canadian origin going over this line was $2,325,000. In 1914, it was $2,618,000. In 1915, it was $3,507,000, and last year, in 1916, it was $4,698,000. Thus, comparing

1912 and 1916, the value of Canadian cargoes has a little more than doubled. Of course, you have to take into account that prices have risen in that time, but still it shows a very gratifying increase. Then there is some little carriage of goods of United States origin.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there a large increase in imports?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The chief increase is in exports. But last year, and partly the year before, there was a very large increase in imports owing to the very large amount of sugar brought in for the refineries.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What are the chief imports?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The chief articles imported are the tropical products, sugar, coffee, cocoanut, Trinidad asphalt, oranges and bananas.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And our exports?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Our exports run over the whole gamut of our natural products, such as fish, canned salmon, canned goods, flour, oats, vegetables, groceries, cheese, pease, live-stock, sulphate of ammonia, tea, fertilizer, lumber, laths, cordage, and a great many other articles.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has my hon. friend any figures in regard to potatoes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not them here. I can get a statement in regard to them.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I understand the minister to say that the value of the goods imported during the last three or four years has doubled.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The exports have about doubled.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I suppose we may also assume that the freight collected by the steamers has doubled. I think, as a matter of fact, it has more than doubled. It would appear to an outsider, if my surmise is true, that the subsidy in this case might be reduced, because if they were able, in 1912, to carry on a successful business and pay dividends on half the trade they should be able now, as they are getting more than twice as much money, to carry on business with a less subsidy. My idea is that these subsidies are given for the purpose of building up a trade. Once the trade is built up, so that it becomes self-sustaining, we should not continue paying the same amount of subsidy. We should have a system by which the subsidy would be reduced and applied somewhere else.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have had a long experience in connection with the running of the service between Canadian ports and the West Indies. When I was in the ministry many, many years ago, we began this service, and I think I can safely say that no West Indian service which has ever been run between Canada and the West Indies has been a paying proposition. My hon. friend knows, probably better than I, the extreme difficulties of a West Indian service to be found in the character of their ports, only one or two of them allowing vessels to get up to dock. They have a system of lighterage everywhere, and long distances between the ports. and an itinerary which takes about six weeks to make, and, in addition to all these things, we have a not over-abundant passenger list, which is, of course, the paying part in such a service. I think I can say, without any doubt, that the line which is now carrying on the service is the best that we ever had, and the service is entirely satisfactory from the point of view of what is attainable and what is advisable between our country and the West Indies. Some parties advocate a faster service, a 15, 17 or 18 knot service, mainly for passengers. Others advocate cargo boats alone. These boats in use now are a cross between the cargo boat and the passenger boat. They have excellent passenger accommodation and good cargo accommodation, and the two combine very well on these steamers, I think that very general satisfaction has been given by the work which is done with them. In reference to the reduction of the subsidy, we keep as close a tab as possible upon the rates, and no rates are raised without the authority of the department, and an investigation is always made before any advance is allowed. The expenses of steamships, as my hon. friend knows, have very greatly increased, and last year and the year before—particularly last year—the expenses were very heavily increased. There has been a very great increase in the price of coal, and on these long voyages a tremendous amount of coal is used. The size of the coal bill for these vessels is astonishing. I have tried to keep in touch with the Halifax and St. John Boards of Trade in reference to the control and regulation of the rates which have been paid, and we have always arrived, I think, at a satisfactory conclusion, after discussion, in regard to freight rates. When one thinks

of what would happen if these vessels were taken off, it makes one prize the service more. We have a pretty severe struggle to keep those vessels on the route, and within the last three or four weeks they came very close to being requisitioned, owing to the necessities of the Mother Country, but we have been able to keep them on. If they were taken off at this particular juncture, it would practically cut off connections between Canada and the West Indies.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am quite aware that the business is abnormal just now, and that it is very difficult to find vessels to do any kind of work. I am glad to know that the minister is keeping track of the rates, and endeavouring to control them in some way, but if the minister has the information at hand, it would be interesting to the committee to hear about the rates on some special articles, as they existed in 1912 and as they exist to-day, so that we may have some idea of the increase that has taken place.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not the figures with me, but will be very glad to secure them. My hon. friend will see, all things considered, that there has not been the increase that he might fear on the staple articles. The rates on flour and staple goods have been kept down very well. The rates on sugar, molasses, and one or two other articles, have been increased, but they have been able to bear the increase.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Perhaps you can furnish us with that information. I know the rates on the tramp steamers from the West Indies on molasses and sugar have increased very much, and I should like to know how they compare with the rates on the steamers to which we are paying subsidies.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is a difficult question to answer, because the tramp steamer takes whatever she can get. If somebody wants a cargo moved, and the tramp steamer is able to move it, if it is a case of necessity, almost any rate will be given. We can compare the rates on our steamers with the rates on the steamers from New York. In no case do our rates exceed—and in most cases they are lower—than the rates from New York.

Mr. MARCIL: During the last year or two I have heard earnest appeals from Canadians who visit the West Indies at various times and who take an interest in trade matters, who feel that the time is now opportune to bring about reciprocity between Canada and the West Indies, as a result of the war. Has anything been done of an official character? Is the minister in a position to know if any feeling has been manifested in regard to this matter among our fellow citizens in Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is a kind of rapproachement.

Mr. MARCIL: That is the suggestion I have read under the signature of very able correspondents in the Montreal press. Mr. Macaulay, of Montreal, thought it would be an opportune time, and I wanted to inquire if any move had been made in that regard, or if the matter is still the subject of academic discussion.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Macaulay has written some very excellent articles, and is a very firm believer in a closer connection than a commercial connection with the West Indian islands. I have my own thoughts about that, but I have not put them before the public, because I think it is a great deal better that the West Indian islands should come to us rather than that Canada should take the position of seeking to influence sentiment in the West Indies. This much I know, that there is a growing friendly sentiment between the two countries induced by intercommunication, and a very excellent influence in that direction has been the extension of the banking facilities of Canada to the West Indian islands, and the increase of trade and personal communication. The extension of the banks to the West Indies has been a cogent argument and a plain proof of how much export trade depends upon banking facilities which emanate from Canada as an exporting country. The lesson that has been learned from what is going on in the West Indies is a very excellent one for our exporters. I have my own opinion that in the extension of trade which is to come after this, one of the potent influences for that extension will be the influence of inter-related banking facilities. There are, of course, questions that have to be taken into consideration when any union between the West Indies and Canada is considered. Those will not be insuperable, maybe, when the proper time comes for discussing such matters.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am glad that my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has brought this question to the notice of the committee. For several years past I have read very able articles by Mr. Macaulay, of

the Sun Life Assurance Company, who has long been the chief exponent of the idea of union between the West Indies and Canada. No doubt the West Indies, since the construction of the Panama canal, have become of great strategic value to the British Empire. The United States have lately acquired one of the Danish islands, which shows that they have an eye open to the business that will necessarily accrue in the future as a result of the construction of the Panama canal. There have been objections raised to the scheme of bringing the West India islands into our Confederation. Some years ago, in my official capacity, I attended a conference in London, that question was discussed in my presence by two of the then members of the Campbell-Bannerman Government. One of them said en passant: "The United States Government have their colour problem; do you think that the Dominion of Canada would absorb the West Indies with the colour question looming up so seriously in the neighbouring republic?" My object in rising when I heard my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) inquiring about the proposed union of the West Indies with Canada, was to speak of that other union scheme which I think is much more feasible and much more practical and urgent. I refer to the union of Newfoundland with Canada. I am travelling perhaps far afield from the item under discussion, but my remarks will not be lengthy. I understand that for the last four or five years the objection in Newfoundland against the idea of union with Canada has lost some of its force. We all know that the late Archbishop Howley had succeeded in influencing public opinion very largely in favour of the idea of an ultimate union between Newfoundland and Canada. Since then—and I wish to draw the attention of the minister particularly to this point—I understand that overtures have been made to Canada, and that there has been a voluminous correspondence on the subject between the present Prime Minister of Newfoundland and the Prime Minister of Canada. The facts were made public not long ago in the Montreal papers as a result of litigation between the owner of a certain paper and one of its former editors. There it was alleged that negotiations had recently taken place between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland, and that the question of union between the ancient colony and the Dominion had been seriously entertained. What truth is there in those allegations or rumours, and has a scheme of union between Newfoundland and Canada been contemplated by the Government?

4 p.m.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend has, in his excursion, travelled so far away from the item under discussion that he has rather confused my tabula. I am now intent entirely on commercial ocean services, and my attention is given so completely to that, that I beg my hon. friend not to switch me off this afternoon. One remark that I made with reference to the West Indian matter to my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), I will repeat to my hon. friend, and follow it up with the simple saying that so far as Canada is concerned, with reference to Newfoundland, our latch-string is always on the outside and a light is always burning in the window.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Some time ago I brought to the attention of the House the fact that salt was extremely scarce for carrying on the fisheries in the Maritime Provinces. The fishermen have responded to the appeal for greater production. We have a prolific fishery and active fishermen, but it is impossible to carry on the business successfully without an ample supply of salt, and owing to the scarcity of tonnage the shortage of salt is becoming alarming. I understand that the department has taken up this question, and I should like to know whether the minister has succeeded in getting tonnage for carrying salt to Halifax and other ports in the Maritime Provinces.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My department has been dealing with this question for about four or five months, and the result is simply this. Great difficulty is met by the fishermen themselves in getting charters for salt, but that is their matter; if they can find a tramp or some other vessel it is for them to make their own arrangements. The fishermen had recourse to the department, and conceived the idea of transports of His Majesty bringing salt in ballast from overseas to Dominion ports. The assent of the Admiralty was cheerfully given, but of course these transports are primarily for war purposes, and if salt is to be taken it must be within each reach of the route of the vessel. If that is the case, the transport will always take the salt if it can be loaded without undue delay. This has been done in the case of Newfoundland ports and others. The salt, I suppose, comes mainly from the Mediterranean, and it is vessels whose route is contiguous to Mediterranean ports that can advantageously bring this salt across. A

reasonable freight is charged, in reference to which some dickering has taken place by the fishermen; that is a matter for adjustment. At present any who require salt brought across in these transports had better get into communication, through their agents, with the Admiralty in London, because it is impossible to fix transport sailings on this side and conduct the operations with any degree of certainty or despatch.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Have the rates been fixed by the Admiralty?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What are the rates?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not got the rates. I know there has been some comment on the fact that Newfoundland has been receiving cargoes of salt while other places could not get salt. The explanation was that the Newfoundland people paid the price, thereby avoiding delay.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I saw a letter from a Halifax firm stating that some people—I do not know whether it was the Admiralty or private shipowners—were asking 40 shillings a ton for carrying the salt. That is considered an extortionate rate, and I was anxious to know whether the minister had a rate which he could make public, so that dealers might have some idea of what they would have to pay.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I suppose the rate would vary somewhat with the port from which the cargo was taken.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister said that some dickering had taken place between the fishermen and some other parties. Who were the other parties?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Admiralty.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: There must be some mistake, because the fishermen themselves do not import salt.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I meant the large companies who are importing the salt.

Steam service between Canada and South Africa, $146,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has there been any increase in the trade between the two countries during the past year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes and no. The war has so confused things that it is pretty difficult to say whether the trade has increased or not. Mr. Egan, our agent there, in his last report speaks very hopefully, and points to an increase in the main lines of trade between South Africa and Canada. South Africa has been undergoing somewhat of a revolution. Owing to the necessities of the war she is beginning to raise what formerly she largely imported, and is finding out that she can save importations in many lines. It is not a detriment to trade in the long run, because the more she produces the more she is able to buy from outside; it tends to increase trade rather than otherwise. The Elder-Dempster line carries on this service very satisfactorily, and has kept the rates remarkably even all through the war.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Have regular trips been made?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, I do not think more than one or two trips have been missed. The line has suffered, if you call it suffering, just as the Royal Mail Steamship Line has suffered, through having a large percentage of their vessels diverted to war purposes.

Steam service between Halifax, St. John's, Newfoundland, and Liverpool, $20,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is this service now being carried on?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, with the occasional omission of a trip.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is the contract from year to year or for a number of years?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: From year to year.

Mr. McKENZIE: I think that by a slight diversion in the route this service could be made of much greater usefulness than it is at present. I would not ask that the steamers call at Sydney, but they might call at Louisburg. Many passengers from Liverpool or St. Johns, Newfoundland, would land at Louisburg, or would take passage at Louisburg going the other way.

Mr. CARROLL: I would urge the attention of the minister to what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie). A considerable volume of trade could be developed if these steamers were to call at other ports, which, besides those in their present route, Louisburg has been mentioned, is an excellent harbour and open the year around. It has splendid facilities for bunker coal, which can be got cheaper there than at any other place in the Maritime Provinces. In the island of Cape Breton we have been developing in recent years quite a commercial centre, with our

large coal fields and our great industrial concerns, such as steel works. I think the Department of Trade and Commerce, in making future steamship subsidy contracts, should bear this in mind. It has always been a matter of surprise to me that these boats did not call at Louisburg, if nowhere else. I do not know whether this is a Canadian Pacific Railway line or not.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A Furness-Withy line.

Mr. CARROLL: I suppose that nothing can be done for the present season, but the matter could be considered in future contracts. The change proposed will develop a trade between Newfoundland and Cape Breton, and also between the motherland and Cape Breton, which we have not at present.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Of course, any detour which would lengthen the time of the voyage detracts by that much from the transport effectiveness of the service. This is the first time, so far as I recollect, that this matter has been brought to my attention. Nothing can be done this season, but when the service is being arranged for again the point will be borne in mind.

Mr. CARROLL: There would be very little detour to Louisburg.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But longer to Sydney.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is for that reason I have suggested Louisburg. Another advantage is in the coaling. At present they coal on this side at Halifax, taking coal the product of the mines in Cape Breton, which has been hauled to Halifax. There are coaling facilities at Louisburg which are so good that many ships bunker there at all seasons of the year. We have thousands of people from Great Britain, miners, who come from Scotland or England, and who go home in large numbers every year, and return again. Nothing seems to deter them from making this voyage. The fact that it is going to cost them a large sum of money does not seem to matter. They go from Sydney to New York and take the boat there. It would be a great advantage to these people, and would be the logical thing so far as the Government is concerned if they could be furnished with transportation from their own door to the Old Country.

Winter steam service between St. John, Dublin and Belfast, $7,500.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many trips do they make?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In 1916 they made six trips only. The usual run of trips has been from four to nine.

Mr. SINCLAIR: They are freight vessels?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, and carried last year upwards of over a million dollars of cargo.

Winter steam service between St. John, Halifax and London, $15,000.

Mr. CARROLL: Are the sailings of these boats so arranged that they do not all leave about the same time?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister keep any control over freight rates which are charged?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The department has control over the rates of every subsidized steamship line.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does it exercise that control?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What are the rates on ordinary merchandise and lumber?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I cannot tell my hon. friend, but I will get him the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The reason I speak of it is that freight rates on the Atlantic route are said to have risen to enormous proportions. I would think that as the rates are so high, and as the steamships are paying extremely handsome profits, it would be much better to take a portion of these subsidies and endeavour to encourage the coastal service between the Maritime Provinces and ports of the United States, particularly those which are capable of furnishing anthracite coal to the consumers of the Maritime Provinces. Apart altogether from the question of building ships, I suggest to my hon. friend the possibility of securing a freight steamship service, or even a service by sailing vessels, between ports in the Maritime Provinces and those of the United States which are close to the coal supply. It seems to me a most extraordinary, a most deplorable, thing that the cost of anthracite coal in St. John has reached the enormous price of $15 per ton. People are looking almost with despair to what will take place during the coming winter. It is almost impossible to get coal. Dealers decline to enter into contracts because of the impossibility of securing

transportation by water. It would almost seem to me that if the Government can not build ships for the export service, it would be worth while considering whether they might not take away a portion of the subsidies paid to some of the Atlantic steamship lines which are making enormous profits in order to encourage the establishment of a coastal steamship service for the purpose of relieving the coal situation. It is a matter of very great importance and I invite the attention of the minister to it. These are times when departures must be made from the rules which govern under normal conditions. In normal times there was an abundance of vessel accommodation available. To-day there are scarcely any available for the coastal service.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, that is very true but the other remark my hon. friend made is equally true that there is a deplorable scarcity of transport tonnage. I do not know at the present time where a single vessel can be got for a subsidy to run on these coasts. We have tried from below New York to Maine and New Brunswick. We have endeavoured to get hold of vessels and it has been impossible to do so. At the present time it is absolutely impossible because no vessels are allowed to go out. They are required on the southern waters. The colliery owners of Sydney are not taking coal to the St. Lawrence district simply because their own vessels are requisitioned and are being used for the war and they find it absolutely impossible to substitute other vessels for those which are requisitioned. Coal is being banked there at this time because of the impossibility of getting tonnage to carry it. That is the result of the war and the circumstances will not, in so far as I can see, be mitigated during this season. I think transport will be more and more difficult to get during this season. At the end of this season, and during next season, there will be a very considerable contribution of new tonnage which will gradually come in. But little of that will come in until the latter part of this season. The year 1918 will, I think, see a pretty large addition. The addition, is so far as freight carriage is concerned, will be measured by the overplus of the new compared with the destruction of the old.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The difficulty is that the new vessels which are being built are being built largely for the Imperial Government under contract with the Imperial Munitions Board. They will be used upon the Atlantic but that will not help out the local situation. My hon. friend admits that the situation is very grave indeed. Why would it not be a good thing for the Government to engage in the building of a hundred small wooden vessels in the Maritime Provinces and in Quebec and put them on the trade routes? Let the Government control these boats and keep down the transportation rates by means of them. These small vessels, of 250 or 400 or 500 tons, could be built very quickly in the Maritime Provinces. I have scores of letters from people who say that shipyards are available, timber could be got, and men put to work. But it is said the Imperial Government does not believe in these smaller vessels, and have limited the size to 2,500 tons. All the better, let the Imperial Government go on through the Imperial Munitions Board building the larger vessels, but let the Dominion Government engage in the building of smaller vessels which apparently there will be no danger of the Imperial Government commandeering. Then they will be available for encouraging local trade. The situation, as the minister has said, is grave. I say its gravity cannot be magnified; it is very grave indeed. I believe that unless some relief is given coal will actually run to $20 a ton. See what a burden it is upon the people, upon the families of the soldiers who have gone to the front to fight the battles of the Empire. How serious will be the burden upon them and upon all classes of the community! The Government can give relief if it wants to and if it will take hold of the question in a reasonable and proper manner, as it ought to have begun to do two years ago. The Government ought to have anticipated the very condition that exists to-day. The war may run on for two or three years longer; that is the opinion of men in England and in the United States who ought to know; and are we simply to lie down and to do nothing except to deplore the situation and express the opinion that it will grow worse as the months and years go by? Surely, instead of talking about it, something practical ought to be done. If the Government took hold of the situation in a practical way, so far as the coal transportation in Canada is concerned, I believe that very satisfactory results could be obtained within a year. It is very late, I admit, but it is not too late. In view of the conditions to which our people must look forward in the near future, I say it will be nothing less than a crime if this Government does not take measures in the emergency which has arisen in respect

to transportation between ports in Canada, and between ports in the United States and in Canada.

Mr. KNOWLES: There is a principle involved in what my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has said that is more important and wider even than the geographical country of which he is speaking. I think it is an important principle which he enunciated, that these unfortunate conditions should, so far as possible, be foreseen and anticipated. It is only thus that you will provide against them in the most economic way. If the Government simply, in an easy-going way, drag along and say, We can get along this week and this month, and all through the summer without coal in the Maritime Provinces and on the prairies, it may have quite an easy existence in the interim, but the condition of affairs when the crisis really comes upon the different parts of the country will be a great deal more grave even than if it were anticipated and provided for as far as possible. We know that the Government has many pressing matters calling for its attention which are affairs of the moment, but it is just as important that they should sit down in an intelligent way and look into the future and endeavour to solve the problems of the future by preparedness, as to think about the things that are urgent for the moment. The whole story of good legislation is the anticipation of the future and providing against its troubles. The trouble we have to-day owing to the shortage of men for overseas service might have been anticipated and prepared for, and we might have avoided the crisis that stares our nation in the face at the moment, if the Government had looked intelligently into the future and had foreseen, as they could have foreseen, what now is clear to every person. They might have foreseen it long ago.

I remember that three years ago this Government had as part of its duty the providing of seed for the western farmers. They had all winter to provide the seed, but nothing at all was done. They waited until spring came, and then they had to pay, not quite double, but nearly double what they would have had to pay if the seed had been purchased when the price was more reasonable. I think the Government then went out and bought seed at $1.50 a bushel which the homesteaders had to pay. They paid that for the very same wheat that they could have purchased some months before for less than $1 a bushel.

We have a condition of affairs in the western provinces which is more grave and vital than the condition to which my hon. friend has referred. On the prairies we have a class of people who have no other source of fuel than coal. We have been accustomed to get enormous quantities of Pennsylvania coal, and we have also received coal from the western collieries, particularly those at Lethbridge and Drumheller. As I said, the Pennsylvania coal is to be cut off this year, and we will not have it next year at all. The best judges of the coal situation tell us that practically no Pennsylvania coal will be brought into the prairie provinces next year, and we all know that we cannot have coal in the winter from the western coal mines unless coal is mined during the spring and summer. The Government seem to be handling this question in the same easy-going manner. We have asked time and time again what has been done and what is being done in the way of anticipating what will be a crisis in this nation when there is a failure of coal supplies from the United States and the western mines to provide fuel to keep our people warm on the prairies. The matter has not yet become one of life and death, but the fact that the crisis is somewhat removed in time does not detract one iota from its certainty. So surely as time is marching on, so surely will that real, physical condition of affairs come upon us, and that grave crisis present itself when the summer is past and the months for consuming coal are really with us. We have been at the Minister of Labour for weeks and weeks to know what he is doing. We do not know whether the minister realizes the gravity of the situation or not. We very much doubt if, for a moment, he realizes its gravity in such a way as a statesman should, and I think that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) is doing absolutely the right thing in impressing upon the Government that it is their duty to anticipate problems and crises of this kind. The only economic way, the only statesmanlike way, of providing against these problems and crises, is to look at them in ample time and make some provision in the way of preparedness before the crisis is really upon us. I say this with a great deal of seriousness. The condition of affairs in our western country is one that no man can contemplate without the utmost seriousness. We have had the Pennsylvania supply cut off; and in our own western coal districts, between the Minister of Labour and the operators and the Coal Miners'

Union, there is nothing but chaos; they are doing everything but producing coal. The minister is digging up excuses by the ton, but no coal is being dug. Under these circumstances, the Government is not discharging its great duty to the people, that is to do something to prevent this very grave and vital crisis from facing us. I have known winters in the West when the Northwest Mounted Police have been scouring the prairies—we do not like to mention these things in this House—going to this shack and that shack, this district and that district, and finding men who had suffered death because they had not fuel to keep themselves warm.

I speak for the homesteaders, the women and the little children on those prairies. The Minister of Labour should not merely say: "For the present there is no crisis, no one is cold; we will cross the bridge when we come to it," but I think he should, as the hon. member from St. John advocated, anticipate the future, and say that these precious days and months shall not slip by, but that something shall be done under the circumstances, so that this impending crisis may be averted. I speak of this as a national affair. You cannot encourage people to continue living on those prairies in the West if you do nothing to avert a crisis such as is threatened. We want the people to stay there, develop the country and produce wealth on the unimproved prairie land. Therefore, the Government must discharge its duties and make living possible in that country. I urge the minister and the Government to anticipate these matters and address themselves to it, and not remain idle day after day, and say they do not know of the conditions. Apparently they have done nothing, and I think that they should, after thoughtful consideration, come to this Chamber and say they are going to do something. They cannot do much by commission. We have had commissions until we are tired of them. A commission was appointed a year and a half ago to deal with the resources of Canada. They were going to knit everything together in a beautiful web, everything would work economically, and each industry would minister to the resources of the other industries. They held a few meetings, and we heard no more of them for some months. I am not hopeful of commissions. I say nothing about the appointment of Mr. Magrath. The hour has not come to discuss his fitness; my mind is open; I have not decided one way or the other on that, but we cannot conclude that the responsibility is shelved, and the Government's duty fulfilled simply because Mr. Magrath has been appointed. The House and the country should be informed as to what is being done to avert the grave condition of affairs which is threatened, and the matter is not far removed from the subject under discussion. The minister might tell us whether the appointment of Mr. Magrath is all that he purposes doing, or whether he is still going to devise something which will have practical results in saving us from the grave conditions which threaten us through shortage of fuel in the West.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have no desire to withhold anything from the committee which I think, in the public interest, should be divulged. My hon. friend from Moosejaw probably appreciates the difficulty that we had to overcome in the southeasterly part of British Columbia, and the southwesterly part of Alberta. This is not the only difficulty that has existed out there. There were serious strikes in 1903, 1906, and 1907, and a more serious one in 1909, extending over five months. Another, still more serious, occurred in 1911, extending over eight months. I have no desire to find any fault with my predecessor. I have no doubt he did everything he could to avert these labour disturbances in that district. We have been exceptionally successful since the autumn of 1911, till a few months ago, and had no difficulties in that district. We first made an agreement in October 1911 for some three years and four months, which continued until March, 1915, when another agreement was entered into, to continue for two years from that date. That agreement worked satisfactorily till July last. At that time the workers declared that they would not adhere to the provisions of the agreement any longer, although it would not expire till the 31st March of this year. They then demanded a war bonus of ten per cent increase over and above the provisions of the agreement of 1915. The operators, in substance, conceded that demand. It was not a flat increase of ten per cent all round, but it ran from 7½ to 12 per cent, or from five to twelve and a half per cent, and the miners, under that arrangement and a subsequent one, continued to work. The last agreement, as the former one, provided that thirty days before its expiration, the two bodies should get together, and endeavour to negotiate an agreement, so that there would be no cessation of work when that

agreement expired. They came together in March and negotiated for seven weeks, and finally reached an agreement satisfactory to the representatives of the men and the operators, but, under the constitution of the United Mine Workers of America, no such agreement could be effective until a vote of the men themselves was taken. That vote was taken about May 5, and the men rejected the agreement that their representatives had negotiated, and quit work. We have been making every effort to secure a resumption of work in those mines. I have not gone into the details of what was done. I do not think it would be in the public interest to do so now. We are just as anxious about it as the hon. gentleman from Moosejaw is, and we are giving it very close attention. I have no doubt that whatever means may be necessary to accomplish the object, those mines will resume operation in a very short time. The Government prefer the owners should operate these mines under an amicable arrangement with the miners. If that cannot be done, other means will be adopted to operate the mines. I do not think it is necessary for me to give details of what is being done at the present time, but I will assure the committee that work will be resumed just as soon as possible, and I expect it will be within a very short time.

Mr. KNOWLES: I expect to go to my riding in the very near future. Inasmuch as I should be informed of what has happened here, the first thing the people will ask me will be: "Did not the Minister of Labour, a number of weeks ago, say that, if the operators and the miners did not co-operate, the Government would see that the mines were operated?" or words to that effect. I will have to answer that the minister did use words to that effect a few weeks ago. They will ask: "What would the natural meaning of the words of the minister be, as understood by an impartial listener; would it not mean that matters would be remedied in much less time than has really elapsed?" We worry about the matter of time, because it is tremendously important to us, as the minister will appreciate. I accept his statement now. There is not much trouble to-day but the time will come when it will be, not only a matter of comfort but of saving human life, and they will say: "Did not the minister give you to understand that, if the mine owners and others did not co-operate, he would do something, and was not the impression that the minister gave that that promise or statement would be carried into effect without the lapse of time which has already occurred without considering the delay which may take place in the future."

Mr. CROTHERS: I will take my hon. friend further into my confidence and give him the information which I had at that time. The president of the Mine Workers of America, which is an international labour organization, having its headquarters at Indianapolis, sent me a message stating that he had sent to the president of the organization in district 18 a telegram the substance of which is as follows: I have instructed the men to return to work immediately on conditions obtaining on the 31st of March last, and as soon as we get through with the convention I am attending here in Minneapolis, I will either go myself or send representatives to the district to endeavour to reach an agreement satisfactory to both parties. When I stated in the House that I expected the men to return to work within forty-eight hours, I had that telegram in my possession, and I believed the local officers would at once carry out the instructions given by the president of the organization. Within a few days the representatives of the men sent me a message giving me a copy of one which they said they had sent to the president of the organization telling him that they were going to manage the matter for themselves and that he should not interfere. That was rather a peculiar stand for the men to take. Mr. White, however, the president of the International organization, took the matter up with the local officers at each mine throughout the whole district, which is a very large one, and he endeavoured through them to have the men return to work at once. That endeavour appears to have failed also. I received a message yesterday stating that I would have some definite information to-day, but I have not received anything yet. We are keeping close watch on the matter, and I can only assure my hon. friend that we are not losing sight of the importance of having coal for the farmers, for transportation purposes, and for the purpose of keeping smelters at work in order that manufacturers of munitions in the different factories throughout the country may continue operations. I believe that very soon work will be resumed in those mines.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Both the Minister of Labour and the hon. member for Moosejaw are good friends of mine, and I am glad to see them occasionally, but they have come into my house and turned me out. I have let them have a period for

cavorting around and honours, I think, are now about equal, so that I suggest that we go back to the work before the committee.

Mr. McKENZIE: Items Nos. 154 and 158 appear to refer to competing lines which go over the same route, except that one service goes to Liverpool and the other to London. In these times of stress and strain and scarcity of money, surely one line of steamers could do the whole work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member is confounding St. John with St. Johns.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is only the difference of a letter.

Mr. McKENZIE: I may be making a mistake, but the service is all on the same track.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Any highroad throughout the country has many people travelling on the same track.

Mr. McKENZIE: Some economy should find its way into this department, and if the work performed by two lines of steamers can be done by one, that should be brought to the attention of the minister.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is true, but both lines are busy.

Steam service between St. John, Halifax and London, $25,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Although the vessels run between the same ports, they run on different times, and the two lines are doing simply what one line with double the accommodation would do.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has there been any change in the subsidy for the service between Canada and Newfoundland?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: I understood that some exception was taken by the department to the service rendered by the steamships Kyle and Meagle which took the place of the steamships Bruce and Linnwood. As the boats now on the line are
5 p.m. rendering service that is not so luxurious but that seems to be satisfactory in war time, that service deserves every possible encouragement. If the minister had accepted my recommendation in regard to the service between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands, he would have had much better conditions there than exist now. In view of the transportation situation by sea, I hope there will be no disposition on the part of the department to make any conditions which will interfere with the existing service between Canada and Newfoundland, which appears to be quite satisfactory. There is strong competition between Canada and the United States for the trade of Newfoundland. The Red Cross steamers have been running from Boston to St. John's, Newfoundland, and securing a great deal of traffic. The other route via North Sydney is the only method by which Canada can trade with Newfoundland since the withdrawal of the steamers from Montreal, so that route should receive every possible consideration and encouragement. I heard incidentally there was some question about the subsidy of last year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There was a question about the subsidy because the steamship company worked without a contract and would not come for a contract. They furnished me with no rates, and I did not purpose to pay a subsidy until the steamship came under contract and performed a satisfactory service. In subsidized steamship services where the vessels are not so well equipped and of smaller tonnage than those which are in the contract, a reasonable adjustment is made for that deterioration. A slight adjustment was made in this case, and the matter for the last year has been settled and a contract entered into for the ensuing year.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the difference

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: About $5,000.

Steamship service between Canada and Australia or New Zealand or both, on Pacific ocean, $180,509.

Mr. NESBITT: Is there any service now between St. John's and New Zealand?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: Is there a service now between Canada and Australia on the Atlantic ocean?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, but the service is interrupted through vessels being requisitioned, although I do not think there have been more than one or two lapses during the year.

Mr. NESBITT: We ship monthly to Australia and New Zealand, and all last winter we had to ship from New York.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The vessels were overcrowded and were not able to take all the freight offering.

Steam service between Canada, China and Japan, $253,333.34.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is this the Canadian Pacific Railway service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. The Empress of Asia and the Empress of Russia are the two newest boats. There is also the Empress of Japan and the Monteagle.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the trade satisfactory between Japan and Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is about the same as usual.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have you exported more wheat to Japan?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not very much.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How do you account for that?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Japan is very prosperous now and rice crops abundant.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I thought our export of wheat to Japan would have increased since the exhibition at Osaka fifteen years ago. I remember at the time I visited Japan, bakeries were established at the different centres in order to get the people accustomed to bread. I was told that the best quality of rice was nearly all exported. Has no effort been made by the minister to increase our wheat exports to Japan?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I cannot say that any great advance has been made in the substitution of wheat and flour for the food of the generality of the people of Japan, though amongst certain classes there flour is being used more and more every day. They use a softer wheat than we do, and our exports have not increased very much.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When I was in Japan I was told that the reason why soft wheat was used was because the freight rates between Canada and Japan were too high. The freight rates from Seattle and Oregon ports were lower than from Vancouver and Victoria.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All the cargo vessels running now between the United States and Japan are Japanese boats. They can be operated very cheaply, and vessel owners in the United States have been unable to compete with them.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has there been any exportation of wheat to any great degree from Pacific ports?

[Sir George Foster.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. The Panama canal from which a great deal was expected, and still is expected, has not developed the through trade that was expected, owing to some difficulties in the canal itself, but more particularly owing to the war.

Mr. MACDONALD: There have been statements that wheat passing through the Panama canal would be in danger of fermentation. British Columbia looked forward hopefully to the development of trade on the opening of the canal. Some time ago I saw a very large elevator there which had been built for the handling of wheat, but had been very little used. Has the department considered the possibility of fermentation of wheat passing through the tropics?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The department, of course, has no experience with wheat passing through the canal, but we do not expect any difficulty such as my hon. friend suggests. Wheat from Argentina moves through equatorial areas and reaches Britain in good shape. My own opinion is that there would be no difficulty in this respect, but the question will not be settled, I suppose, until the cargoes go through.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am glad to hear that the minister is of that opinion; it is my own view. There should be no danger of fermentation, as wheat from the Argentine and other countries passes through the same zone and arrives in Britain in good condition.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is always this to be taken into account: Wheat raised in different countries, and even in different parts of the same country, varies greatly in the degree of moisture it contains. That has been exemplified in our own Northwest. About three years ago, taking up the question of the future transportation of wheat with a view to the lines which that transportation would permanently follow, I established in Winnipeg a laboratory in charge of Dr. Birchard, where experiments have been, and still are, carried on, to ascertain the moisture contents, at different seasons, of the wheat grown in different parts of the Northwest and the keeping qualities of the wheat under transit conditions. Records of these experiments are carefully kept, and so we are building up a basis for general conclusions in regard to such matters as the use of the Panama canal for the transport of our wheat. As

the temperature conditions will be about the same—certainly no worse—for the Panama canal transit for our wheat and the present transit for Argentine wheat, I venture the opinion that there will be no difficulty on that account.

Steam service between Victoria and San Francisco, $3,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: What service is this?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is one of the perpetual commemorations of confederation with British Columbia. We have to keep a service between San Francisco and British Columbia. Formerly that service was run at a cost of $25,000. This is not a service you would subsidize if you were choosing to subsidize services, and so it has been cut down to $3,000, which is the smallest amount that, with proper dignity, can preserve the memory of a great event.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is it an American line?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: R. P. Rithet & Co. This is a service we cannot get rid of except with the consent of British Columbia. I made a proposition to them to use the money for the British Columbia coast trade, but they thought it should not be changed.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1917, between Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie or Campbellton.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I notice that the good service we had in the old days on that coast has disappeared. Last year the hon. minister presented to that coast a steamer called the Elaine. She was a very poor boat; I think if I should call her a tub no fault could be found with the description. Moreover, instead of plying at the dates which would be reasonably expected, she only started the service on the 6th of August.

The service is required during the whole year and more especially in the spring and fall. I simply call the attention of the vigilant minister to the very poor service performed by the unfortunate Elaine, and I would expect that he would stir up the owners of the vessel to at least give the people on the coast a chance of getting their provisions and sending their produce to market.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The reason the vessel went on at such a late period was that the old vessel disappeared and we came very close to having no vessel at all. In the end we got this one but she did not get on the route until late. Of course, she was not paid for work she did not do. That route is one of the disappointments of our coast traffic. It is one of the finest scenic routes probably that we have in Canada in its way, running along the coast of the Baie de Chaleur for its whole distance. This used to be the only method of transit and it was well patronized. Then the railway came in and it is there now. The railway itself is not the most modern bit of machinery you could devise.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The first section but not the last.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have never been over it myself, I have never risked my life which is somewhat precious, but I have heard some tall stories in the past of private cars which tried to get over the route. We are keeping up that route and I do not like to tell the committee how small is the amount of freight which is carried.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The season was short.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The minister is torn between conflicting emotions; one is his disinclination to abandon that route on account of its scenic beauties and the other is his sense of duty to the country with reference to paying out money for subsidizing that route. However, the old vessel is going on this year in good time and I hope she will do better than she did last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The minister is quite right in saying that this is one of the most beautiful sections in Canada. When the old Admiral was plying between Dalhousie and Gaspé we had, during the summer months, quite a number of American and Canadian tourists visiting the coast. Later on the people of the coast formed a syndicate, got the contract from the Government and built a boat that suited the business of the coast. The name of that boat was the Lady Eileen, but unfortunately the boat was lost in a storm somewhere near Newport Islands. Another boat was obtained but it was an old boat which had been in service around the Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. It was a very poor substitute. So it has gone from good to bad and from bad to worse. I understand the difficulties of the minister. As he explained, during the war we cannot expect to get boats, they are not to be had, but I hope that after the war the hon. gentleman will see that the service is restored to its former conditions. As regards the railway, no doubt

the construction of that road has affected the trade which formerly gave the service the bulk of its profits. But a boat is needed all the same. The first section of the railway from Paspebiac to New Carlisle was built under the hon. gentleman's regime and I agree with him when he says that there are tall stories about that bit of the railway. As regards the section from New Carlisle to Gaspé, it is in excellent condition but of course, in order to reach Gaspé, you must pass over the bad section of the road. During the last two years the company has made an effort to give the public a fairly good service. If the hon. gentleman will risk his private car next summer—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It was not my car.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —he will certainly find no difficulty in reaching Gaspé where the people will be glad to meet him provided he does not talk politics.

Steam service between Halifax, Canso and Guysboro, $5,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has that service been performed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, a weekly service by the Halifax-Canso Steamship Company.

Steam service between Halifax and Newfoundland via Cape Breton ports, $10,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who performs that service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: J. A. Farquhar and Company.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are there two boats now? There used to be the Seal and the Sable.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Just the Seal is on the route.

Mr. McKENZIE: At what ports in Cape Breton does she call?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Halifax, Sydney, North Sydney, Marble Mountain, Baddeck, Ingonish, Neil's Harbour, White Point and St. Paul's Island, and at Channel, Codroy, Sandy Point, Bay of Islands and Bonne Bay, Newfoundland; thence on the return voyage to Halifax, calling at Bay of Islands, Sandy Point, Codroy, Channel, St. Paul's Island, White Point, Neil's Harbour, Ingonish, North Sydney and Sydney.

Mr. SINCLAIR: These local services on the coast of Nova Scotia that connect with the railway might be improved by making them more frequent. The service between Guysborough, Canso and Halifax carries large quantities of fish to be shipped by the Intercolonial to Montreal and western points. In this way it has become a good feeder to the Intercolonial railway.

The same is true of the Canso service, running between Guysborough and Queensport to Mulgrave, and also from Canso to Mulgrave. I pointed out to the Minister of Marine and Fishries the other day that that service, which has been carried on for a number of years, has been a very profitable source of traffic to the Intercolonial. When the service was started in 1896 the amount received by the Intercolonial for traffic at Mulgrave was $6,460. Twenty years afterwards, in 1916, the amount received by the Intercolonial there was $90-435.04. This will show the minister that this has been a splendid investment for the Government. They have been paying out some $10,000 and receiving traffic amounting to $90,000. This kind of traffic could be very much developed if facilities were afforded. The Intercolonial railway has had no enterprise during any part of its history in dealing with this question of collecting freight along the coast. The steamship lines that have been established for that purpose have been founded by private capital and assistance has been given to them by other departments of the Government, but the Intercolonial itself has not taken the matter up and has shown a lack of enterprise in collecting traffic in that way.

The trouble with the service between Canso and Guysborough and Canso and Halifax is that the boat can call at only a few points in a distance of over one hundred miles. Much local traffic could be collected there if facilities were afforded. I refer to this in order that the minister may take it up with the Minister of Railways, and possibly work out some policy that will give the fishing interests of the Maritime Provinces an opportunity of reaching the Intercolonial and thus of developing their business.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I quite understand that.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will you do anything?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: After the war.

Steam service between Halifax and Spry Bay and ports in Cape Breton, $4,000.

Mr. KYTE: This is the service carried on by the owners of the steamer Margaret. For many years that service was subsidized between Halifax and Spry bay, the subsidy being $2,500. This $1,500 additional, I sup-

pose, is to subsidize the service between Spry bay and Cape Breton.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It runs as far as L'Ardoise. The ports of call are Halifax, Jeddore, Owl's Head, Tangier, Pope's Harbour, Ship Harbour, Sheet Harbour, Sober Island, Spry Bay, St. Peter's, Arichat, West Arichat, Poulamond and L'Ardoise.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Port Felix is not included?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, I do not see it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The boat passes about one hundred miles of coast there without making a call. I understood she did call at one port in Guysborough, Port Felix. I trust it has not been overlooked.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will inquire about that.

Steam service between Halifax, South Cape Breton and Bras d'Or Lake ports, $6,000.

Mr. CARROLL: What are the ports of call?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This boat makes two round trips from Halifax to Gabarous, Louisburg, Main-à-dieu, Port Morien, Glace Bay, Sydney, North Sydney, and one trip from Halifax to Gabarous, Louisburg, Main-à-dieu, Port Morien, Glace Bay, Sydney, North Sydney, Baddeck, Grand Narrows, Iona and St. Peter's.

Mr. CARROLL: Who is the contractor?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Halifax and Glace Bay Steamship Company.

Mr. CARROLL: Was the service performed last year to Glace Bay?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: I was given to understand by a citizen of Glace Bay that she did not call at Glace Bay last year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Glace Bay is mentioned in her round. I will inquire about that.

Steam service between Halifax and West coast Cape Breton, calling at way ports, $4,000.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Where does that boat call?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Halifax, Port Mulgrave, Port Hastings, Port Hood, Mabou, Grand Etang, Cheticamp, and Eastern Harbour calling once every two weeks at Havre au Bouche and Margaree, and calling at Inverness whenever there is a reasonable quantity of freight or number of passengers to be landed or embarked, weather permitting.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Margaree is one of the most important points on the whole route, and why the boat should be permitted to pass Margaree and call at the other points is something I cannot understand. If the minister looks over the returns he will find there is more freight taken at Margaree than any other point, excepting, probably, Cheticamp. Its port serves a large and prosperous section of country, with a population of 8,000 souls. It is a glaring injustice and insult to the people of this section that the option of calling at the port only once in two weeks should be given to the boat authorities. Are the men who constitute this company of more importance in the eyes of the Government than 8,000 free citizens? Does the Government prefer meeting the wishes of the steamship company than the urgent needs of the people of Margaree and surrounding country? I wrote the minister with regard to this matter. Margaree is also an important fishing station, and I should like to call the attention of the Government to the pressing need of regular boat service in view of the fact that we depend on this for all our supplies and for shipping our fish and farm produce. I also wish to impress on the minister the great need of making Margaree Island a place of call. This is an important fishing station with stormy rough coast. I would not ask them to call except when there is a necessity, but there should be some way for them to know when there was a necessity—when there was something to ship or when people desired to go aboard of the boat.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will look into the matter and give my hon. friend the information he desires.

Steam service between Halifax and Sherbrooke, $2,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What are the ports of call in that service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Halifax, Port Dufferin, Moser River, Ecum Secum, Marie Joseph, Liscombe, Sonora and Sherbrooke.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the name of the boat?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The "Dufferin."

Mr. MACDONALD: And the contractor?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: J. W. Murdock is the contractor.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1917 between the mainland and Magdalen Islands, $18,000.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister is aware that this is a very poor and unsatisfactory service. The directors and managers of the steamer employed in this service openly discriminate, in their own favour, against other people doing business. The fact of the matter is that while the "Lady Sybil" was on this service, the "Amelia" was also employed at the work she is doing to-day, namely, carrying goods for her owners, the difference being that she is now being paid a subsidy by the Government. I had occasion to call the attention of the department to a glaring instance of discrimination, which took place last fall, of which I have personal knowledge. Some parties in the Magdalen islands in the fishing business—and I suppose rivals to some extent in business with the owners of this ship—bought some boat plank from the firm with which I am associated. When we were shipping this plank, the captain told us he had no room and could not take it. The owner's boat builder happened to be present, and he offered to buy the plank. Under the circumstances we were delighted to sell it, and immediately space was found for it on the steamer, and because, in doing my duty, as a member of Parliament, I drew the attention of the department to this fact and to other facts of which I was aware, these people refused to pay for the plank, and the consequence will be a lawsuit.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You should not have complained till you got your money?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: But, as a public man, I had a duty to discharge.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Duty is imperative.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the name of the owner of the vessel?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: William Leslie & Co. are large owners, and Robert Leslie & Co. are part owners. Dr. Starrat is the manager representing the firm of Robert Leslie & Co. I know that parties in the Magdalen islands cannot import goods unless they have the good will of these people. They are penalized, and they have no certainty that their goods will be carried. It is an intolerable state of affairs.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the name of the boat?

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The "Amelia." Last year a lumber-laden steamer was wrecked in the gulf of St. Lawrence. This boat went to the rescue, but it was after tugs powerful enough to take the disabled steamer to Halifax had arrived; the "Amelia" was doing very little work, and her services could have been dispensed with. I am informed that the manager, Dr. Starrat, was remonstrated with for having the steamer off the route for such a length of time, and he stated that he did not care whether he received the subsidy or not, because he expected his share of the salvage would be larger than the subsidy the Government would pay. The service was interrupted for a considerable time in that way, without any necessity whatever. I called the attention of the department to this last year, and I thought possibly some reduction would be made in the subsidy, on account of the very inefficient service, and on account, particularly, of the discrimination against the ordinary business man, but no penalty was enforced, and they were not obliged to make any refund. Conditions this year are worse. The company appear now to realise that they can do just what they like, and yet this large subsidy is being paid. This condition of affairs is intolerable. When the contract with the Lady Sybil expired, Mr. William McLure, the owner of the ship, was willing to enter into a new contract with the department for a number of years, but the department refused to renew the contract for more than one year. If that be the case, it was poor business judgment on the part of the department because ships were becoming scarcer every year and it would be an advantage for the department to enter into a contract for some years. Mr. McLure, knowing that he could not get a contract for more than one year, received and accepted a good offer for his ship, and the result is the inefficient service we have to-day. Surely the department is not powerless; surely this company will not be allowed to do just as they please; surely the department will not pay them $18,000 a year of the public money for practically carrying their own goods and discriminating against those of nearly everyone else. It would be almost a good thing to abolish this service, because the public are receiving no good whatever, and the company feel their position so strong that any one who calls attention to this matter is likely to be penalized. Surely the minister can do something to mitigate this crying injustice.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Last year I informed the minister that the Amelia was quite inadequate to the service and was a dangerous boat to travel on. The same boat is still on the service, and I have received from my former electors in the Magdalen islands many protests against the service. There is no space in the boat available for passengers and the boat is very filthy. The Lady Sybil was built especially for the service; she was run for a year or two by the Leslie company, and then that company thought it more advantageous to put that boat elsewhere and to put on the Amelia. Finally the Lady Sybil was sold to Mr. McLure, and she gave a most excellent service to the Magdalen islands. It would be a pity if the inhabitants of those islands, who are isolated for such a long period of the year, should suffer through the action of the department. The minister should look into the matter again and see that those people receive a better service.

At six o'clock, the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If I could have lived up to the difficult task set for me this afternoon by the hon. member for Moosejaw, and known five years ago what was going to happen to-day, I might have made different dispositions, but that was a pretty difficult thing to do. We are in our present condition mainly for the reason that the really good boat we had, and which had been on the service for five or six years, left us. I tried to get the loan of a boat from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but it was impossible for him to accommodate me, and in the end the Amelia was the only boat available and I had to take her. I do not think we could have done without this service to the Magdalen Islands. The boat made 52 round trips last year and in addition to the mail carried 1,714 passengers as compared with 633 in 1915, and 6,600 tons of freight as compared with 8,400 in 1915. She was paid therefor $14,000, there being a reduction on account of services not performed. The same condition of affairs prevails this year; there is no other boat available.

With reference to what the hon. member for Prince Edward Island said, this is the first I have heard of the difficulties which occurred last year, and I shall certainly look into the matter. A steamboat owner who is paid to perform a public service certainly should not discriminate in favour of his own business or between two persons whose freight he carries, and I should be loath to think that that had been done. But as the hon. member has brought the matter to my attention I will make inquiries, and if the information is different from what he says I will inform him and the committee.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the minister instruct his inspector to see that the boat is kept in a sanitary condition? From the complaints I received last fall from a clergyman on the Islands it certainly looks as if the inspector had failed in his duties. How many times a year does the inspector look over these subsidized boats?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He visits them all once during the season; that is the utmost he can do.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know it is difficult to get a suitable boat for this service, but I wish the minister would make a special point of seeing that this boat is kept in a clean and sanitary condition.

Mr. MACDONALD: Had the minister followed my advice about this service two or three years ago we would not be in the position we are in to-day. The minister will recall that I urged the desirability of giving such a subsidy as would secure the services of the Lady Sybil. The eastern portion of Prince Edward Island and the Magdalen Islands may be an isolated place, but they are inhabited by the very best Canadian citizens, and it is very important that a good service should be given them. If the Lady Sybil had been engaged all this trouble would have been avoided. There is no question about the unfitness of the Amelia for carrying passengers and performing the service generally in a proper way. I have not personal knowledge of the conditions mentioned by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, but I have heard rumours of complaints along the line indicated, and I think the minister should look into the matter.

Steam service between Pelee Island and the mainland, $8,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This was a new boat last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the port of call on the mainland.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The boat runs between Kingsville, Leamington and Pelee

Island. It is the only means of communication they have.

Steam service between Petit de Grat and Intercolonial railway terminus at Mulgrave, $7,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: William G. Leslie is the contractor, and the name of the boat is the Magdalen.

Mr. KYTE: Has any complaint reached the minister regarding the inefficiency of the service last year and the length of time the boat was laid off for repairs?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know just how long she was laid off, but it is an all-year service and the boat is allowed one month for repairs, either January or February, I think. She must have some chance to repair.

Steam service on the Petitcodiac river between Moncton and way ports, and a port or ports on the west coast of Cumberland county, $2,500.

Mr. MACDONALD: How long has that service been subsidized?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: According to the record before me, the subsidy began in 1907.

Mr. CARROLL: I have on several previous occasions brought to the attention of the minister a matter of importance to the county I have the honour to represent, South Cape Breton, the establishment of a steamer service on the Moira river. Year after year, petitions and other communications have been sent to the minister regarding a service on that river. On each occasion when I have brought the matter to the minister's attention he has told me that it is not the policy of the Government to subsidize steamers on inland waters. But when the Estimates come down I find such subsidies included.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Survivals of the unfittest.

Mr. CARROLL: If it is not the policy of the Government to do that sort of thing, these subsidies should not be allowed to survive. Moreover, at this particular stage in the history of the country I do not press the matter as I certainly did press it in 1911, 1912, and 1913. But I am going to press it—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: After the war is over.

Mr. CARROLL: Yes, after the war is over.

[Sir George Foster.]

Steam service between Pictou and Montague, calling at Murray Harbour and Georgetown, $6,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would the minister give the figures showing the trade on that route?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: According to my record the service began in 1907. The passengers carried in 1907 numbered 1,320 and in 1916, 1,455. The freight in 1907 was 2,464 tons, and in 1916, it was 5,468 tons. Livestock and mail make up the rest of the traffic.

Mr. MACDONALD: In view of the proposed car-ferry communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, what is proposed as to the existing route between Pictou and Charlottetown, Pointe du Chene and Summerside?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Prince Edward service is to be carried on by the Intercolonial railway. I have not exact information on that subject. I understand from the report of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) and from his statements in the House, that everything is now fitted for running and that the improvements contemplated will be made before the season of navigation is over, so that this new route will be in use through the winter season. As to the concentration of the service at that point, and as to what is taking place on the old route, I am not able to give my hon. friend the information. There will be some dislocation and it may be some hardship to localities, until the trade accommodates itself to the new route. But, on the whole, the balance of advantage ought to be with the new and improved ferry route.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do I understand the minister to say that during the present summer it is expected that the Department of Railways will manage communication with Prince Edward Island by the ferry between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is what I understood.

Mr. MACDONALD: And the route from Summerside to Pointe du Chene, and Pictou to Charlottetown, will be done away with? Is that the hon. gentleman's impression?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, but I may be wrong.

Mr. MACDONALD: I hope the hon. gentleman is wrong. Some department of the

Government own boats which are still fitted for service on the present route. And, as the Prince Edward Island railway is not of standard gauge, to concentrate traffic at one point by means of a car ferry seems an outrageous proposition.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: These boats may be running; I am not sure. All I know is that the railway is looking after the service.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The Minister of Trade and Commerce is much more familiar with the geography of that portion of the country than is the Minister of Railways.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, I know the geography.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I can tell the hon. minister that it is the opinion of people in close touch with the business that goes on between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, men whose opinions are worth something, that the car ferry, run under present conditions, that is with a narrow guage railway on Prince Edward Island, will never take care of all the traffic. Besides that, a large portion of the Island traffic is with eastern Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. To carry produce from the eastern end of Prince Edward Island by car ferry to the eastern portion of Nova Scotia is much the same in principle, though not quite in degree, as to go from Ottawa to Liverpool by way of Vancouver and Montreal. If the minister can use his influence with the Minister of Railways to allow the boats to run at least this summer between Pictou and Charlottetown and Pointe du Chene and Summerside, until the car ferry is tested, I think that would be only reasonable.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall be glad to see my colleague on that subject.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Railways is a very difficult man to get anything out of. It is very difficult to find out what he is doing. He is not like the Minister of Trade and Commerce who, I am bound to say, is genial and willing to give information.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Don't draw comparisons, please.

Mr. MACDONALD: I hope the hon. gentleman will not be offended seeing that the comparison is favourable to him. I am going to appeal to him as an old Maritime Province man——

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is where you hit me on a tender point.

Mr. MACDONALD: —to have some consideration for the situation. I do not think there is much good in our talking to the Minister of Railways. Whatever virtue there may be in the car ferry, it is only in being able to send a loaded car direct to its destination either from Prince Edward Island to the mainland or vice versa. Pending these conditions, however far in the future they may be, to divert the present boats from the route which they now cover, and concentrate all the traffic at an out-of-the-way point, compelling all the travel and all the business to seek that one route, is an unwise and unnecessary thing, and ought not to be permitted. I bespeak from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) that he will see the Minister of Railways and urge him to permit trade and travel to continue their present course until new conditions are provided. The people of Prince Edward Island who, at one time were supposed to take some interest in the car ferry, have come to the conclusion that it will mean such a serious dislocation of their business conditions that the result will not justify the expenditure. Such a change, under the conditions which I have described, would create the greatest possible dissatisfaction in the Maritime Provinces. I am not speaking any too strongly upon this subject in pressing the matter upon the minister I bespeak his attention to the matter involving as it does the internal trade of the three Maritime Provinces. No service that the minister is providing for in his Estimates in our part of the country can compare in importance with the service to which I am referring. If the interprovincial connection between the three provinces be dislocated it will create nothing but the greatest dissatisfaction and it should not be thought of for one moment. I trust the minister will use his powerful influence to see that conditions remain as they are and that the boats which are now employed are kept in their regular positions until we can see what the future will bring forth.

Schooner service between Pictou, New Glasgow, Antigonish county ports and Mulgrave, $1,000.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: What is the size of that schooner?

Mr. KYTE: What class of vessel is subsidized by this item?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: She is a schooner with auxiliary power which was put on that serivce for the accommodation of the people

of that coast as the harbours are so shallow that a large vessel cannot get in. She gives not a very extensive but a very good service.

Mr. KYTE: What quantity of freight and what number of passengers did she carry last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: She made 26 trips, carried 253 tons of freight and received her subsidy.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1917, between Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, $7,500.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Has the department control over freight rates charged by these boats?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, all rates have to be submitted and no changes are made unless they are approved by the department. For a series of years the rates charged by these coast services were kept at about par. They received their subsidies and the rates were the same each year. There may have been some few changes but very few indeed. But, during the past two years there has been an almost universal pressure for some increase in the rates because coal and other costs have increased and it has been a choice between advancing the subsidies and giving a reasonable advance in the rates. The department has taken up each case, and, as well as it could, has come to its decision as to what is a reasonable advance. In some cases applications have been granted, in other cases they have not been and in still other cases the demands have been scaled down. Under present circumstances costs are higher and they have a fair claim for some increase. If there is to be an increase, we do our part by paying the subsidy and asking those who carry on the trade to take their portion of the added cost if there be any through the added rate. It is not an easy thing to do but we have to do it.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I quite appreciate that. Is there any schedule in the department that one could get to show what freight rates these concerns are charging? A man in my own county, who gets considerable freight over this boat, might like to know what is regarded by the department as a reasonable charge. Could the department furnish anything in that line?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is a schedule for each one of the services and we have in the department the rates that are charged every year by every one of these subsidized boats.

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Could I get a copy of that?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I am in possession of a letter from an importer of hay and he tells me that the boat plying between Mulgrave and a northern port of Inverness county, Margaree, charge $3 a ton for pressed hay. That is certainly an exorbitant charge because I know that boats plying on other coasts in Cape Breton charge 65 per cent less than that.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: For a similar distance?

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Yes. There have been complaints against the exorbitant charges that are being made by this boat. I do not know whether these charges are regarded by the department as being fair or not and therefore I would like to get that schedule. It seems to me most unjust and unfair to burden our people with exorbitant charges in view of the very fat subsidy enjoyed by this boat. $7,500 a season the two subsidies receive by the boats which ply between Pictou and Inverness and Mulgrave and Inverness. There is another matter which I referred to last year and that is the lightering costs from steamboats at Margaree Harbour. This harbour has been scandalously neglected for the last five years. Formerly steamboats could get in and out but it is only under favourable conditions that fishing boats can get in and out now. It is only by boat that goods can be landed down there. Importers of goods are at least entitled to some consideration in the matter of lightering goods. The Government could very well insist on the steamship company landing the goods at Margaree at their own expense. I would respectfully ask the hon. minister to look up the files in his department and he will see there that I got this arrangement made in 1911. Why was this discontinued? The importer to whom I have referred had to pay 85 cents a ton for getting that hay off the boat to the wharf. Some arrangements should be made by which the people would not be called upon to pay this extra charge in addition to the extraordinary increase in the freight rates, particularly in view of the large subsidy received. I again bring this matter to the attention of the minister. I have brought it to his attention twice already, but it seems the desire of the steamship company is paramount in the thoughts of the Government. This company have absolutely no justification in asking the minister to permit them to increase their freight.

The country are paying them a subsidy larger than was ever thought of in the past.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have made a note of it.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: I have never heard anybody say that there were any good results from my former efforts.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We will see what happens this time.

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not catch the name of the steamer performing that service.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is the Kinburn, owned by Roderick McDougall.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would it not be as well to have her go through direct from Pictou to Mulgrave? I am told that it now parallels the Intercolonial and any person going from Pictou to Mulgrave gets there more quickly by railroad.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are quite a number of routes on which the vessel parallels the railway. The trouble is that when the vessel is put on the people all want the railway and when the railway is there they want both the railway and the vessel.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is quite possible that the boat was running before the Intercolonial from Mulgrave to New Glasgow was built, and they wanted it kept on.

Mr. MACDONALD: The natural route would be direct from Pictou to Cheticamp.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Since this discussion has come up, I may say that this boat has no right to go to Pictou at all if the minister had continued the service we enjoyed before he took charge, viz., the service of two boats, one from Pictou to the Inverness coast, and a second from Mulgrave to the ports of the coast. It was originally the custom to carry the trade from Port Mulgrave to the Inverness ports, making two regular trips a week. There was another boat from Pictou touching Port Hood, Margaree, Mahen, Grand Etang and Cheticamp, but for some reason the subsidy was taken from the Pictou-Margaree-Cheticamp route and added to the subsidy given to the boat from Mulgrave to Port Hood, Mahen, Margaree, Grand Etang and Cheticamp and Pleasant Bay. The result is that we do not get as good service from Mulgrave on the Intercolonial to ports in Inverness as we did before, owing to the delay caused by the boat going to Pictou. It is impossible for one to properly give the two services. I repeat that this boat has no right to go to Pictou at all, but attend to the Mulgrave-Inverness ports. Another if smaller boat should be on the Pictou route as was there before my hon. friend took charge. The steamboat is the only service we have. We have no railway service and surely we should be expecting improvement in this service rather than retrogression, as is now taking place.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is hard to be the arbiter between two such conflicting interests.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would the minister mention the ports of call?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: One round trip every fortnight between Pictou and Mulgrave, calling both ways at Arisaig, Georgeville, Cape George, Morristown, Malignant Cove, Livingstone Cove, Ballantyne Cove, and Cribbin's Point, making twelve round trips during the season; and two round trips each week between Mulgrave and Cheticamp, calling both ways at Port Hastings, Port Hawkesbury, Port Hood, Port Hood Island, Margaree, Margaree Harbour, Grand Etang and Eastern Harbour, making fifty-five trips during the season; and calling once each week at Pleasant Bay, and whenever passengers and freight are offered and whenever required by the minister, at Henry Island, Madou Mouth, Inverness, Red Cape and Port Bain, as well as at whatever port or ports, place or places en route the minister may direct.

Mr. KYTE: The first half dozen names are those at which the schooner calls, and the reason given by the minister for subsidizing the schooner is that the water is very shallow in these harbours. This would look like duplication.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The schooner calls at a number of ports that are not visited by the steamer.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As I have to leave the House in a few moments I would ask permission to make a few remarks to the committee upon Franco-Canadian trade relations. I am aware that Canada and France have a steamer service which was subsidized by Canada to the extent of $200,000. Will the minister tell the committee the names of the steamers which are performing the service at the present time, and if, generally speaking, they have given satisfaction to the public? I wish to call attention to the fact that the Department of

Trade and Commerce, over which my hon. friend presides, should stimulate the manufacturers of Canada to endeavour to get their share of trade in the vast demand that will be made on the various manufacturers of America in the near future, in the reconstruction period into which France is now entering. I have in my hand documents which show that about 729 communes—that is, small villages and towns—have been invaded by the Germans. About 200 of them have been relieved since the great drives have been inaugurated by the Allied armies, and, according to the opinion expressed by a member of the French Chamber of Commerce, it is expected that, in a short time, the other communes will also be relieved, and the people of France will then realize that over 50,000 habitations have been actually destroyed. Apart from the sympathy which this country has in connection with the terrible disaster which the passage of the Huns in those regions caused, there is a practical view to take of the situation, when all sympathies have been given. France will have to reconstruct those hamlets, towns and communes, and she will have to draw on the foreign countries for the raw material. Last year I read to the House a circular which the Chamber of Commerce of Boston and the Board of Trade of New York had jointly published broadcast in the United States, inviting all the manufacturers to look after the enormous trade which this reconstruction period in France would involve. I told my hon. friend at the time that attention should be paid to that practical side of the question, and I should like to know if anything has been done by his department in that connection. As we have a direct service between Canada and France, it seems to me that it could not be better utilized than by asking each of the manufacturers to encourage that service by the shipping of their goods to France, for the reconstruction of these communes. The trade between Canada and France, I am happy to say, has greatly increased of late years. I find that in 1912 the trade was $14,000,000 in round figures. In 1913, $18,000,000; in 1914, there was an increase of $200,000, making a total of $18,200,000. In 1915 that trade had increased to $22,847,000, and in 1916 to $41,799,951, and I have seen figures which show that up to February, 1917, our trade reached the high water mark of something like $63,000,000, or $65,000,000 for the eleven months of the current fiscal year. This means that France is an excellent client of Canada, and that we should not maintain

that trade for war purposes only, but that we should try to capture that market for the years of reconstruction, which will come very shortly. Eight or ten years ago a committee of very distinguished Frenchmen was formed. One of the most prominent members of that committee was Monsieur Gabriel Hanotaux, former Minister of Foreign Affairs in France. He and Monsieur Ribot, the President of the Council in France, were the fathers of the alliance between Russia and France. This committee, viewing with alarm the strides made by the Germans on the various foreign markets, and the attention paid by the German traders to North and South American trade, formed an association called France-Amérique. It comprised all the prominent friends of the United States, Canada, Argentina, Brazil, and some other of the southern republics. They have their head office in Paris. They publish a monthly magazine called France-Amérique, and this review of very high order is devoted chiefly to the promotion of good fellowship between the Allied nations, and also to the development of better trade relations with these nations. This committee sent a delegation to Canada a few years ago, which visited Montreal and Quebec, after having visited the United States. On its return to Paris the committee published a little book which I hold in my hand, about the possibilities of trade between France and Canada. The contents of that book are most interesting. I ask my hon. friend to communicate with this committee in Paris, through the Commissioner for Canada in France, Monsieur Philippe Roy, and through the French Consul General in Montreal, Monsieur Bonin, who has worked so conscientiously and so unsparingly since he has been in Montreal for the enlargement of trade relations between France and Canada. Through the Comité France-Amérique the minister will find the natural channel his department requires abroad for making known in France the resources of Canada, and at the same time he will get, through the review published by that comité, an advertisement of the greatest advantage.

On two occasions I have spoken of the project launched a year ago by a committee of French and Canadian business men for the equipment of exhibition trains, one touring the principal cities of France with the staple products of Canada, and the other touring our country from ocean to ocean with the staple products of France.

A voluminous correspondence has been exchanged between Senator Beaubien and the minister on this subject, and the minister encouraged the movement as far as it lay in his power to do so. I have the correspondence before me. I have here the answer the minister made to Senator Beaubien, and although the project for the time being fell through because of the dire necessities of war, I hope that at the earliest opportunity, this project will receive the attention of the minister. The manufacturers of Toronto and Montreal have manifested a deep interest in it. Our four railway systems, the Intercolonial, thanks to the good-will of the Minister of Railways and Canals, the Grand Trunk, the 9 p.m. Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern have agreed to give the trains free access over their systems. I have here the letters which have been sent to Senator Beaubien on the subject, and the following firms are willing to favour the scheme: The Desbarats Printing Company, Limited, Montreal; The Phoenix Bridge and Iron Works, Ltd., Montreal. This company understand that in the reconstruction period in France our structural steel will be sorely required by the communes which have been so heavily devastated. Then there is the Roland Paper Company, Limited, Montreal. France is already a large consumer of Canadian pulp, and we must encourage that trade as much as possible. I know a firm, the Chicoutimi Pulp and Paper Company, which had some large contracts with the publishers of Le Petit Parisien, a paper which has a circulation of about a million a day. That journal is supplied with its paper by a Canadian firm. This is one instance; I could name others: The Canada Linseed Oil Mills Co., Montreal, Laurentide Company, Limited, Montreal, J. & T. Bell, Limited, Montreal, The Steel Company of Canada, Limited, Montreal, S. H. Ewing and Sons, coffees, spices, corks, wholesale teas and general commission merchants, Montreal, The William Rutherford and Sons Co., Ltd., Montreal, Cluett, Peabody and Company, Inc., Montreal, Charles E. Frost & Company, Pharmaceutical Chemists, Montreal, The Montreal Cottons, Ltd., Valleyfield, B. J. Coghlin Company, Ltd., railway supplies, etc., Montreal.

The various boards of trade in Canada and in France have also given their support to that project. I quite agree with the minister that at present we must abandon the idea of having an exhibition on wheels, but I hope the project will not be shelved in the files of the department. We must, by all means, maintain the trade between France and Canada at the figure, namely, $60,000,000, which it has reached. It would be regrettable, indeed, if, with a treaty between France and Canada and with a steamer service between Havre and Montreal we should revert to the days when we hardly did any business with that magnificent country, the pride of the world. This war has awakened the sympathies and also the commercial activities of our people, and in the years we shall have in France one of our foremost commercial Allies.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have listened with interest to the statement of my hon. friend. We have no subsidized service running now between Canada and France, nor have we had one since the first year of the war. Conditions make it impossible for boats to be put on that service. There was a statutory provision under which we paid a subsidy to the boats of the Allan line before the war commenced.

The statement that my hon. friend has made with reference to the closer acquaintanceship between France and England is very apt, and we look for results from it. We do not look upon it as an acquaintanceship generated for war purposes only, and to continue only during the war. We believe that as they become better acquainted with us and with our resources, and as we become better acquainted with them and with the particular wants to which we may cater, the foundation for an expansion of trade will be laid on a better basis than ever before. But after all, a department, ever so wide awake a department as that of Trade and Commerce, cannot go beyond a certain point. The merchants themselves, the producers and the business men, must take advantage of their opportunities and push the interchange and exchange of articles between the two countries. A very instructive letter appeared in the Bulletin a week ago from our commissioner in Paris, which I would advise my hon. friend to read if he has not already done so, as I think it struck the nail right on the head. In a word it amounted to this: there is plenty of trade in France for the future if Canadian business men will look after it, but it will not take to itself wings and fly over here; it needs the nurture and care and enterprise and activity of the men who are interested on this side of the world. The United States has awakened to great activity in thought, and in planning to cater to the wants of the reconstruction period, but in so far as France is concerned, the

letter goes on to say that the people of the United States have not made much more progress than we have, and for the same reason—they have not banded themselves together to look after the possibilities of the future.

The $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 trade that my hon. friend has spoken of is of course only a war trade, and we shall only be laying up disappointment for ourselves if we expect that figure to be kept up after the war. It will sag, but afterwards it will rise again if we look after the opportunities which I am sure are open to us. France will need the natural resources that we can supply, and as her Ally we shall be given a sentimental advantage in France. At the present time negotiations are proceeding for the supply of a large amount of lumber from Canada for reconstruction purposes after the war. Correspondence is taking place with my own department, and I hope it will come to much, but it will not do so unless producers on this side take advantage of their opportunities. It is true that the producers of Canada for the last three years, and at no time more than now, have had their hands and hearts full in doing what was necessary to be done for the war, and it has been difficult—I acknowledge the difficulty—to switch them from the absolutely necessary work of the war and turn their thoughts and activities to planning for conditions after the war, but they are thinking more about it than ever before. No one knows, however, when the war will end, and no one knows what conditions will be when the war does end, and it is practically impossible for them to lay definite plans until the conditions that will prevail are more definitely known than at the present time. It is a case largely of watching and waiting, not simply waiting, but planning in thought, if not in actual outlay and equipment, for the seeming possibilities of trade after the war.

The project of an exhibition on wheels is a lively and up-to-date project; it is a good project, but at the present time it is absolutely impossible of achievement because of transport conditions in France, and transport conditions here would not favour it. The project has to go into the category of those things that are not out of sight simply because they are not being carried out. Here, again, we shall have to watch and wait for the proper opportunity.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In connection with the reconstruction period in France, it was suggested to the minister, I think, that a number of ready-built houses, such as in my younger days we used to see in Ottawa, should be exhibited in Paris. Has anything been done along that line?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The matter was brought to my attention, and I took it up with the department and had the woodworkers plan certain houses. After these plans were made it was thought better—and under my advice it was done—to send the plans to Paris to have them thoroughly looked into and viséd, as it were, by governmental authority, acting either directly or through a committee. That was done, and we received modified plans from them for two or three different styles of what we would call shacks, to be used temporarily until more permanent buildings could be erected. In every case their plan called for a more elaborate and more costly building than we had planned. Our buildings would cost from $75 to $100, but with the improvements, coverings and the like of that, suggested by the French authorities, they would cost considerably more. However, a number of houses were constructed and I got transport for them free of charge to Paris, where they were on exhibition in the Champs Elysées. I myself saw them when I was over there last summer. They had the name of Canada on them, and served to show not only our plan of construction for temporary buildings of this kind, but our materials as well, and they were seen by a great many people. But the war has gone on much longer than anybody thought it would, and although we know now what they want and though the plans are in the hands of the woodworkers of Canada, not much is being done at present. They, too, I suppose, are awaiting the proper time. What works directly against them is the absolute impossibility of getting transport for goods.

Mr. CURRIE: I think that the question of our trade with France is one of the most important subjects to be discussed in this House. The ideas that prevail in Canada as to what will be required in France after the war is over are largely erroneous. For instance, it is expected by many that immediately after the war we are going to be called upon to send large shipments of lumber and ready-made houses to France. Having lived in the war zone, I have some idea of what the requirements there are likely to be; also, I am conversant with the building trade. The building material used in France is almost entirely brick. When a farmer wants brick to build a house he

simply goes into his fields, builds a kiln, and makes his brick. The lumber used for the roof consists of limbs from the trees in the fields, usually elm. The timbers for the building are the same. The flooring and roof is tile, which the farmer makes out of clay, as he does his brick. Consequently, the wood products that we shall need to send to France will be doors, window sash and some flooring. For doors and window sash we are likely to find a ready sale. We should get patterns from France in order that we may be in a position to supply what they will require. Then there is hardware.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And structural steel—

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, I wish to deal with all these matters. I had these things under observation when I was there, and I think that after the war there will be a large market for builders' hardware such as locks, hinges, and other things, usually of a cheap kind. In France, most of these articles that have been destroyed by the Germans were made by the local blacksmiths, and we ought to be able to supply the French people with a cheaper line of articles suitable for their building purposes. As to structural material, it is to be assumed that after the war France will have recovered her iron and steel works, and will be able to supply for her own use large quantities of rails and of structural material. But many bridges of the old regime, stone bridges, will be replaced with bridges of steel, and a great deal of structural material will be used in France in that way after the war. Figures show that already a large trade has sprung up between Canada and France, and it is not altogether a war trade. Many articles of iron and steel manufactured in Canada are shipped to France, as well as certain textiles and articles of wood. The concern that has taken charge of this trade in France is the Hudson's Bay Company. That company has something like forty or fifty ships carrying goods from the United States and Canada to France. So far that company has given a preference to Canadian goods. But the United States is lending large sums of money to France, and I notice that these loans are made on condition that the purchases to be made with the money shall be confined to the United States. I have not observed that the Canadian Government is lending money and in this way promoting the purchase of goods here for France. France had already borrowed large sums in the United States, but without any string on the money, with the result that she was able to place large orders in Canada. I know this because I know of one concern which had an order of half a million dollars from France, not of a war character, but, as I may say, of a semi-war character. But we have reached the highest point in that trade. There does not seem to be any arrangement made for the exchange, the money, to continue the purchase of these goods in Canada from now on, and those who have been manufacturing goods for France and have been looking forward to a continuance of the trade will find this business falling off within the next two or three months. The purchasing, I understand, is taken out of the hands of the parties who had it and is given to the Imperial Munitions Board, which has now virtually come under the rule of Washington, and the purchases for France must be confined to American goods. Therefore, I do not think that Canada need look for more than eight or ten millions of dollars' worth of business with France next year unless something is done. This is to be regretted. I would strongly urge upon the Government the necessity of looking thoroughly into this French trade question. It is not altogether a matter of shells and munitions. It is a valuable trade and can be continued after the war if the necessary credits and exchange are provided. Therefore, those in Canada who are manufacturing for France—and I know a number of them—need not, I think, look forward to more business after the next two or three months when their present contracts expire, because they are faced with the fact that purchases made for France from now on must be made in the United States, because the money is being provided by the United States. I wonder whether the Minister of Trade and Commerce has taken this matter into consideration. If not, I would urge him to look into it to see if some arrangement cannot be made so that the French Government may participate in the credit here with the British Government, so that this trade, which is important, may continue not only now but after the war.

Mr. LOGGIE: The minister referred to the fact that the subsidy is not used by the Allan Line. I am sure he will recall the fact that boats of the Allan Line that loaded at Montreal did not load their full cargo for Havre but after discharging at Havre, went on to London and did not stop long at Havre because of the congestion and the difficulty of unloading cargo. Has any effort been made to procure the service in

a different way? For instance, if a monthly steamer were to start from Halifax and go via New York, or Portland, or both, having in view a full cargo for Havre, would not that meet an existing demand? I am informed that several steamers loaded partly with Canadian military stores, and also carrying commercial goods to some extent, went from Portland. But these sailings were known to very few of the mercantile people. I can understand the reason for that, as these vessels were carrying military stores. But I think that in the interests of the commercial world it would be worth while for the department to find out if it would not be practicable to have two or three sailings start from Halifax calling at Portland and New York, and then to Havre with a full cargo. I am quite sure that there was not the slightest difficulty in procuring full cargoes because I know that goods were held up in New York for months last year and practically all the goods that were forwarded from the Maritime Provinces to France went by New York.

Mr. CURRIE: Does the hon. gentleman not know that there was a ship sailing for France each day nearly all last summer?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Were they of the French line?

Mr. CURRIE: I do not know what the name of the company was that was operating the ships, but they sent out a ship every day from Montreal last summer.

Mr. LOGGIE: I know that there are ships in the employ of the Government sailing from Montreal to Havre, but these ships will not carry commercial goods.

Mr. CURRIE: They did.

Mr. LOGGIE: Then I am wrongly advised. I would like to know to whom to apply, as I am interested in applications for tonnage.

Mr. CURRIE: Why not apply to the parties who have these boats in charge? Nearly all of these ships are chartered by the Hudson's Bay Company, and if the hon. gentleman would apply for tonnage I am satisfied that they would let him have it.

Mr. LOGGIE: I will be very glad to do so, and I shall certainly use the information which my hon. friend has given me.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If it is correct.

Mr. LOGGIE: Yes, if it is correct. I fancy that we will find that it has a little flaw in it when we come down to the business end of it. But we look to the minister to keep up communication between Canada and France. The minister suggested that it was not possible after war was declared. I know his difficulties. I know there was a ship on the sea bound for Havre at the time war was declared, and that the cargo was discharged at London and held a long time there before it was sent across the channel. The sailings to France were discontinued. If the minister will have his ships fully loaded when they set out for Havre it will help to solve the trouble. The difficulty with the Allan line boats is that they have not been loaded for Havre but for London, and they have taken some cargo for Havre. They do not want to lose time by calling at Havre. If the steamers had been fully loaded there would not have been that difficulty. I hope the minister will find some boats that will enable us to have a sailing once or twice a month during the summer with a full cargo for Havre. They have the right to call at one port after they leave Halifax, to call at New York and then to sail for France. I am not sure whether they have a right to call at Portland. If the minister will look into it I will be very much obliged.

Mr. MACDONALD: The statement made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) to the effect that under existing conditions the whole control of purchases for war needs in France is to be vested in our American friends is a statement of very great import. I see no reason why there should not be a conference between our Government and the French and British Governments in regard to this whole question of purchases of this character. We see French and English commissions coming to the United States, we see conferences in regard to financial matters and arrangements being made for providing food supplies of all kinds. You find a British minister stating in the Imperial House of Commons that they are relying on the United States for their food supply. Why should they not be relying on this country for their food supply in regard to production, and why should not France, as far as our industries may permit, have arrangements made so that Canada might take some part in the rebuilding of France just the same as under existing circumstances we are told the United States are to do? I hope the minister will be able to give us some assurance that a condition of that kind is not being permitted to exist and, if it does exist, steps should be taken to remedy it immediately.

Mr. LOGGIE: Has the minister anything to suggest as a way out of the difficulty which we meet in sending goods to France while the war is going on? I am sure that when the war is over the matter will be adjusted but in the meantime something might be done by the Government.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think care ought to be taken before statements are made or criticisms are offered that the sources of information are correct. At this time there is a multiplicity of statements made as to what is going to be done and what is being done. There is a multitude of projects sent in from various sources to the two Houses of Congress in the shape of bills but no man on earth knows what the shape of the matter will be when it gets out of Congress. I do not bestow very much time or attention upon Bills that are merely introduced into committees of the two Houses of Congress, and which are waiting for discussion and ultimate action. It is a peculiar thing that in all that has been going on since the second day of April, and in all the preparation that has been made in order to put powers into the hands of the administration of the United States, up to the present moment only three important Bills have really become law. One is the Loan Bill, another the Bill for selective conscription and the third is the one which has been passed just a day or so ago and which is known as the Espionage Bill. The name, however, does not give very much of an indication of what the Bill is. The essence of the Bill is to confer a power upon the administrative authorities to control exports from the United States, and in that way to put into their hands a power of blockade which is the most effective which can be established with reference to the Central Powers in Europe.

Mr. GRAHAM: The powers with regard to censorship which were originally in the Bill were stricken out?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The proposition which was made was changed in the first Bill and then the section of the first Bill which was passed was too wide to suit Congress and the extreme espionage provisions of the Bill were stricken out. But there are considerable powers of supervision, or of espionage as it is called, still remaining in the Bill. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) says that he has noticed that in the British House of Parliament statements are made that Britain looks to the United States for their food supply. Statements are also made by the leader in that House that Great Britain and the Allies look to Canada as well as to the United States for their supplies. I should not like the impression to go out, and I am sure that my hon. friend would not, that the British people were saying in their Parliament that they looked to the United States for their supplies and left Canada out.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was speaking about understandings, following my hon. friend from Simcoe.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is this to be remembered: when we want to do anything here in war time we have a more speedy way of doing it. Under the War Measures Act, almost any power can be taken and can be exercised by the Government for war purposes and under war pressure. An Order in Council gives the power, and you go on and exercise it. In the United States there is no such thing as an Order in Council or a War Measures Act. When a state of war was declared in the United States, the President and the secretaries of the different departments had no more power in these respects and could get no more power than any outsider, and they cannot get that power until it is conferred in every separate instance and in every separate line by Acts of Congress. It is these Acts of Congress for which the Administration is waiting and has been waiting, in order to organize the several departments of work. Take the matter of food regulation and food supplies. That bill is still before Congress. It is being debated, it has not yet been passed. It has been before Congress for ten or fourteen days. It is expected that it will be passed in a few days. When it is in so far as powers are given, then the Administration will be able to use those powers. The French mission and the British mission visited Washington and conferences were had with the United States Administration. Lines of effort and co-operation were discussed and principles were laid down and in course of time agreed to, and they will be adhered to; but up to the present time, in most particulars, the Administration has not received the powers that are necessary to enable them to act. Co-operation between Canada and the United States, thorough co-operation between the Allies and their commissions, and the United States, is what is being aimed at and is what I believe will be carried out.

With reference to the purchase of sup-

plies for the Allies, Canada's resources, I am quite sure, will be called upon for everything that she can possibly supply. I do not know that there is a staple food product that Canada can make or produce this year, after she has served her own people, and has a surplus, that will not be exigently required by the Allies, and every ounce of exportable wheat and flour made therefrom is required and will be asked for by the Allied powers through their buying commission. So that we are not being left out in the cold in any possible way. Neither do I know, I have no authority for saying —if I were asked I would say exactly the opposite—that all the money which is loaned to Great Britain or to France or to the other Allies must be expended in the United States of America. There is this fact to be considered, that Britain's advance contracts made in the United States were tremendously large, and I believe that almost every cent of the loans so far made to Great Britain has gone to pay for advances that were already made in that country. To that extent, if the purchases were in the United States and the debt was owed for them in the United States, those moneys would go, of course, to clear off that indebtedness. But I have yet to learn that there is any absolute string that is placed upon the expenditure of the money. Naturally most of it will be expended in the United States of America by the Allies who desire to obtain supplies.

With reference to transit from this country to France, there are not, as I have said, any subsidized services—there have not been since the war. Havre became, almost immediately after the outbreak of war, a port so congested that it was almost impossible for a merchant vessel to get any service there, and even up to the present time it is a great British seaport, and supplies and munitions and equipments for war flood and congest it. The Hudson Bay Company has been, and still is, the agent of France, to a large extent, in buying in this country, but the Hudson Bay Company with its ships, either owned or chartered—and there are a good many of them —has been buying for the French Government, and it is the articles that the French Government needs that have the first place, if I am not wrongly informed, almost the total claim upon these vessels. I have had man after man and company after company ask my good offices to get commercial freight on the Hudson Bay Company's vessels, but I have not succeeded in doing so because the claims of the French Government were paramount and they had to be. In one case I did get a consignment put upon one of those boats, but it was because the French Government saw that that particular consignment was almost absolutely necessary for French agriculturists, and so they made some room on one of the vessels in order that that shipment might go forward.

Two countries like Canada and the United States, with their basic products almost the same, taking food into consideration, must act in conjunction with each other; a border line of three thousand miles, with producers and farmers on each side, has to be looked at in these matters. The consumers in the United States have just as large stomachs and just as big appetites as consumers in Canada, and it is certain that, in all the regulation of prices that may take place, the vast mass of consumers in the United States will be considered as being a very vital factor. On the other hand, production is just as necessary for the United States at this hour as it is for Canada, and if anything it is a little more necessary. Production must be looked at in the fixing of prices as well as consumption, and you must strike a happy medium which give price enough to attract productive enterprise and yet prices not unreasonable, under all the circumstances, for the consumer.

It is absolute folly for any one of us to imagine that we can appoint a food controller, and that he can go into the market in Montreal, Toronto, or anywhere else and fix prices at his arbitrary discretion, without having regard to supply and demand and the conditions that are world-wide today. If we try to bolster ourselves up with such a remedy we shall be trusting to a quack remedy, and shall only meet with disappointment. In this world there are forces which no mayor of a city, and no man seated on a nail keg and talking to his fellows of the enormous prices that are demanded, is going to have very much influence on. The results are being motived by world causes, and these are as the deep currents of the sea. Storage and speculation are but scum and froth upon the surface, not to be allowed if they can be kept off, to be sedulously looked into, restrained and restricted; but to-day we are called upon to pay high prices because of the basic conditions of the times in which we live, supervening upon three years of the most disastrous and widely destructive war that history has ever recorded.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The minister has scarcely answered the question put to him

in respect of possible sales of goods by Canada to France. If I understood the question aright, it was whether in the event of Canada selling goods to France the Government had in contemplation any means of financing international transactions. The member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) emphasized the desirability of trade between France and Canada, but the weakness of his argument was that he suggested no way by which France could pay Canada for goods purchased. The truth is that if tomorrow Canada sold to France $200,000,000 of structural steel there is no way by which France could pay for it, except by Canada, or some one on her behalf, making a loan to France, and paying for the commercial transaction with the proceeds of the loan. The United States is selling to France and England tremendous supplies of goods, but everybody knows that this is only possible because the United States is willing to lend, and is lending, to these countries the money with which to pay for these goods. While it is very desirable that we take advantage of the possible trade open to us in France, for instance, during the reconstruction days which are soon to come, still the wishing of it does not bring the trade. The person suggesting the proposition should propose some way of financing the transaction. It is a matter, I think, to which the Government should give some consideration. It is very desirable that we should have a share of the European trade which will be coming to this side of the Atlantic after the cessation of the war. Our factories will then have ceased their work upon munitions and war contracts, and it would be very disastrous if our largest industries were closed down for the want of orders. If we can bring to this country contracts from the European countries amounting to some hundreds of millions of dollars in order to keep our factories open and our labour market busy, that certainly is desirable, and I think, if possible, the Government should assist our industries to make these sales abroad. I do not know at the moment just how it could be done, because Canada perhaps could hardly afford to borrow money at the present time for such purposes, but she might do so temporarily, and she might dispose, in the United States or elsewhere, of these securities which France, or other purchasing countries, would gladly give to the Canadian Government. In that way, Canadian exporters might be paid for orders which came to this side of the water from the European countries. If the minister is desirous of developing this class of trade with European countries after the war, it seems to me that he must consider the question of assisting our manufacturers in arranging the financial transactions which are incident to such commercial exchange of goods. If this cannot be done, there is not much use keeping the elaborate machine going in the Department of Trade and Commerce. It may be educative, but it can bring no trade to the country. My impression is that I have seen in the press, on several occasions, the statement that the minister has had many interviews with Canadians relative to the export of their products to the Aliied countries now and after the cessation of war. I would like to inquire from him if that matter was ever placed before the manufacturers by the minister, or did they place it before him for consideration?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know that I can answer all my hon. friend's questions. When this war is over, and the exhausting processes of the war have had their effects, I do not know what will happen with regard to the purchase of new and necessary material for the reconstruction of the damaged and ravaged countries that have passed through the war. We know the course of events at the present time. The Allies, in so far as their resources and credit went, financed themselves as long as they could. They then very largely had recourse to Great Britain, and Great Britain financed them, and is helping to finance them to-day, and, on the whole, has financed them to a most tremendous extent, as my hon. friend knows. Now, the great nation which has lately gone into the war, with her resources undiminished by the ravages of war, has all the advantages which have come from business resulting from the war, and is looked to, to give credit, and she is giving credit. No one likes to say that France or Great Britain or Italy is exhausted. Those countries are not exhausted, but they have gone through a tremendous process of exhaustion during the three years of the war, and financially they are in a very tense state of strain. What will happen after the United States has given its loans to the aid of the Allies to the extent that it can, and after the war has been finished and after the reconstruction takes place and new material has to be secured, is a problem most difficult of solution. One thing of two and, maybe, two things will take place,

first that, instead of reconstruction going ahead at a bounding pace after the war ceases, it may have, by sheer necessity, to go ahead at a very moderate rate, and people will probably have to live for many years in less comfort and with fewer appliances and equipments than they had before; secondly, that the actual necessities in some way or another must be had, and the Government and financial institutions will have to come to the rescue in so far as these necessaries must be bought. Take Canada at the present time, and to turn to the question of my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean): is there any way by which Canada can finance the producing interests of the country, manufacturers, for instance, in order to enable them to finance Allied countries which are not able to meet the payments at present? My hon. friend has to take into account that money markets are pretty well closed to Canada at the present time. She cannot make loans in Great Britain; on the contrary she has advanced many millions of dollars to finance orders that Great Britain has placed in this country, but there is a limit to Canada's capability for doing that for what is sold to Great Britain or to France, because Canada has to take up and to take that burden almost entirely upon her own shoulders from this time on, however long or short the war may be. That makes it difficult for the Government to arrange financial strength in order to protect large sales to be made to Allied countries and payments to be made to manufacturers without their having to wait a long time for them. The banks do their share in that respect, and they must be relied upon with their combinations to bear a large share of the burden. It depends on how far the banks can go along that line.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would be well to have some experts study the matter so as to anticipate the future.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend can rest assured that these matters have been and are being studied. It is easy to study them; it is much more difficult to find a solution.

Mr. CURRIE: The vital point that I raised has not been answered; that is to say, that orders that are placed now upon this money that is being borrowed by France in the United States, must be placed in the United States. I know for a fact that many orders in this country for France and Great Britain are being held up on that account. Of all the business that we have done with Great Britain and France in respect to the war—and according to our returns we have turned out millions of dollars worth of munitions—fully two-thirds of the money went to the United States for the raw material. Fully two-thirds of the steel and copper that has been sold to the Allies by Canada, has come from the United States, and Canada's money has paid for that. Therefore, when the United States trade papers all announce distinctly that every dollar of this loan that the Allies are getting from the United States, must be spent in the United States, that is an unfriendly act, and this Government should take steps to ascertain whether it is true, because we are just as much entitled to some business from that money as is the United States. It should be a free loan.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is the money of the United States.

Mr. CURRIE: The United States lends that money on the understanding that it must be spent in the United States and not in Canada, nor in the Argentine Republic.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It was borrowed on that condition.

Mr. CURRIE: That is the case, and that is an unfriendly condition to insert in a loan of that description. Millions of dollars have been sent to Canada by the British Government for investment in various things, and large sums of that were immediately sent to the United States for investment in munitions without anybody in Canada having an opportunity of tendering on the articles desired. Over a year ago the British Ordnance Department sent over $50,000,000 with the late General Donaldson to establish gun works in Canada. That money, instead of being spent for ordnance works in Canada, was switched by the late Shell Committee down to the United States, and the money was spent in building guns and gun works in that country. We have done everything possible to assist in financing the war, and the time has come when, apparently from the statements made, we must finance any orders that come here from the Allies ourselves. France has no loan in this country, and consequently this trade with France will cease for lack of money unless some steps are taken for an interchange of trade. The great foreign trade of France is in toilet articles, silks, curtains, laces, gloves, pocket handkerchiefs and articles of that description. She is still manufacturing these goods. But France

10 p.m.

is not increasing her exchange of products with us. All those toilet articles for Canada are now being bought in Japan, and the silks are being bought in Japan or in the United States. As a supporter of the Government, I say that the Government of the day should take cognizance of these things, and see that vessels do not return from France in ballast filled with mud. It would be better if they were filled with dry goods, because in that way we would be able to exchange trade with France and secure war orders. I trust the minister will consider this matter, which is a very serious one to the manufacturers of Canada, who are finding it hard to carry on business owing to heavy taxes and high prices. $54 of the $80 which the manufacturers were getting for steel castings for shells was going to the United States for pig iron, although we had pig iron plants standing idle in Canada. I do not wish to criticise the Imperial Munitions Board, but the Government should have kept some control over that business.

The country should carry on its business in a reasonable way, and exchange commodities with other countries even though we are a protectionist country, and the Government should take steps to see that tonnage is given to our merchants. If our business men want to send dried fish to France, why should not they be given the opportunity of doing so, just as Argentina is able to send beef over there? These are matters that should be more closely attended to. I do not say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is to blame. The question of foreign trade has been discussed by the United States, and the principal reason why the United States came into the war, outside of sympathy, was because they wanted to participate in the foreign trade of the Allies after the war. A great convention of all the manufacturers of the United States was held about two months ago, at which papers were read by all the leading manufacturers, one of the most important being by Mr. Farrell, president of the United States Steel Corporation. He went into the whole question of the foreign trade of the country. Any one who reads the debates of Congress will see that all the Bills brought forward by the Government of the United States are based on the action taken by that convention of manufacturers. I have not heard of the manufacturers of Canada being called together to discuss these matters, and I think the Government should show a little more ginger in this matter. We are getting tired of drifting and watching and waiting. The policy of watching and waiting in business never gets one anywhere; it always ends in bringing in the sheriff. We want an aggressive policy in regard to the trade of this country and no man is better able to carry out such a policy than the minister, and I can assure him that in any action he takes along this line he will have not only the House but all the manufacturing and producing interests of the country behind him.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have had a very great deal of theory and cloud navigation for the last hour or so, and perhaps we had better come down to earth again.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Perhaps we had better come back to the Estimates.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not want the line to be drawn the moment I have something to say. The minister was the worst sinner of all. He went careering all over the country, and I must ask him to permit me to do a little careering. The hon. member for Simcoe has brought out a point which is rather against the minister. In his judgment the minister is a man full of capacity and ability, but he will not do anything. Now, there is some excuse for a man not doing anything who has no ability, but no excuse at all for a man at the head of a department who has, as the hon. member says, both ability and capacity. I was very glad to read the Order in Council that the minister laid on the Table yesterday; that was a practical step. The Order in Council says that Mr. Magrath is to be fuel controller. That has a very restricted meaning. By fuel we usually understand fire wood, or what is used for domestic purposes, but the Order in Council is much more comprehensive in its scope. It deals with power of every kind that is produced from steam or coal, as well as with domestic fuel. I notice that some months ago the minister called before him the coal managers of the different parts of Canada, particularly of the Maritime Provinces, and he has the advantage of the knowledge he gained in that way. I come from a very large coal centre and know something about coal mining, and about what a mine may ordinarily be supposed to produce. A manager may say that such an amount is the full capacity of his mine, but if you can show him where he is going to make money he will produce more. If the minister would give the coal companies of Canada, and of Nova Scotia particularly, a fixed price for every pound of coal they produce up to their utmost capacity the mines of Nova

Scotia would be producing four million instead of three million tons a year, and so on throughout the country. The Government would be taking no risk, because every pound of coal they bought they could readily dispose of. But the great thing is to hold out to the coal companies an inducement to produce an article for which there is the greatest possible demand, and for which there will be the greatest possible necessity. Rather than find fault with the minister for this appointment, I think the task he has imposed on Mr. Magrath is too much for any one man; he has more than he can accomplish. The fuel controller should not ask the coal managers, how much coal have you in your bank? How much did you produce yesterday, and how much will you produce tomorrow? He should be empowered by the minister to say to them, "Produce as much as you like. We will give you a fixed price for every pound you produce." The minister should adopt a policy similar to that followed by the Government at the inception of the munitions industry, when the manufacturers were told to produce as much as they liked, and would be given a fixed price for a certain number of years which would cover the cost of their plant and allow a very substantial profit besides. The minister need not be afraid that he will have coal on his hands because he will be taking gold out of the ground. I again want to impress upon him the necessity of holding out inducements to the large coal companies to produce to their utmost capacity. In the Order in Council it is stated that only 200,000 tons of coal could be got in Nova Scotia to meet the demands of Montreal and other places. That is mere folly. It is ridiculous to mention such a figure as 200,000 tons in connection with the tremendous coal mines in the Island of Cape Breton and Pictou, particularly in the Island of Cape Breton. I can assure the minister that if he will hold out such an inducement of this kind, the coal companies will have no difficulty in providing all the coal he wants.

Mr. LOGGIE: Referring to item 183, at what points does the steamer call?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: At Chatham, Lower Newcastle, Loggieville, Oak Point, Church Point, Escuminac, Neguac, and Mills Point Wharf on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and at Chatham, Lower Newcastle, Loggieville, Oak Point, Baie-du-Vin, Church Point and Neguac on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Steam service between Rivière du Loup, Tadoussac and other north shore ports, $6,000.

Winter steam service between Rivière du Loup, Tadoussac and other St. Lawrence ports, $8,000.

Winter steam service between St. Catherines Bay and Tadoussac, $3,500.

Mr. GAUVREAU: It has always been hard for me to understand why the Minister of Trade and Commerce was so quick to listen to politicians when he entered into that last contract for winter and summer navigation between Rivière du Loup, Tadoussac, and North shore. Perhaps he is not aware that the Trans-St. Laurent Navigation Company, of Fraserville, was really the pioneer of winter navigation, on the lower St. Lawrence. If he comes to Rivière du Loup, where he will be well received, he will find that a little boat called the Mahone has done a really great service on the St. Lawrence, especially in its winter trips made to Seven islands for the relief of the people there. I thought at the time that, in view of what this company had done, it would be better treated by the department and by the minister. But, unfortunately, politics carried weight, even in so serious a matter as this. In 1912, Mr. Berube was elected to the local legislature for Temiscouata, and he happens to be a Conservative. Being unfriendly to the management of the company, he started at once to oppose it. Then there was the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard) a Conservative member on the North shore. With these two warring against it, it is no wonder that the poor company was killed. The contract with that company was cancelled and a contract was made with the Quebec and Levis Ferry Boat Company. At the time I warned the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) that the boat they proposed to use, which had been built principally for the ferry crossing between Quebec and Levis, could never stand the strain of the trip between Rivière du Loup and Tadoussac and the North shore. I never thought that this would be so quickly proven. But in the winter of 1915, the boat went on a rock on Red Island at the mouth of the Saguenay river. She was a total loss, and if there were no lives lost it is due to the fact that this little boat, the Mahone, went to the rescue and rendered good service. The contractors then sent out the Queen, and two months afterwards she was sunk in St. Catherines Bay, on the north shore. This is what happened to the company that stepped into the place of the Trans-St. Laurent Navigation Company, of Fraser-

ville. I think the minister realizes that if there is a place below Quebec where we need steamer communication it is between Tadoussac and Rivière du Loup. I believe the amount appropriated is sufficient for ordinary circumstances—these three services represent a total of $17,500. But since these two boats disappeared we have been without means of crossing. Tenders were called for, and I believe that the Trans-St. Laurent Navigation Company sent in tenders. But, if I am well informed, their tender was higher than the amount placed in the Estimates. This, no doubt, accounted for the refusal of the minister to give the contract. At present we have no service at all. I hope that the minister will try to arrange that, even if a larger sum is necessary, the tender of the Trans-St. Laurent Navigation Company shall be accepted and their boat may be placed on the line.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: How long did they have the contract?

Mr. GAUVREAU: For many years, up to 1914 I think. Perhaps the minister may say that the boat is too small, or that she has been condemned. That may be true so far as the winter traffic is concerned. But he will see by the report of the commissioner who was sent down there that the boat could have been allowed to make trips in the winter, carrying freight only and no passengers. If I am well informed there is a man who wishes to place a gasoline launch on this route between Rivière du Loup and Tadoussac. I do not know what kind of a boat it is, nor what is its capacity, but I am told that this man, Mr. Lajoie, of Chicoutimi, is recommended by the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay. Well, even a small boat would be better than none, and I hope that the minister will find a way to give us a service between Rivière du Loup and Tadoussac, first in the summer, and then in the winter time.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not thoroughly clear in my own mind with regard to the steps that have been taken in this matter, but my impression is that the vessel that was there was condemned and consequently we were unable to employ her. We require a certificated vessel. Then came the difficulty of getting another vessel.

Mr. GAUVREAU: The boat was not condemned as a freighter, but it was condemned under the pretext that it was not safe for passengers. You can employ a boat as a freighter without allowing passengers to go on board.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, but we subsidize for both freight and passengers, and as it was impossible for them to carry passengers because of the condemnation, we did not feel that we could subsidize the boat. There has always been the difficulty of the exceedingly small amount of freight to be carried. Take, for instance, the route between Rivière du Loup, Tadoussac and St. Lawrence ports, for which there was $8,000 subsidy. The number of trips made in 1916 was 29, and the amount of freight carried was 42 tons. That was about one and a half tons per trip. It is a very small amount, of tons per trip. It is very small amount of pay for it. You could buy that tonnage over and over again for $8,000, and if the boat could not carry passengers it seemed too much to pay. We asked for tenders, but the tenders were still higher, and in some cases it became impossible to get a boat. I will look into it and read the remarks that my hon. friend has made.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The minister says that he could not subsidize a boat condemned as far as the passenger service is concerned. I am informed that the steamer Amelia, plying between the mainland and the Magdalen islands, was condemned last fall as a passenger steamer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, she has a certificate and always has had. She would not be allowed to run without a certificate.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Would the minister go back to item No. 191:

Steam service between Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton and Newfoundland, $16,500.

How often will the trips be made, and at what ports in Prince Edward Island will the boats call?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think it is the same as last year:

Regular sailings every fortnight between Summerside, P.E.I., and St. Johns, Nfld., calling each way at Charlottetown, P.E.I., at Sydney, N.S., and, if so required by the minister, calling on outward voyages only at Souris, P.E.I., and North Sydney, N.S.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the name of the boat?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Sable Island.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have had complaints from my town about that boat because when going to Sydney she passes our port and does not call. If she had to go farther to call there might be some excuse for it, but in going in and coming out she has to pass North Sydney and if she brings freight

for North Sydney she leaves it at Sydney and it has to be reshipped to North Sydney. Some arrangement should be made by which this boat would regularly call at North Sydney.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Sir George Foster for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. GRAHAM: What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know what arrangement has been made by the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition as to the Military Service Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it is not coming up until next week.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not to-morrow?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not to-morrow.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I suppose we might as well go on with Estimates to-morrow. I shall go on with my Estimates and some other ministers will be ready, the Minister of Agriculture probably.

CONDUCT OF THE WAR.

PROPOSED MOTION BY HON. GEO. P. GRAHAM.

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.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Will that opportune time probably be to-morrow?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.35 p.m. Wednesday.

Thursday, June 14, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 79, respecting a patent of Ernest Mead Baker.—Mr. Robb.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Bill No. 80, respecting a certain patent of The Sharp Rotary Ash Receiver Company, Incorporated.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 81, respecting a patent of James B. King and others.—Mr. Macdonell.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PENIAC BRIDGE.

Mr. COPP:

1. What was the total cost of the renewal of Peniac bridge on the Fredericton division of the Intercolonial Railway?
2. How many concrete piles were used in the construction of same, and what was the total length of said piles?
3. What was the cost per lineal foot for said piles?
4. What was the cost of labour in the renewal of this bridge?
5. How many days was the track pile driver used on this work, and at what cost per day, including the cost of fuel?
6. What is the length of said bridge?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Total cost, $9,009.28, which includes $2,011.53 for improving grade by raising track.
2. Thirty concrete piles were used, with a total length of 904 feet.
3. $1.40 per lineal foot, f.o.b. Peniac.
4. $5,339.80.
5. Twenty-one days at a cost of $31.42 per day, which includes fuel and labour.
6. Eighty-one feet.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MILFORD BALLAST PIT.

Mr. COPP:

1. When was the property known as the Milford ballast pit purchased by the Government, and at what price?
2. How many acres were purchased in this property, and from whom?
3. What was the cost of the right of way to said ballast pit?
4. How far is said ballast pit from the main line of the Intercolonial Railway?
5. What engineers or other officials examined the material in said ballast pit and recommended the purchase of same?
6. What was the total cost of constructing line from main line to said pit?
7. How much material has been taken from said pit?
8. What is the estimated quantity remaining in said pit?
9. Has said ballast pit been abandoned?
10. If so, why?
11. Where was the material used that was taken from said pit?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The property was expropriated—final plans and descriptions filed in the registry office, August 16, 1916; price paid, $1,497.96.
2. Total, 74.898 acres. From David I. Blackburn, 52.218 acres; from Mrs. Mary A. Wood, 22.68 acres.

3. Cost of right of way to date, $958.60. The claim of Mrs. Mary Hunter for one small parcel of land has not been settled.

4. 3.58 miles.

5. It was tested under the supervision of the roadmaster and resident engineer. Samples of material from test pits were submitted to and examined by division engineer, general superintendent, chief engineer and general manager. The roadmaster brought the pit to the attention of railway officials, and all the officers concerned recommended purchase.

6. $38,061.01.

7. 28,000 cubic yards.

8. Approximately 1,700,000 cubic yards.

9. No. The rails were taken up temporarily to lay in sidings, to release National Transcontinental railway rails for shipment to France.

10. Answered by No. 9.

11. On the Halifax Oceans Terminals railway, main line and yard tracks, and on the spur leading from the main line to the pit.

BAY STATE FISH COMPANY.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Is the Bay State Fish Company permitted to land fish fares at Digby, N.S., to the Maritime Fish Corporation without payment of customs duties?

2. If customs duties are paid, are the same remitted?

Mr. HAZEN:

1 and 2. No. This company is given no exceptional privileges in Canadian ports.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE.

Mr. COPP:

1. What is the height of the stone piers in the Grand Narrows bridge on the Intercolonial Railway?

2. How far are said piers below high water mark and how far above low water mark?

3. How long since the said stone piers were built?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The only information the department has in this regard is from the as-built plans of the Cape Breton railway, which is as follows:—

Top of pier to bottom: Pier (from west end).	Of Crib Under Pier.
No. 1	74′ 6″
" 2	77′ 10″
" 3	81′ 8″
" 4	80′ 8″
" 5	72′ 10″
" 6	71′ 4″
" 7	35′ 0″

2. This question is not clear, but from the records the relationship of average high water level to top of piers is as follows:—

Top of Pier.	Above High Water Level.
No. 1	5′ 3″
" 2	5′ 3″
" 3	5′ 3″
" 4	5′ 3″
" 5	5′ 0″
" 6	5′ 3″ (High part.)
" 6	4′ 0″ (Low part.)
" 7	0′ 3″

The department has no record of the distance from the tops of piers to low water level, but according to tide tables of 1917 the range between high water level and low water level in the Bras d'Or lakes is about one foot.

3. According to the as-constructed plans of the Cape Breton railway, these piers were completed in 1890.

GOVERNMENT LANDS AT DIGBY.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

Who is the holder of the lease of Government lands at Digby whereon troops of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces were located in 1915 and 1916, and what rental was paid for the same?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Mr. G. E. Torrie. Mr. Torrie was allowed a rebate of $10 on the rental for the year 1916, on account of the occupation of the ground by troops. The rent is $20 per annum.

PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. KYTE: I have received a number of petitions and memorials from churches and temperance organizations asking that legislation be introduced at the present session to provide for Dominion-wide prohibition. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce such legislation during the present session?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have already explained that the subject is under consideration of the Minister of Justice as to certain legislation. Any further announcement that may be necessary will be made in due course.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

SUGGESTION AS TO VOTE ON SECOND READING.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): I desire to make a suggestion with regard to the so-called Conscription Bill, the second reading of which, I understand, is to be moved early next week. It is almost certain that the debate will occuy at least a week, that is, there is little possibility of reaching a division next week. I am sure there are many members who would

like to visit their ridings and speak to some of their electors on the point. I know I would. If the Prime Minister could see his way clear to have an understanding on the part of the House that a vote would not be permitted within a week from the day the second reading is proposed, I do not think it would do any harm. Of course, it is almost certain that the debate will take that long, but at the same time one does not like to take the chance of absenting himself when a vote of such importance is in prospect. The right hon. gentleman may not wish to answer at once, but I would suggest that he should take the matter into consideration, and tell us later if such an arrangement as I propose could be made.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Of course, as I stated yesterday, I would like to proceed with the measure at the earliest possible moment. On the other hand, I desire to meet as far as reasonable the wishes of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I will take what my hon. friend has said into consideration.

LAKE OF THE WOODS WATER LEVEL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I see it stated in the press that the International Joint Commission have made a very important report fixing the level of the waters of the Lake of the Woods. If this report has been made can it be laid on the Table?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If any such report has been made it has not yet come to my attention. As soon as the matter comes before me I will give it consideration, and will inform my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or will lay the report on the Table.

HON. ROBERT ROGERS.

SITTING OF ROYAL COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is reported that the Commission appointed to make an investigation in the case of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) is sitting in Montreal?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that it is sitting.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Are the sessions private or public?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no official information on the subject. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) if he were here, could probably give more information on this subject than I can give. I have heard nothing about the matter at all since the Order in Council was passed, except that I understood incidentally from other information that the Commission had the evidence before them and were looking over it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will renew my question to-morrow.

REMOVAL OF RAILS FOR USE IN FRANCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: The Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) has laid on the Table a report, with blue print, regarding the lifting of rails on the Grand Trunk west of Edmonton. When I spoke on this subject some days ago, I think the hon. gentleman said that he would lay on the Table a similar report in regard to the lifting of rails on the Transcontinental.

Mr. COCHRANE: I have not got that ready, but expect to have it to-morrow or Monday at latest.

STRIKE OF BRANTFORD MOULDERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. NESBITT: Is the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) aware that a strike of moulders in Brantford has been on for some days? And has he taken any action in the matter?

Mr. CROTHERS: I heard some days ago that the moulders in Brantford were on strike. The difference between the moulders and the employers arose as to the length of the working day, the question being as to an eight-hour or a ten-hour day. I am not aware whether the matter has been adjusted yet or not.

Mr. NESBITT: Does the hon. minister know that one of his officials had gone to Brantford, or had been spoken to by men in Brantford, and that these men were told by him that the Department of Labour had nothing to do with that kind of matter?

Mr. CROTHERS: I have not heard anything of the sort. No official of my department, so far as I am aware, went to Brantford.

LABOUR STRIKE IN WESTERN COAL MINES.

Mr. OLIVER: I think the Minister of Labour said yesterday that he would prob-

ably have some definite information today in regard to the labour strike in the Alberta coal mines.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have received a message from that district, which contains no definite information, but merely states that the prospects for adjustment are brighter.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Steam service between St. John and ports in Cumberland Basin, $3,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yesterday the Minister of Finance made a statement in regard to the land service, which appears on page 2394 of Hansard, as follows:

A slight adjustment was made in this case, and the matter for the last year has been settled, and a contract entered into for the ensuing year.

And he is reported to have said "about $45,000." I understood him to say $5,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: $5,000 is the right amount.

Mr. BOULAY: An item was voted last night for the service between Quebec and Gaspé basin. Will the minister give us the ports of call in the counties of Rimouski and Matane, where the company is bound to make calls, acording to the terms of the contract with the Dominion Government.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The ports of call are Matane, Cape Chatte, Ste. Anne des Monts, Mont Louis, Grande Vallée, Chlorydomes, Fox River, Griffin Cove, L'Anse à Louise, Grande Gréve, Douglastown, Gaspé Basin, and, at the contractor's option, to extend the route as far as Paspebiac, calling both way at Malbay, Percé, Cape Cove, Grand River, Newport, and Port Daniel; and at the following places once each round trip, either on the up or down voyage, viz., Ste. Félicité, Mechins, Martin River, Claude River, St. Antoine, Magdalen, Petite Vallée, pointe Frigate, pointe Secher, Grand Etang, Anse à Valeau, Pte. Jaune, Little Fox River, Cape Rosier, as well as such other port or ports, place or places, en route, as the minister may from time to time direct. I think these are the same as last year.

Mr. BOULAY: I understand, they do not stop at Matane or Ste. Félicité, and very seldom at Mechins. They should stop at Matane and Ste. Félicité, because there is no railroad at those points. I do not think the company is fulfilling the conditions on which they received their subsidy, and I ask that the minister, before renewing the subsidy another year, should compel them to fulfil their obligation. I should like to know, also, if the Government has control over the freight rates on those steamers, because we had complaints from the people along the coast that they charge very high rates, which complaints, I think, are well founded. The subsidy is granted to those companies to enable them to carry freight at a moderate rate, to points where there is no railroad service. If the Government has control of the rates, they can redress the grievance.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Every steamship company which is subsidized is under contract to perform certain services; otherwise they are subject to a reduction of the amount paid them. Generally, we hear from places which are not touched at and we take the matter up. If there be any reason why steamers have not called at these places the steamship company is given an opportunity to explain. The weather might not permit of their calling, or there might be some other reason. The freight rates are controlled. The company must file its schedule of rates, and is obliged to follow that schedule, and rates cannot be increased without the permission of the department. The subsidy is given for the encouragement of the service, and is not simply to take the place of freight rates, which have to be paid in any event. During the last two years costs and charges have gone up, as my hon. friend knows, so that, in most of these cases, demands have been made for a certain rise in the rates of freight. The demand was taken up by the officers of the department, and reported upon; the department fixes what it considers to be a fair rate, and refuses to sanction any rate that is considered unfair. In some cases a partial increase is granted.

Mr. MARCIL: Between Gaspe bay and Paspebiac the service is optional with the company?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Could not the minister make it more binding on the company in this respect in view of the very poor service on that coast? I have received a petition from Anse aux Gascons, thirty miles east of Paspebiac, asking that the boat call there. I forwarded the petition on to the proprietor of the boat in Montreal, but have had no answer yet. If an arrangement could be made by the department to give better

service on that part of the coast it would be greatly appreciated.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That port is beyond Gaspé?

Mr. MARCIL: Between Gaspé and Paspebiac.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have another service between Campbellton and Dalhousie and we pay them for the service to Gaspé. We do not wish to pay a double subsidy on the portion of the coast between Gaspé and Paspebiac, but if the company wishes to go beyond Gaspé to Paspebiac we do not put any bar in their way, so long as they perform the service between Quebec and Gaspé for which we pay them.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister understands why they should go to Paspebiac. They may have through freight from Montreal and Paspebiac, and that being the chief station of the largest firm in the district, anything the minister could do in improving the service would be of benefit.

Mr. COPP: Referring to the services between St. John and ports on the Cumberland basin, what boat is engaged in the service and what trips does she make?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is the same steamer that has been on for some years, the Harbinger, run by the Harbinger Steamship Company. The ports of call are St. John, Albert, Riverside, Harvey, Joggins Mines, Minudie, Rivière Hébert, and a call is required at Amherst Point wharf when there is freight offering for that port.

Mr. KYTE: How frequent are the trips?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The contract is for a trip once a week.

Mr. COPP: Last evening an item was passed providing for the service on the Petitcodiac river. I saw an item to the effect that this boat would not be in service this year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think I was told in the department the other day that there was a doubt as to whether this boat would go on or not. I will inquire.

Steam service between Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence, calling at way ports, $6,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is a very important service. While we may criticise a good many of these services, this is one that I wish to bring in the most serious way to the notice of the minister. He has received petitions, I know, from that part of the country asking for a better service. I am not complaining of the present service, but it is impossible for one boat to satisfactorily perform that service.

The route covers a distance of nearly 120 miles from Sydney along the coast of Cape Breton and Victoria counties, extending as far back as a place called Meat Cove at the extreme northern part of the island of Cape Breton. The ports along this part of the coast are good fishing places—Bay St. Lawrence, Meat Cove, White Point Dingwall, Neil's Harbour, North Ingonish, South Ingonish, Breton, Cove, Barrachois Plaster, North Shore, English Town, Jersey Cove, Murray, South Gut, North Sydney and Sydney. As was brought out in the discussion the other day with regard to the fishing business, it is necessary that fishermen should be enabled to get their products to the markets. One boat cannot do justice to the business done at the places which I have mentioned. The present boat was specially built for this route, and the company would probably secure another boat if they received some encouragement in the way of subsidy. I voice the sentiments of the people along the northern part of Nova Scotia when I ask that they be given better accommodation than they are now receiving. Representations along these lines have been made to the minister by friends of his own party. I mention these facts not in any spirit of carping criticism, but in the hope that the minister will give the matter consideration, in view of the fact that it is absolutely necessary that this part of the province should have better accommodation.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend knows the difficulty of getting either more money or more ships. However, there is always hope for the future.

Steam service from Sydney, N.S. around the east coast of Cape Breton to Hastings and return to Sydney via the Bras d'Or Lakes, $5,500.

Mr. CARROLL: Will the minister tell the committee what amount of traffic was carried in this service last year, the number of trips made and the number of passengers carried?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Thirty-four round trips were made, 1,045 tons of freight were carried, and 35 passengers.

Mr. McKENZIE: At what points is the vessel supposed to touch?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Sydney, North Sydney, Port Morien, Main-a-dieu, Louisburg, Gabarus, L,Ardoise, Petit de Grat,

Arichat, West Arichat, Mulgrave, Hawkesbury. On the return: Grandique, Poulamond, St. Peters, Johnston's Harbour, Irish Cove, Big Pond, North Side East Bay, South Side East Bay, Castle Bay, Grand Narrows and North Sydney.

Mr. KYTE: I wish to call the attention of the minister to a matter concerning which representations have been made to his department from time to time, that of the necessity for a steamship service at the port of Fourchu on the south coast line of Cape Breton. Fourchu is one of the most important and prosperous fishing communities on that coast, but it has no communication with any of the ports of Nova Scotia. It has no railway accommodation, the nearest railway being about 25 miles distant. Up to a few years ago a sailing vessel carried to Fourchu purchases made by the merchants at various ports in Nova Scotia and carried away the products of the fisheries, but this service has not been in operation during the last three or four years. It is desirable that the steamship company enjoying the subsidy which is under consideration should be requested to call at the port of Fourchu.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What steamship is that?

Mr. KYTE: The Weymouth. Some years ago a considerable sum of money was spent by the Department of Public Works for the purpose of dredging out a bar across the mouth of the harbour at Fourchu. Owing to the removal of that bar there is now a considerable depth of water in the channel. Some years ago the Government made provision for the construction of a public wharf at that port. The public conveniences, therefore, required at such a port as Fourchu are fairly well provided, with the exception of the most important of all, a steamship service. If the depth of water should be found inadequate to enable the steamers to approach the Government wharf, a small expenditure for dredging would provide the necessary depth of water. I am not exaggerating the importance of Fourchu when I say that it is one of the most important fishing communities in the island of Cape Breton and that the individual catch is larger than that of any other fishermen in the island of Cape Breton.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentlemen thinks that the service might be performed by the Weymouth?

Mr. KYTE: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will look into it.

Expenses in connection with the supervision of subsidised steamship services, $3,000.

Mr. MARCIL: The member for Rouville and the minister made certain statements yesterday regarding the Gaspé-Campbellton service which were warranted by the facts, but in justice to the Quebec and Oriental Railway Company, operating between Matapedia and New Carlisle, I think that I should set forth certain facts showing that, under the circumstances, they are doing the best that can be done to operate that railway.

If that were not so, the people of that part of the country would be very much worse off than they really are, because, besides the steamer service, which is not altogether what it should be, the people have nothing but the railway. I want the minister to become familiar with the position the railway occupies. These are the facts to which I wish to direct his attention: For the six months ending December 31, 1916, the Quebec Oriental railway spent on special repairs and renewals of way and structures $18,064.41, or roughly $3,000 per month. They also spent $5,000 additional on ordinary maintenance more than for the corresponding period in 1915, making a total additional expenditure on this account of over $23,000. That the line is being considerably improved is amply demonstrated by the fact that they are handling without delay an increased volume of traffic including many heavy 60 ton cars of coal. They are doing a better business at present than at any time in the history of the line, and if it had not been for the inflated prices of material and the scarcity and cost of certain classes of labour, caused by the war, they would be making considerable profit, which would have enabled them for the current year to carry out repairs on a more extensive scale than they are doing. There is one fact that should be mentioned, namely, in the operation of a daily service on the line during the winter under very adverse conditions along a coast line exposed to storms. They have managed to operate the 200 miles of railway from Matapedia to Gaspé during the whole winter without a single day's interruption, carrying the mails and proving a great advantage to the people, despite the severe weather. This has cost a good deal of money, and full credit should be given to the company for what they did. The general manager of the railway who has given me these facts says that other lines similarly situ-

ated had to resort to a tri-weekly or bi-weekly service in the winter. It is only fair to the company that I should make these facts known. The minister was a member of the Government when this railway was chartered, and it was proposed to be a branch of the Intercolonial. It fell into the hands of a private company and has had a very precarious existence since. The people hope that, after the war, this railway will be merged into the Intercolonial and will become one of the best features of that system, giving access to a splendid territory for fisheries and lumber. The line is fairly well operated from Matapedia to Paspebiac, and is in splendid condition from Paspebiac to Gaspé.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am glad to know the company are improving it.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: After recess yesterday, when I was not present, the minister stated that this was the first time that complaints had been made to him in regard to the service between the mainland and the Magdalen islands. During the earlier part of this session, I consulted the deputy minister in regard to all the details of the service, and I thought the minister had been informed. The minister stated yesterday that he found it hard to believe that any company receiving a public subsidy would act in such a manner, and I do not find any fault with his remarks, because it is hard to believe that a company would act in the way I have described. The minister said that he would look into the matter. If he does, he will find that every statement I have made is absolutely correct. I received from clergymen and reputable business men in the Magdalen islands numerous complaints to the effect that the management of the company was discriminating in their own favour and against every one else. The manager, Dr. Starrat, would hardly give a courteous or civil answer to any one doing business. The firm with which I am associated, a few years ago, had a fairly large business with several people in the Magdalen islands, but that business has been completely wiped out because those people know there is no use in giving orders for goods to companies which are not in favour with the owners of this steamer service, for the reason that the goods will not be transported, or they will be delayed so long in transit that the importers will give up hope of receiving them altogether. The conditions are simply intolerable, and I hope, if the minister looks into the matter during this session, he will give me an opportunity of proving my statements.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will certainly look into the matter. Of course, with the multiplicity of work, it is impossible for the minister to have knowledge of all the details. What I said last night namely, that the matter had not been brought to my attention was true.

Trade commissioners and commercial agents, including expenses in connection with negotiation of treaties or in extension of commercial relations; miscellaneous advertising and printing, or other expenditure connected with the extension of Canadian trade, $160,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister might give us some inkling of what was accomplished at the various international trade conferences of the Allies.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This vote is for the trade commissioners. Of course, they have nothing to do with international negotiations.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know that, but I thought I might ask on this item for a statement from the minister regarding the trade conference of the Allies, one at least of which he attended.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I intend on one item of the Estimates to make a general statement with reference to the work of the department, and I think it would be better to embody the information that my hon. friend asks for in that statement. It will cover a good many points, for there are many matters that I think should be placed before the House. For instance, there is the Dominions Royal Commission, which has finished its work and published its final report, copies of which, together with the evidence, I intend to have printed for the use of members. The report is a voluminous one, but to those members of the House who take an interest in Dominion-wide trade, the report and the statistical volumes which accompany it are documents of very great importance. In my general statement I shall also refer to the work of the Advisory Council on Industrial and Scientific Research, and to the work of our trade commissioners in the different countries. I shall also make a short statement in reference to the Economic Conference, which is what I think my hon. friend refers to. I will give notice beforehand of the item on which I shall make this general statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Have any new trade agencies been opened since last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know whether the two Russian agencies were opened last year or not, but at least preparations were then being made for them. One has now been opened at Petrograd, in the East, and another at Omsk, in the West. Mr. Just, our agent at Petrograd, is one of our best trade commissioners. Mr. Wilgress has been appointed to Omsk. He is a graduate of McGill University, where he had a distinguished career, and was highly recommended on economics and other subjects. Mr. Wilgress has passed through the course of training which all our new trade commissioners undergo in our offices in Canada for a year or a year and a half.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Where in Omsk?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In Siberia; it is the central point in Western Russia. We have also opened a branch at Milan, in Italy, and recently sent there one of our sub-commissioners, a graduate of Toronto University, who had undergone a course of training in this country for over a year and a half. Not much, perhaps, can be done during the period of the war either in Russia or Italy, but it is very important that these men should be at their seat of future work before peace comes, so that they may make themselves thoroughly acquainted with local conditions. I have made a point lately of insisting on these trade commissioners understanding the language of the country where they are going to work; that applies to our commissioners in Russia and Italy. The young man who has gone to Milan studied Italian while he was here, and had a fair colloquial knowledge of the language before he left, and probably will be able to perfect himself in the language before peace comes. There is also a sub-commissioner being trained in our offices who is destined, if everything goes well, to take up this work in Japan; he is studying Japanese. His father was living in Japan at the time of his birth; the young man has passed a few years of his childhood there, and has something of the Japanese atmosphere. It is a great advantage for a man to be able to enter into conversation with business men in the language of their country. It makes communication easier, and enables the commissioner to get at their habits of thought better than if everything had to be done through an interpreter.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it is a good idea to have these commissioners trained in the language of the country to which they are sent, although it might be considered an intrusion on bi-lingualism. I get the bulletins regularly, and read them very carefully. They contain a lot of useful information for the public, particularly for the manufacturers and business men interested. I have made a point during the past few years of having these bulletins reproduced in the newspapers, in order that they may reach as many people as possible. I have met several of these trade commissioners, and I believe they are doing a good work. Of course, their viewpoint will have to change, and their methods also, on account of the war. I suppose that the war will disarrange a lot of business, and it will rearrange a lot of business also, some to our advantage and some to our disadvantage. It ought to be impressed upon our manufacturers that it will be necessary for them to be ready to grapple with conditions that may exist after the war. A great many of our industries, small as well as large, have been devoting almost their entire attention to the manufacture of munitions, at the request of the Munitions Board. Consequently, they have allowed their staple trade to slip away from them—and, of course, the demand for their staples has decreased. But when the war is over—and we hope it will be over very soon—these manufacturers ought to be in a position, not only to look after the staple trade they had before, but also to secure trade that they have never had up to this time. The trade commissioners, I assume, are and will be very useful in this connection in keeping the department informed as to the new conditions and the requirements of markets which our manufacturers can reach. It is absolutely necessary not only that this information should be given to the department, but that it should be made known to the industrial centres and captains of industry all over the Dominion. I presume that this is done. If I have a word of advice to the minister, it would be to increase efficiency in this respect and to see to it that all such information is placed before the manufacturers. The majority of the trade commissioners with whom I have discussed affairs, are hopeful of a constantly increasing trade—of course, war has unhinged business for the present. But they have found this difficulty, that our manufacturers have not been ready to adapt their output to the requirements of the market. In Australia, let us suppose, the people are in the habit of purchasing certain patterns of goods in certain lines,

4 p.m.

these goods being made elsewhere than in Canada. Some years ago, at any rate, our trade commissioners found it difficult to induce the Canadian manufacturers to change the style of their output to meet the demand of the market in such a case. If our industries are to meet the new situation and to secure trade that they have not yet had our producers must accommodate themselves even to the whims of their customers. I have found that in some countries—and I suppose the minister is aware of this condition—goods of Canadian manufacture are used but those who use them are not aware where they are produced. For one order, I suppose it does not make much difference so long as the manufacturer sells the goods; but for future trade and the development of our industries I think the trade commissioners do good work by keeping as nearly as possible a straight line between the Canadian manufacturer and the foreign consumer. I found, in travelling in Europe, that Canadian goods were becoming better known as such than in former years, largely, I suppose, through the work of the trade commissioners. People there were beginning to learn that these goods were from Canada and were not the product of the distributors from whom they were bought. I approve of this vote for the trade commissioners and would not object to putting on more steam in this service, if it were shown to be desirable. We do not know what is ahead of us; we can conjecture, but we do not know. It may seem discouraging at this time to put on more steam; but we do not know how soon the circumstances may change, and we ought to be ready to take advantage of conditions, whatever they may be, so as to regain any trade we may have lost, to retain what we have, and to secure the trade that will develop under the new conditions. The remarks I wish to make on the other points I reserve until the minister (Sir George Foster) has made his statement.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Graham) are very pertinent to the subject in hand and to the circumstances of the time. In the present dearth of ships and all the confusion resulting from a state of war, it may seem of little use to have trade commissioners in some of the countries in which our commissioners now carry on their work. But I find that there is a very fruitful field to which I am directing their attention and to which they are giving a large part of their time. In other countries, as in our own, great changes are taking place. It is gratifying to know that our manufacturers, large and small, are more and more getting the idea that more things can be made in Canada, and made profitably, and marketed outside of the country as well as within our own borders. There are numerous new industries springing up in Canada to make things which we have not made before. The pressure and discipline of war work have given an impetus to the making of things along new lines. The organization of plant, the extreme nicety of the work that is to be done, has been a drilling and disciplining of our mechanics and our employers as well, and has taught them that they need not despair of being able to produce alongside the manufacturers of any other country. When the workman has a piece of work which he has to get down to the thousandth part of an inch, or perhaps the two-thousandth part of an inch, the completing of that work is an invaluable training.

There are two things that it is of great importance for the manufacturers and artisans of the country to realize: One is that time is always of the essence of the contract, that when a contract is made it should be filled on time; and the other is the necessity of accuracy of make. Many people think: Oh, if this will do the job, no matter whether it is accurately fashioned or not, it will serve. It is an invaluable training and an invaluable aid to our workmen to have instilled into their minds every day the idea of accuracy and of finish, of making an article absolutely according to specification. In this respect changes are taking place in our own country and in other countries, and an important part of the work of our trade commissioners to-day is to watch and follow up these changes and to bring information of them to our own people, with warnings and advice as to changes and means of taking advantage of them. I would not have my hon. friend forget that in addition to our trade commissioners appointed from Canada we also have, under a system recently adopted, the benefit of the services of the Intelligence Department and the Commercial Department of the British embassies in all countries where it is of advantage to us to secure information of this kind. It has been peculiarly satisfactory to see the hearty and enthusiastic way in which these branches of the British Embassies in different parts of the world have taken up this work with regard to Canada. They have given the most valuable information, and have given it with a freedom and a fullness that are all that could be desired. Thus

we must always add a plus to our Canadian trade commissioners when we think of the extension of foreign trade—we must add to our own service the Intelligence Department and the Commercial Department of each British Embassy.

Trade Commissioners, bounties on lead and crude petroleum, to cover expenses in administration of the Act, $5,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is the usual vote. Under the provisions of the Lead Bounties Act no bounties are now being paid on this product as the price of lead is far above the figure at which bounties are to be paid. There is, however, some expense of administration, I think about $500. The other part of the vote is for the supervision of the petroleum bounties, which work still goes on and is confined chiefly to Ontario, under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister will, perhaps, recall representations that were made to him in regard to a bounty on oil produced in Alberta. In the interview that I had with the minister, he explained why a bounty is paid on oil produced in Ontario, but not on oil produced in Alberta. It would be desirable for the minister to explain to the committee the reasons for that distinction, because I feel that, however sound the explanation may be as justifying a method of administration, the policy under which different courses are followed in relation to the two provinces is not susceptible of the same measure of justification. I shall compare the conditions surrounding the production of oil in Ontario and in Alberta. I do not desire to discuss the question of oil bounties on its merits; I am discussing merely the right of the production of one part of the country to share in the same considerations as the production of another part of the country. The idea of the bounty was, I assume, to put the producer of oil in Canada on an equality in supplying the home market with his competitor in the United States, who may be supposed to have some advantages in the matter of cheap production. The production of oil in Alberta, on behalf of which the claim for bounty is made, occurs under circumstances and conditions stupendously more expensive than in Ontario, and if there is any warrant or justification for the payment of a bounty upon oil produced in Ontario, that justification is tremendously stronger in the case of oil produced in Alberta. I understand that in Ontario oil is produced from wells of a depth of less than a thousand feet. In Alberta the wells are three thousand feet deep and cost about three times as much to bore. In addition to that, owing to the broken nature of the formation in which the oil is found, at the foot of the Rocky mountains, there is much greater uncertainty as to striking oil in any particular location, and the rock through which the well must be drilled is of a very difficult character. In the locality southwest of Calgary, where oil is produced, there is no such certainty of striking oil in any given spot as I understand there is in the oil fields in Ontario.

There is, on the contrary, the very greatest uncertainty, so that the production of oil in this locality involves vastly greater expenditure and greater risk of no return, and, therefore, I maintain that, where oil is struck, it is entitled to share on an equality with the oil produced in Ontario, and that, if the law as it stands does not provide for that equality of treatment, it is for Parliament to amend the law so as to give equality of treatment to the production in the two different parts of the country. All the more so because in Alberta the production is in an experimental stage, whereas in Ontario it has been demonstrated for a period of thirty or forty years. I do not wish to make any special plea, or any plea at all, for the Alberta production except for equality of treatment under equal conditions. The fact that the conditions are so greatly to the disadvantage of Alberta substantially strengthens their claim on the ground of justice and desirability of further promoting the exploitation of the possibilities of oil production in that country. It is, as no doubt the minister will be good enough to explain, a mere matter of difference in the quality of the oil produced. It is true the quality of the oil produced in Alberta is higher than that produced in Ontario, but the fact that the law excludes from bounty that quality which is produced in Alberta is merely an incident, and was not, I submit, any part of the original intent of the law. It simply occurs by reason of the phrasing of the provision, and not by reason of any intent to cut out the enterprise of any section of the country from sharing in the same consideration as that which the produtcion of Ontario shares.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Act under which bounties are paid on crude petroleum was passed in 1910, under the regime of my hon. friends who now sit opposite, and I suppose it really was an adjustment as between duties and bounties, that when the duty on imported oil was lowered, the bounty was

given as a recompense to the producer of oil in Canada. I do not think the bounty was put on to stimulate the search for oil, and to develop the industry in Ontario, but rather to offset this reduced protection. If the intention is to carry out a policy designed to stimulate the production of oil, there is no reason why the bounty should be limited to any locality. If, however, the legislation was designed to recompense the producer in Canada for the loss of a protection in the matter of duty on import, and, if at the time the Act was passed, all of our production of oil was in a certain section, there is a basis upon which the present Act rests, which does not necessarily call for equality, as between different sections of Canada. Representations have been made to the departmeent on several occasions upon the subject, and at my last interview with some gentlemen connected with the development in Alberta, I asked them to send me as complete and accurate returns as possible of the wells which were being developed, and of those which were producing, and, generally, information which would enable us to deal with the whole subject. I think it is perfectly fair that, in the case of another development in another part of the Dominion, a difference in specific gravity should not be the determining factor in the payment of a bounty. Some other and better principle should be adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Will the minister give me the information as to bounties paid on zinc at the present time?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is by a special Act passed last year. I am not administering that provision, and have not the information with me, but I shall be pleased to obtain the information.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do I understand the zinc bounties are now in force?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There was an arrangement which was made to stimulate the production of zinc, I think, in British Columbia, and that is a special arrangement. I think there was an enactment passed last year or the year before which carries that out. From my general knowledge, all I can say is that that operation has been very successful, and that the foundation of an industry has been laid, which is developing, and which promises to be permanent, and the price at which the spelter is now provided, under that arrangement, is very much lower than the price for which it could be obtained from other sources.

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. DOUGLAS: I have information in connection with the zinc industry which would lead me to believe that, if the bounty on zinc were continued after the war, a very large plant might be established for concentrating, under the retort process, in the province of Alberta, at the gas fields which are being developed in that province at the present time. The statement has been made that the price of spelter is so high that a bounty is not required to stimulate the industry, but that, after the war, with the large number of smelters established in the United States to take advantage of the demand for zinc at the present time, the competition will be so keen that, unless some stimulus is given to the zinc industry in Canada, the Canadian industry may suffer very materially, and that if a guarantee could be given that the industry would receive some protection for a number of years after the war, a large retort smelter might be established in the province of Alberta, but that, unless such guarantee be given, the large expenditure which would be necessary would cause promoters to be very chary about going into it. The writer of this letter informs me that, at the present moment, he has a large operating company in the United States, ready at any time to build a plant, provided the Dominion Government will give some assurance that, after 1918, which I believe is the time at which the zinc bounty ceases, under the enactment which the hon. minister refers to the guarantee will be continued for two or three years, it would be possible to have an industry of this kind established. The claim is made that, on account of the excessive rate of freight, it is absolutely essential that a very cheap fuel should be used in the smelting operation, and that gas appears to be the only fuel employed that would make it a profitable industry. Without a guarantee from the Government that a bounty would be enjoyed for a number of years after the war, the advisability of establishing a large industry of this kind would be very doubtful.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I imagine that my hon. friend has reference to the bounty upon lead ores. Zinc and lead are intimately connected in many of the British Columbia mines, because zinc is recoverable from the lead ores. There is no general bounty on zinc of itself. The Act under which the bounty is paid upon lead ores will come to an end on June 30, 1918. What I was speaking about was the special arrangement made for the refining of zinc and the manufacture of spelter at the Can-

adian Pacific works at Trail. The bounty was given there for a special purpose—largely for a war purpose—the idea being that it was necessary to make a special arrangement in order to get practical results and to get them speedily. Although a certain bounty was given, the consideration was a minimum price for the product to the manufacture of which the bounty was applied. That product has been utilized in the munition work of Canada. The matter does not come under my department; I am merely giving my impression with regard to it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are the zinc bounties not administered by my hon. friend's department?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No; I think they are under the Militia Department. The lead bounties are under my department.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the legislation not provide for a bounty on zinc?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. Where the two are combined, I suppose the bounty is upon lead-bearing ores.

Mr. MACDONALD: I assume that any one producing merchantable zinc from lead bearing ores would be entitled to receive the bounty. The answer the hon. minister has given to the member for Strathcona would, I assume, apply also to an inquiry which I received the other day from a gentleman in Toronto who is interested in zinc bounties in Nova Scotia. I understand that special arrangements have been made by the Department of Militia with a concern in British Columbia for production at their smelter, and that unless some new legislation is introduced or the bounty extended, the aid now given to the production from lead-bearing ores will expires next year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: What smelters in Canada handle lead-bearing ores?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think they are all in British Columbia.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has the minister considered the desirability and importance of doing anything in the way of extending trade with South America? When the manufacturing nations which are now embroiled in the war shall have set their houses in order, they will proceed to deal with their own trade arrangements on the same basis as before the war. On this continent no effort has been made—not even by United States until very recently—for reaching the tremendous trade of South America. We have not attempted to extend our steam communication on the Atlantic coast south of British Guiana. The great industrial countries of Brazil and the Argentine Republic have maintained their trade conditions, largely on account of their exports to Great Britain and other nations across the Atlantic. After their entry into the war, United States put forth special efforts to capture South American trade. As we are capable of sending our products south from Vancouver on one side of the Dominion, and from the Maritime Provinces on the other, special efforts ought now to be exerted with a view to extending our trade with South America, and, if possible, creating conditions under which after the war we shall have the advantage of the people on the other side of the ocean. However we may be associated in sympathy and sentiment with them, I am quite sure that the Allied nations will, after the war, strain every nerve, without the slightest regard to Canada, with a view to extending their trade. There is no reason why we should not anticipate that. The peaceful war of trade will go on, and if the fates decree that the older continent shall suffer the penalty of being the actual theatre of war, those nations which are more fortunate in that respect should take advantage of existing conditions. I do not criticise the minister for maintaining trade agencies on the other side of the ocean, although they must of necessity mark time until the war is over. But I think the people would support any effort made by the minister—and would consider any money devoted to that end as being well invested—to extend our trade with South America and the West Indies.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: One great difficulty I have always found with regard to trade with South America is the lack of direct communication. You are always at a disadvantage where your trade has to filter through a foreign port, and it tends to get into the hands of a commission business in the foreign port through which the trade filters. Before the war I had taken up especially the possibility of steamship communication between South America and Canada, and had carried on negotiations to a certain extent. Had the war not broken out, I believe they would have been successful, but on the outbreak of war negotiations ceased, and during war time it has been absolutely impossible to have anything like a steamship service between Can-

ada and South America. The war completely disorganized the finances of South American countries for a long time; in fact they have not yet recovered. The system of carrying on trade with South American countries involves a good deal of difficulty and long credits. The United States or any other country that undertakes to do a large export business with South America must have banking arrangements; they are as important as steamship communication. Last night I spoke of the extension of our Canadian banks to the West Indies, and the effect of that on our trade has been very marked. The German policy was to push their banks ahead of their trade, and their banks were their commercial travellers, so to speak. We need in Canada some adaptation of banking facilities which will project that auxiliary to Canadian export trade which is needed everywhere, especially in South America. The necessity for banking facilities of that description is being brought home strongly to the British people to-day, and the result of their cogitations in the matter has been the formation of a very large and influential corporation, which is not assisted financially by Government, but with which the Government is sympathetic. This corporation is given an opportunity of acting in conjunction with the Government in the different countries in which it may establish itself, and to that extent is given the sympathy and the active backing of the Government. It is called a trade corporation, but according to the articles of incorporation, it might just as well be called a banking corporation, because banking is the foundation of the trade and is intermixed with it as a factor or agent. I think a similar organization should be formed in Canada, so that along with the efforts of middlemen, producers and carriers, there would be this most important agent of banking and financial assistance. This matter is now being canvassed by business men throughout the country, and I hope that before the reorganization period we shall make some progress. South America has not been neglected. One of the best and most experienced trade commissioners that we had, Mr. Poussette, was our trade commissioner at Buenos Aires. The year before the war started he made a tour of all the different states of South America, and made a very thorough examination into trade conditions and possibilities. His reports which are excellent, have been distributed everywhere, and they are being studied by our Canadian people. The war intervened, and the work was not brought to the point to which it otherwise would have attained. After Mr. Poussette had finished that tour and published his report, I had him brought to Canada through which he made a tour, and he met the producers and manufacturers face to face and canvassed with them. A year and a half ago Mr. Poussette felt the call of the war and left his post, and he is now engaged in military work in England or at the front. In his place we have a Mr. Webb, a very excellent man who understands the language of the Argentine Republic. Our men occasionally go to South America, and whenever they go they speak very highly about the commissioner there, of the assistance he gives to them and of the reputation he seems to have with the commercial people there. This field is therefore not by any means neglected, and when the war is over I hope we shall be able to get steamship service to South America, and with an organization of the kind I have described, and the co-ordination of trade, here is a great field in South America for certain branches of Canadian products. The people there do not manufacture largely; the countries are rich in possibilities; the better class of the people not only are rich, but indulge their propensities, and are good, generous, heavy traders.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am glad the minister agrees with me as to the wisdom and advantage of looking to South America for trade development, and I quite appreciate the difficulties to be encountered. One of the difficulties would be removed if it were possible, by the Government taking certain exceptional powers with our Canadian banks or in some other way, to provide for an extension of banking facilities in South America. Our brethren in Great Britain, while the war is on, appreciate the necessity of maintaining their trade connection, and by the corporation which has been formed and of which the minister has spoken, they are preparing for the maintenance of the trade which has always existed between the Atlantic states of South America and Great Britain. We ought not to be behind, and I would urge upon the Government the duty of taking up this financial problem and endeavouring to do what is being done in Great Britain.

With regard to the question of shipping, I am sorry the minister is talking about waiting until after the war. I have grown weary of urging on the Government the duty of providing for a Canadian Mercantile marine. If we wait until after the war, we shall

have the greatest difficulty in getting ships for our needs, because the ships of Great Britain, France and our other Allies will be used in maintaining their own trade. Here is this great continent to the south of us with marvellous possibilities. The possibilities of trade are quite as great on the western coast as on the east. The minister has outlined the difficulties; those are the only difficulties, and I would sincerely urge upon the Government the bounden necessity and duty of providing for the conditions I have described. Unless we provide a market on this continent for our natural resources and manufactured products I believe that the expenditure of money for trade expansion in these older countries will not produce any considerable results. The whole world requires our grain and our farm products, and will continue to require them for a great number of years. It will not be necessary to have commissioners to look after that trade; the trade will be there, and it will simply be a question of getting the products to the market. The competition that will arise as soon as the war is over will prevent to a very great degree any expansion of our trade with these older countries. But this great continent to the south of us is the Mecca to which the eyes of the business men of this country should turn. We should bend every possible energy in that direction, by the immediate construction of ships, by the creation of banking facilities, and of trade routes both on the Atlantic and the Pacific, because the people of the United States are our natural buyers, and have a great many commodities to exchange for ours.

Salaries and contingencies under the Inspection and Sale Act, $3,000.

Mr. OLIVER: A few days ago I brought to the attention of the minister a communication which I received from a point in my constituency, in which the secretary of the local branch of the United Farmers of Alberta complained that they were unable to place any orders for binder twine either with the Grain Growers' Grain Company or the T. Eaton Company. The correspondence they had received was to the effect that binder twine was scarce because it had not been possible to secure transportation of the raw material from the seaboard to the point of manufacture. The minister was good enough to send me a memorandum on the subject which, I am sorry to say, bore out the statement made by my correspondent. It would be a very serious condition if there was to be a shortage of binder twine, and I should be glad if the minister would tell us what the situation is.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The general situation has, I think, improved. It has been very difficult, if not impossible, to import the raw material for the binder twine. Hitherto we have received a good deal of binder twine from the United States, but there has lately been some difficulty in having orders placed and filled. I think most of the manufacturers of binder twine in Canada are filling orders. The International Harvester Company, of Hamilton, in a communication in the month of May which I sent to my hon. friend, do not anticipate any shortage of binder twine; I think they provide more than 50 per cent of the output in Canada. Since that time we have had no complaints. We presume that the orders are being filled. A pretty large order for binder twine was placed in the United States by British people, but the twine was not exported from lack of transport. We allowed this to be brought into this country, although it did not comply with the conditions of the Act, as regards tagging and we guarded against its being sold under our own Marking Act by giving it a special tag. By Order in Council 300 or 400 tons of this twine was allowed to come in to help make up the shortage.

5 p.m.

Mr. OLIVER: Has it been distributed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. Since the middle of May we have had no further representations in the matter. Of course, my department simply lends its good offices towards facilitating the supply.

Mr. NESBITT: The only thing wrong with the twine was its short length?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: My correspondent stated that the raw material for binder twine was being held up at ocean ports.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The trouble arose at Seattle. Supplies came in there, but a railway embargo consequent upon the congestion of freight and the lack of cars prevented its quick transport to the factory. I have made inquiries to find where the trouble was but have not yet received definite information. My impression is that the embargo was put on in the United States rather than on our side, and also that the embargo militated against the reception of that material in the binder twine factories

in the United States, and the lack of supply of raw material caused a lack of output.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there a probability of that embargo being lifted?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think it has been lifted. These embargoes are matters which each railway manages for itself, and, of course, we have no jurisdiction over them. Such embargoes are of limited length and are designed to facilitate the movement of some special goods, or to prevent congestion. With our own railways we communicate with them and ask them to facilitate the transport in urgent cases, and this they always try to do.

Mr. OLIVER: Seattle is a common point for our railways, as it is for the railways of the United States. I hope the minister will take measures to find out if the material is still there—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My impression is that the embargo has been lifted.

Mr. OLIVER: —and if it is still there I think some suggestion should be made to the railways to bring it forward. For, while we may not have an over-abundant crop, yet it is early in the season, and we may have a crop so large as to call for a large quantity of binder twine, and in that case it would be a calamity if the raw material were not brought forward so that it could be worked up.

Salaries and contingencies, under the Cullers Act, including an amount of $1,800 for superannuated cullers, $8,500.

Mr. MACDONALD: What does that mean?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is the remnant of an old service in Quebec, which is constantly diminishing and, in the course of a few years, will pass away. A large part of the amount is for the superannuation of the officers.

To provide for the construction, acquisition, leasing or expropriation of terminal elevators, (revote), $810,000.

Mr. NESBITT: None of this was used last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would not be quite right to say that none of it was used, but very little comparatively. The chief item under this vote was to provide for an elevator to be erected at Hudson Bay. It was not gone on with last year, and is not being gone on with this year, further than to complete the foundation.

Mr. NESBITT: Better do without the foundation; just let the thing stop.

[Sir George Foster.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The foundation of the elevator is part of the dock which is being built. It is, of course, economical and wise to prepare this foundation while the work of construction is going on.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the capacity of the proposed elevator?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: About 1,300,000 or 1,400,000 bushels, divided between warehouse and storage, the large part storage. The other expenditures were for the completion of other elevators in such matters as trackage, additional machinery for cleaning, and other items which are counted part of the expenditures on the original construction. We have now five of these elevators, which in cost and capacity are as follows—giving round numbers:

Place.	Capital Cost.	Capacity, Bus.
Port Arthur..	$1,407,000	3,250,000
Saskatoon..	1,129,000	3,500,000
Moosejaw..	1,314,000	3,500,000
Calgary..	872,000	2,500,000
Vancouver	752,000	1,250,000

Mr. NESBITT: I quite agree that, if the Government is going to build an elevator at Hudson Bay, the minister is very wise in preparing the foundation in connection with the construction of the dock, but I appeal to him to do without both the dock and the elevator.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Talk to your neighbour on the left (Mr. Oliver) and find out what he says.

Mr. NESBITT: We will never want it, and it will only be a waste of money like the rest of this enterprise. I appeal to him, as he generally shows common sense in these matters, to stop the expenditure for this year at any rate.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am going this far, that I am spending nothing on the elevator this year except what is necessary for the foundation.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister give us information as to the present and prospective use of the elevator at Vancouver?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have left over a vote for the operation of the grain system, and when that is taken up I will be prepared to give the hon. gentleman full information on this point. Generally I may say at this time that the elevator at Vancouver is finished and thoroughly equipped, and waiting for business. Very little business is offering, of course. The elevator was built in prospect of the trans-

fer of grain from the western part of the plains to the Old Country by way of the Panama canal. But the war has stopped all that. If I had had the preternatural wisdom which seems to be predicated as necessary to a minister of the Crown, had I known five years ago just what would happen in the five years then coming, the Vancouver elevator probably would have been postponed for some time. But I did not know it; we went ahead, and we have that structure ready and waiting.

Mr. OLIVER: No person will find fault with the minister or with the Government for the building of the elevator at Vancouver, although things have turned out unfortunately for the enterprise. I understand that last evening the minister made a statement with reference to the feasibility of shipping grain in bulk through the tropics, a question which will have a very important bearing upon the success of this Vancouver elevator under normal conditions. I would suggest to the minister that, as the climate on the coast is very moist and the moisture is very penetrating, the elevator there should be equipped with the necessary means to ensure the absolute dryness of any grain going out from it for shipment.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It must be remembered that the elevator at Vancouver is a transfer elevator, not a storage elevator. The elevators out of which the grain will go, at Calgary or Moosejaw, are equipped with driers, and the probabilities are that the grain will leave them in good condition. The suggestion of my hon. friend is a good one, and I shall ascertain if the elevator there is equipped with a drier. The installation of a drier is a simple matter.

Mr. KNOWLES: Has the minister yet given consideration to my proposed Bill in connection with the employees of these Government elevators, providing that they should be put on the same footing as employees of ordinary commercial elevators?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Bill is now before the legal advisors of the department.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is the minister's heart sympathetic towards the employees in this regard?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Always towards the employees, but as to the method I should not like to say.

Mr. KNOWLES: Do these elevators make a profit for the Government?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, a good profit.

Mr. KNOWLES: Including interest on the capital?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I should not like to say that. The elevators have been in operation for three or four years, that at Port Arthur a little longer, and the profits now total about $600,000.

Mr. KNOWLES: I presume that the report of the Grain Commission will give a statement of the balance of grain left on hand after the season's operations. When will that report be out?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is now in the printer's hands, giving the figures for the last crop year.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is the surplus left on hand every year substantial, and if so why is it so large?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Unfortunately it is not always on the right side.

Mr. OLIVER: In connection with the interior storage elevators, my hon. friend asked if they had made a profit. They were not built for profit. But owing to the combination system between the Grain Commission and the railway companies, these interior storage elevators should make a profit. They are in the same happy position as the Emperor of Japan when he started a newspaper and issued an order that every subject who did not subscribe would have his head cut off. His paper was, of course, a tremendous financial success. So with these interior storage elevators. The railroads from time to time put an embargo on grain, will not accept grain for any place except the interior storage elevators. If under these circumstances, they cannot produce a profit, they must be very badly conceived or badly managed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think that story must be no better founded than the story of the Emperor of Japan. Is it an historical fact that the Emperor of Japan did that?

Mr. OLIVER: I cannot vouch for that, but I will vouch for the statement that last winter the railway companies did put an embargo on the carriage of grain elsewhere than to these interior storage elevators.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think there is a very good reason for it in some cases.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is the minister going to spend any money constructing elevators other than the Hudson Bay elevator?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does he intend to spend all of the $800,000 on that elevator?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not expect to spend very much of it—probably not a dollar this year.

Mr. MACDONALD: I hope the minister will persevere along that well-intentioned line, although I do not see why we should vote this money in war time.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not going strong on elevators during war time.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why do you take the money?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We do not know what might happen, but it is perfectly safe.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister thinks we can trust him. We will be very canny.

Census and statistics, $100,000.

Mr. OLIVER: In what position are the returns of the census taken last summer, for the three western provinces?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not altogether completed but very nearly so. The schedules of the population have been published and are all complete, with the exception of the returns for Saskatchewan, which are now undergoing some revision.

Mr. OLIVER: Are the returns from Manitoba and Alberta printed yet?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. The acreage report of principal field crops of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta in 1906, 1911 and 1916 is complete. The preliminary bulletin of cities and towns of 1,500 and over has been published. The bulletin of Manitoba has been prepared, giving the population, male and female, and the number of dwellings and families by electoral districts, cities, towns, and incorporated villages, for the last four census years, 1916, 1911, 1906 and 1901, and the principal agricultural statistics of the province, giving area and production for 1915, and the number of animals on farms in 1916 have been published. The bulletin of Alberta, giving the population by electoral districts, cities, towns and incorporated villages for the last four census years, has been published. We have, in course of preparation, the classification of the population in the three provinces, according to origins, religions, nationality, education and occupation; the number of animals purchased and sold alive during 1915, animals slaughtered on farms, dairy products and egg products, fruit and orchard crops and forest production on farms, 1915. This return will soon be ready. Then the postal census of manufactures, 1915, has been published in a bulletin issued December 30, 1916, and the volume is now in press, showing the final results of investigation.

Mr. OLIVER: Was this census as complete as the decennial census?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not as complete because it did not take in the same range of subjects.

Mr. MACDONALD: Have the expenses of the 1911 census been paid?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not all.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is there any work yet to be done?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: Under whose authority is the census taken every five years in certain provinces?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Under the authority of the Act. The subsidies are adjusted for the provinces every five years, and we have to get a census of the population, and we add to it essential information, which is much to be desired.

Mr. OLIVER: What was the length of time occupied in the taking of this census? Its accuracy depends somewhat on the length of time over which the work was spread.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The actual census was taken as of June 1st.

Mr. OLIVER: How long a period was occupied in collecting information?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think about four weeks in the work on the ground.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is it against the rules for persons to make a duplicate list, and hand it to a political organization?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I never heard of it being done.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is it against the rules, or is it being done?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No enumerator, or person connected with the taking of the census, has any right—in fact he is absolutely forbidden—to give any information

to any person, except the department. His oath requires him to obey instructions.

Mr. KNOWLES: It would be a violation of the oath if the enumerator were to make a carbon copy and hand it to a political organization?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He is bound by his oath to give no information, except according to his instructions.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would such an act as I refer to be a violation of his oath?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I would like to look into the matter. My impression is that it would be absolutely against the instructions.

Mr. MACDONALD: What does the minister say in answer to that question?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When it is proved to have been done, I will give an answer.

Canada Year Book, $13,500.

Mr. OLIVER: The Canada Year Book is a very complete statistical statement, in regard to very many interesting subjects, but I have never seen one that was printed within the year. I do not think I have seen one published within two years of its date. The information contained is not available until, approximately, two years after the information had been collected. Is there a possibility of bringing that useful book approximately up to date?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is very difficult to bring it closely to date, for several reasons. Delays in the printing have, sometimes, prevented early publication. We have tried to have the book issued as soon as possible after the compiling of the information. It is somewhat difficult, however, to have it issued immediately upon the conclusion of the year to which it relates. That is so with all year books. I am glad that my hon. friend believes it to be a good book. The information that I get from those who receive it, in other countries as well as in Canada, is that it takes a high place amongst the various year books that are published. Of course, a year book is designed not so much to give current information as to illustrate sources of information; to give actual information that is current at a certain time, and to put it in permanent form. We did make an improvement last year in the way of getting the book out earlier; whatever can be done this year will be done.

Mr. OLIVER: Admitting that the book is a matter of record, I think there is no doubt that the longer its publication is delayed the less its value becomes. I know of somewhat similar publications that are quite up to date. For instance, that standard work, the Canadian Almanac, which contains a great deal of information, is brought almost absolutely up to date. There is, no doubt, a difference in the character of the two publications, but what has been done by the Canadian Almanac in that regard shows what is possible. If the minister appreciates the immediate value of the Year Book, I am sure that he can, by giving attention to the matter, make such arrangements as will bring it out within a very few months of the year to which it relates. As to the printing, surely that is not a matter of delay. There is a magnificent printing establishment across the canal, and there are 10,000 capable and well-equipped printing offices throughout the country, all anxious to do the work at fair prices, a large proportion of them entitled to such patronage as the Government is able to give them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did take a personal interest in the year-book, because it is a child of my fancy. I have done my best to improve it and to bring it out in better time. I am now discussing with my officers the advisability of combining two years' information in the next year's publication, bringing it up to date, and keeping it up to date ever afterwards. This may have a little to recommend it in the way of economy, besides putting us in a position to do more prompt work.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: How many copies are printed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: 9,000 in English, 2,000 in French.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who is the editor?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Godfrey.

Mr. MACDONALD: How long has he been connected with it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He was formerly with the Agriculture Department, but when Census and Statistics came to my department, he came with them. He is a very efficient officer. He is also editor of the Monthly Statistics Bulletin.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: How many copies of the Year-book are distributed outside of Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not a list with me. We send them to libraries and we exchange, pretty generally and quite generously, with other Governments.

Dominions Royal Commission, $10,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is to provide for Canada's share of the expense of printing and for looking after what little odd things may yet remain. The Dominions Royal Commission has finished its work and made its final report. Later I shall ask the House to listen to an explanation as to what its work has been.

Mr. MACDONALD: When will the minister make that statement?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When we take up the item that is left, with regard to grain.

Mr. MACDONALD: When the minister was putting through his Estimates last winter, he made a similar assurance with regard to grain; but during the whole session we heard nothing more about grain. I think that the minister should before this have made a statement as to the work of the Dominions Royal Commission. The minister's services in that connection carried him all over the world. The report of the Commission is contained in a large number of volumes which it is difficult for members of the House to study in detail. The statement that only the minister could give with regard to the work that the Commission has accomplished would have been of very great benefit to members of the House in considering many of the problems that came before them. I hope that the minister will not do as he did last year; I hope that he will come back to us in regard to this matter.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will not leave you this year.

Mr. MACDONALD: When will my hon. friend make the statement? He ought to fix a time. Why not to-morrow?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think I can do it to-morrow. I will do it at no very distant date, and I will give the House information as to the time. It struck me that the better time to give an exposition of the work of the Dominions Royal Commission would be when the report of that body had been laid upon the Table, so that I could impress upon the minds of such facile members as my hon. friend the lesson that I wanted to teach, and so that I could point him to the document itself.

Mr. MACDONALD: A good many of those documents are around now—I have seen half a dozen of them—and we have been waiting for my hon. friend to tell us something about the work of the Commission. We read in the English papers what the commissioners there have said about it; but although my right hon. friend in the Budget debate and on other occasions discussed the trade conditions of the country, he has not yet given the House and the country the benefit of his experience as to that commission. We are always glad to facilitate the passage of the minister's Estimates, but last year, although we were told we would have an account of the commandeering of grain the session came to an end and we never heard anything about it. I hope the minister is not going to treat in the same way this wonderful Royal Commission on which he worked so hard. Perhaps hon. gentlemen on his side voted wrongly on tariff matters and other things of that kind because my hon. friend did not give us the benefit of his wonderful experiences. I beg my hon. friend not to postpone his statement too long. We all know we are going into a contentious debate next week. The House is in a congenial mood to-day, and if the members heard that the minister was to speak on the subject of the Royal Commission to-morrow, we would have a large audience.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think I can give my statement to-morrow, but I will not keep my hon. friend away long from that fountain of inspiration.

Mr. KNOWLES: No minister can instruct and entertain this House so ably and successfully as the Minister of Trade and Commerce, both because of his natural endowments and because of the travels which, as a matter of strict duty, have fallen to his lot during former years. The minister has covered the greater part of the globe in the performance of his duties, and we, who stay at home, would be delighted to have an account of the interesting things he has seen and heard during his travels. He has travelled not altogether in his personal capacity, but as the representative of the Government and Parliament of Canada. Last year after he had taken part in the Paris Conference, on his return to Canada he toured this country and gave the people the advantage of his very interesting addresses. He came very near my own city, giving the people of Regina an account of his travels. In this House, we discuss matters that are hum-drum and matters that are grave, and next week we shall enter upon a debate that will be extremely serious. I think, therefore, it would be

informing and refreshing if we could have from the minister at a very early date an account of all the sight-seeings he must have had.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I certainly cannot withstand that appeal; I will make my statement at the earliest possible opportunity.

Gold and Silver Marking Act, $4,000.

Mr. OLIVER: In some of the papers I have seen complaints in regard to the working out of this Act. Have any such complaints come to the attention of the minister?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, the Act is working very well. It is under the supervision of Mr. W. J. Ryan, a very faithful and competent officer.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is there any officer in the West?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. KNOWLES: The trouble seems to be in the West where travelling pedlars sell their goods, and the legitimate dealers, in order to have the Act invoked, must take steps through Ottawa, and that takes up so much time that the purpose of the Act is rendered ineffective. It would be better if some officer were established at Winnipeg to whom legitimate dealers in the western towns might apply.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Representations to that effect have been made, but the Act seems to be working pretty successfully as it is.

Mr. OLIVER: In the instance I mentioned the complaint was that in actual operation the Act had worked in favour of articles not of sterling character.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That complaint was fairly well founded at first, but an amendment made to the Act two years ago remedied that.

West India cable, $38,933.33.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is the yearly subsidy that we pay, Great Britain paying an equal amount, and the people of the West Indian islands paying £10,000 a year. It resulted from the arrangement we made, which has as its effect the cheapening of cable rates between Great Britain and the West Indies and Canada and the West Indies.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is the cable state-owned or privately owned?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The cable is owned by a company. There were two or three companies originally, one owning a cable from Halifax to Bermuda and one amongst the islands themselves. We got these companies together in London and put them under certain conditions which they have fulfilled, and as they fulfilled those conditions and made the reductions, a certain subsidy was paid. The full subsidy is paid for four years. If after that period the profits are large, a portion of them come back until the subsidies which have been paid are paid off. There have been very considerable reductions in the rates.

Mr. MACDONALD: The time for re-payment has not yet arrived.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is one year more to run.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the southern terminus of this cable?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The cable runs through all the islands.

Mr. OLIVER: Does it go to Guiana?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It runs from Halifax to Bermuda by the Halifax-Bermuda Cable Company; thence to Jamaica by the Direct West Indies Company; thence to the several islands and British Guiana by the West Indies and Panama Company.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: What is the total amount to be paid next year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: $38,000 is the amount of the subsidy.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: I understood there is only one more year to run.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: After that it was supposed that the company's lines would be more profitable, under the new arrangement and with the betterment of the cables, and all profits over and above a certain amount were to be shared equally and the moiety to be paid back to Great Britain and Canada.

Supervision Lake and Ocean Freight Rates, $6,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There has been no appointment and no expenditure under this item up to the present time. Things have been so absolutely confused during the last three years that I have made no appointment.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Indians—British Columbia, $166,050.

Mr. GRAHAM: Difficulty seems to have existed for some time with regard to the Indians of British Columbia. A deputation of the Indians waited on the Government about a week ago, and I am not sure that they did not go so far as to carry their case to the foot of the Throne, at least they sent a delegation to the Mother Country. Can the minister tell us what steps have been taken to settle the difficulty, and what is the position of the matter at the present time?

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Superintendent General of Indian Affairs): The question involved is really that of the title to Indian lands in British Columbia. There has been a dispute for many years between the British Columbia Government and the Indians as to the Indian title; in fact, I understand, some of the Indians go so far as to claim the whole of the land of British Columbia—that is, they say that their title has never been extinguished. It was because of these difficulties that my predecessor in the Superintendent Generalship appointed a commission to investigate the reserves in British Columbia. In 1913, an Order in Council was passed providing that if the Indians would abide by the decision of an impartial tribunal as to reserves, the full question of the Indian title would be submitted to the Privy Council, through the ordinary course. This impartial tribunal was to ascertain, with regard to each band of Indians in the province, whether the area of its reserve was large enough for the band or not. In case the reserve was found to be too small, the British Columbia Government promised to increase its area by the addition of provincial lands; and if the reserve was found to be larger than necessary for the band, the area was to be cut down accordingly. For many years the Indians have been trying to get an appeal to the Privy Council, but the British Columbia Government did not approve of having the case submitted in that way. Neither our predecessors in Government nor ourselves were able, for a time, to bring the British Columbia Government to agree to submit the case. We pledged ourselves, if the terms of the Order in Council were carried out, to have a reference to the Privy Council, and the British Columbia Government consented to the same. The findings in regard to the reserves have been made, and are to be approved by the British Columbia Government and the Dominion Government. Of course, Mr. O'Meara, counsel for some of the Indians, takes the position that these findings should be submitted to the Indians for their consideration before they are submitted to either Government. I think that is a fair statement of the dispute with the Indans whom Mr. O'Meara is representing. There are many Indians in British Columbia who are willing to adhere to the terms of the Order in Council and to abide by the findings of the commission, and to have the appeal as to the title of the land carried through the ordinary course.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is it very near a settlement?

Mr. ROCHE: Not so far as the Privy Council is concerned.

M. BOULAY (Rimouski) (texte): Monsieur le Président, je voudrais avoir de l'honorable ministre de l'Intérieur, certaines informations au sujet du personnel des employés supérieurs de son département. J'ai fait une liste des noms des principaux officiers qui reçoivent un salaire de $2,400 à $6,000 par année et dans cette liste, qui comprend vingt-sept noms, je ne relève que les noms de trois Canadiens français.

Je désirerais savoir de l'honorable ministre si, lorsqu'il a pris la charge de son département, cet état de choses existait.

Comme il ne semble y avoir personne pour me répondre en français, je répéterai mes observations en anglais.

I will now repeat in English the effect of my remarks. I would like to have from the minister certain information. I find from a list I have made up of the superior officers of his department, that out of twenty-seven officers who receive high salaries—from $2,400 to $6,000—there are only three bearing French-Canadian names. I would like to know if that condition existed when he took charge of the department, or whether it is a condition that he has made since taking charge. I made some remarks on the same line when the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture were before the committee, showing that out of nineteen highly-paid officers in that department, only one bore a French-Canadian name. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) took it upon himself to say that this was a fair proportion for us. It is a real disgrace that a mem-

ber from the province of Quebec, representing a French county, should come here and say, in the face of such evidence as that, that we have our share of the public positions. This state of affairs should not be, in view of the number of French-Canadians in this country, for it indicates the belief that we have not French-Canadians qualified to occupy good positions in the Civil Service.

It is not because I covet those positions for my fellow-countrymen, not at all; but it seems to be a discrimination that should not exist, and a knowledge of that discrimination amongst our countrymen predisposes them to anger, and puts them into such a spirit that sometimes they are more than mad, and with reason. Hereafter, when inquiry is made why the French-Canadians of the province of Quebec are not always pleased with what is done, we may find the explanation of their attitude by looking a little more sharply into the way in which they are used and have been used. I do not blame this Administration more than its predecessors, because I think that if we have lost ground we lost more ground during the previous Administration than during this one. In fact, when the Laurier Government came into power in 1896, we had four deputy ministers in different departments of the Government at Ottawa, and when we came into power in 1911 we found only one. That shows that the Government preceding this is largely guilty of the conditions that we found when we came into power, and that may be the reason why the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) the other day so strongly defended the Minister of Agriculture, saying that he was giving us almost real fair play. I do not want to insist any longer on this question.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are you not given fair play?

Mr. BOULAY: I am getting fair play in saying what I say because nobody can say it is not true; I have the figures here before me; they are taken from the Auditor General's report, and cannot be contradicted. Every one in this House has a right to state the facts and I have stated them in order to show that I am right when I claim and when we claim that we do not receive entire justice, as we should. I should like to know from the minister if this condition existed in his department when he took charge of it.

Mr. ROCHE: Of course, we do not make appointments to the Inside Service; they have to come through the Civil Service Commission. Those positions are open to French Canadians just as to English-speaking persons, and if they do not come up and pass the examinations the Government cannot be blamed for their not doing so. In the Indian Department there has been no change, and certainly there has been no intended discrimination against any nationality. As a matter of fact, there are only six more employees in the Indian Department, both Inside and Outside Service, than in 1911. There is no more relative disproportion to-day in the Inside Service of the Indian Department than when this Government came into power.

Mr. OLIVER: I desire to bring to the attention of the minister certain allegations which have been forwarded to me for the purpose of being brought to his attention, in relation to the Okanagan Indian reserve. I presume that these matters have some relation to the commission which was under discussion a few minutes ago. At any rate, my information is that certain complaints were made by the Indians in December, 1916, and were forwarded by them to the commissioner, J. A. J. McKenna, but up to the present time my information is that no satisfactory action has been taken in regard to these many matters. The complaints as set out are very long. They include:

1. That Chief Baptiste Logan was deposed without cause. 2. That no complaint or charge was ever brought to the attention of the band against him. 3. That Inspector Cumminskie's sole reason for opposition to the chief was that Baptiste had opposed the illegal deal for the surrender of the Long Lake Indian Reserve, Inspector Cumminskie having been one of the interested parties to this deal. 4. That the election of Pierre Michell, conducted by Inspector Cumminskie and Agent Smith, from Kamloops, was a strictly unlawful election in which every right of the band was set aside, and by right of authority a disreputable chief was thrust on the band. 5. That reports sent to the department by the officials who engineered this election were deliberately false reports. 6. That Pierre Michell (the chief who was elected in the place of Logan) did not secure a majority vote. 7. That he was not elected by acclamation as reported by Inspector Cumminskie or the agent from Kamloops, if he made a report on the proceedings.

Another complaint is:

1. That members of the band have been unjustly deprived of their rights to election for the position of chief without just cause. 2. That members of the band have been forcibly expelled from public business meetings of the band without just cause, by order of Inspector Megraw.

Another complaint is:

1. That the matter of the Henderson lease was and is a criminal invasion of all the rights

of the band. 2. That Alexander Henderson's agreement was criminal and illegal. 3. That Inspector Megraw's conduct in connection with this matter was directly in variance with his duties as Inspector of Agencies and directly opposed to the will and best interests of the band.

Another complaint is:

That Inspector Megraw exceeded his authority in forcing the man Henderson's presence on the reserve under the provision of a strictly illegal agreement between a Nichola Indian, a non-member of the band, and a white man.

Another complaint is:

1. Inspector Megraw's reports regarding the incompetence of Chief Gaston, immediately following the chief's refusal to countenance the fraudulent lease to Henderson, calls for the strictest investigation. 2. That Inspector Megraw has acted in an underhand manner with the chief; has animated his personal spleen against chief. That no charge has been brought against the chief at any meeting. 3. That Inspector desires the removal of the chief solely on personal grounds and to secure the election of a chief amenable to officials. 4. That inspector has encouraged and favoured men on the reserve known to be openly hostile to the chief.

Another complaint is:

That railway rights of way have been granted through various reserves of the band and the band kept in ignorance of these transactions.

That band funds from the proceeds of right-of-way of these railways have been unlawfully distributed to non-members of the Okanagan band, to the amount of several thousand dollars.

The sixth charge is:

That officials have permitted for years the fencing of large areas of our reserve for range purposes, said ranges being exploited for individual profit.

The seventh charge is:

1. That promiscuous cutting of timber has been permitted. 2. That individual half-breeds have been granted permission to remove hundreds of thousands of feet, for personal profit. 3. That no adequate return has been made. 4. That a complete return of all timbers sold, and money paid, amounts to whom paid, for the past five years, shall be procured on commission to band.

The eighth charge is:

1. That for years against the repeated protests of the band, undesirable characters, American half-breeds, American Indians, Indians from local reserves, have been permitted to intrude upon our reserve. 2. That no action has ever been taken on the many complaints made that they have received every comfort and consideration from officials. 3. That the intruding element has almost exclusive control of all our business. 4. That they openly boast of our helplessness to have them removed. 5. That they openly defy the authority of the chief. 6. That Inspector Megraw and J. R. Brown are fully aware of the criminal characters. 7. That Inspector Megraw has approved of threatened criminal violence expressed by this element. 8. That 90 per cent of all troubles on reserve is caused by this intruding element, trespassing on our reserve. 9. That the band demands a thorough investigation, and the expulsion of all undesirable characters from our reserve. All reports regarding any claim of half-breeds having been approved as members of the band, with dates of such, if any.

The ninth charge is:

That inspector and agent persist in continual employment of Isaac Harris, charged as false interpreter. Cummiskie's principal agent in attempt of sale and illegal surrender of Long Lake Reserve. That favours are granted this man at expense of band, knowing that the band holds this man guilty of the most serious crimes. That a special grant for competition was made for his benefit, and his employment is detrimental to the band's interest. That Inspector Megraw has persistently employed men as special policemen, whom he knew to be openly hostile to the chief and the Okanagan Indians.

The tenth charge is:

1. That Inspector Cummiskie allowed encroachment on our reserve at Priest's valley, surveying portions of reserve to adjoining property. 2. That reserve at Swan Lake has been encroached on by adjoining owners.

The eleventh charge is:

1. That the local officials have overlooked the procuring of young girls for immoral purposes. 2. That Pierre Michel procured the young daughter of Lena Helleen for the use of Alexander. 3. That nothing was done in the matter beyond Inspector Megraw informing Alexander he should be in jail.

The twelfth charge is:

That Alexander, a Nichola Indian, unlawfully secured and was paid $2,700 of the Okanagan band funds which was squandered by Alexander in automobiles and young girls.

The thirteenth charge is:

1. That Inspector Megraw has had cognizance of open threats to personal violence and murder of our present secretary, Mr. J. H. Christie, by one Frank Godfpresen, an American intruder on the reserve with criminal record. 2. That when Inspector Megraw's attention was called to this matter he fully approved of the crime.

The fourteenth charge is:

Mrs. Josephine Edwards, of Coyote Creek, Indian Reserve charged that Jimmy Logan, an Indian on Head of the Lake Reserve, stole two horses from the open range on the reserve, the property of the complainant. That Inspector Megraw refused to allow Agent Brown to investigate. That he refused to assist her to secure the horses; that he protected Logan for this theft.

The fifteenth charge is:

That Mary Nicholas of Head of Lake Indian Reserve charges Johnny Ophheimer, an American half-breed and professional gambler, with the abduction of her daughter from her husband, Patrick Johny, of Enderby. That he took her to the States for two years, that he returned here two years ago and lives openly on reserve with my daughter as his wife. That he threatens to take my girl away and I will

never see her again, if I make any trouble for him.

The sixteenth charge is:

That since the retirement of Mr. McKay, as Indian agent, who was held in the highest regard by every Indian on our reserve, and whose memory we all respect, we have received no consideration, instruction or assistance in any manner whatsoever, from any official in connection with the Indian Department.

These charges were formulated at a meeting at Black Town, on December 23, 1916. In the same action complaint was made that certain payments were made, as follows:

Moneys paid to Hermoin Gregoire, $752.50; moneys paid to Joseph Jimy, $703.19, both men are intruders on reserve Shuswap Indians; to Alexander Chilahista, $2,763.50, a Necklo Indian (all non-members of the Okanagan Band. Information at hand regarding Duck Lake Reserve, Mrs. Christina McDougal, to whom $570 was paid, is a white woman by marriage, no right on reserve. The distribution of the 50 per cent of the sum of $2,043.90 is not credited by the band—have no knowledge of this. On this distribution by agent, they wish the questions asked for information, the individuals' names and amounts paid.

They ask for information in regard to this distribution, and wish to know the amounts paid, and the individuals to whom they were paid. I am simply placing before the minister the statement which has been forwarded to me.

Mr. ROCHE: By whom is it signed?

Mr. OLIVER: A gentleman who signs as secretary of the Indian meeting, J. H. Christie. The allegations are of a serious character, and were made long ago, and apparently they have not been acted upon by the department; and the only thing for me to do is to place them before the minister in the most public manner, in order that there shall be a show-down and a conclusion of this affair, and that these charges shall be absolutely proven or disproven. If disproven, the parties to such terrible accusations should be punished. If they are proven, it will indicate a terrible condition of affairs in the administration in my hon. friend's department. It is certainly desirable that no condition should exist which would in any way justify such statements as I have felt compelled to place before the House.

Mr. ROCHE: Unfortunately, I have been given to understand that there are at least two factions among the Indians, and this man Christie, who prefers these charges, is not an angel. If my information about him is correct, he is a most unreliable individual, and no credence can be placed upon any charges he sends to any member of this House. In fact, he has written a number of very impertinent communications, threatening that if we did not take action he would have the matter aired on the floor of Parliament. Some of the charges which he has forwarded here are, on their face, so absurd that their falsehood is patent to anybody. A number of these charges have been brought to the attention of the department before, and others have never been placed before the department. It is true they were referred to Mr. McKenna for investigation, but about that time Mr. McKenna was superannuated, which stopped the investigation. He is not now an official of the department. Inspector Brown is not an appointee of this Government. If any such conditions as have been mentioned prevailed under his agency, I admit that it would be most discreditable. No agent should be allowed to hold his agency if he permitted that condition of affairs to exist. But I have too much confidence in Mr. Brown's uprightness and in his ability as an Indian agent to believe that he would allow these things to happen without bringing them to the attention of the department. There have been certain abuses on that reserve. Our Chief Inspector for the province, Mr. Ditchburn, is there for the purpose, among other things, of investigating charges that were referred to the department. Mr. Ditchburn is a good inspector who has had long experience and he has full authority to investigate the conditions in this reserve. I should be pleased to place in his hands any charges that he is not in possession of, in order that he may investigate them. But I fancy that a great many of these apparently serious charges will, when investigated, be shown to be figments of the imagination, if not of Mr. Christie, at least of some others on that reserve.

Mr. OLIVER: I shall be very glad if it turns out that these charges are unfounded. But I have to make the reflection on my friend's administration that these charges were made in the fall of 1916, and the minister should surely be informed by this time as to what foundation there was for them. As to Mr. Brown, if he was appointed by the previous Government and if this condition prevails upon the reserve, undoubtedly he should cease to be in the employ of the department—he could not cease soon enough to please me. It will be noticed that the complaints seem to be directed rather against his superior Mr.

Megraw. I do not know who Mr. Megraw is, but the blame seems to be laid upon him. I hope that Mr. Ditchburn has authority not only to inspect, but also to adjust these matters, to prevent trespass upon the reserve, and to decide who is entitled to be a member of the band and to share in the benefits of that membership. This is a matter that should be settled on the ground by a man of sufficient judgment and responsibility. These very serious assertions, if there is any foundation for them, constitute a grave scandal against the Indian Department, and the minister did not do himself or the country justice in not taking more prompt means to clear them up. I do not know Mr. Christie; he may be good or he may be bad, that is not the question. The question is, do these things exist or do they not? The welfare of the Indians and the good faith and good name of Canada are in my hon. friend's hands. I hope that he will not treat the matter lightly simply because Mr. Christie may be, in some degree, an undesirable person. I hope that he will recognize the importance of the proper discharge of the country's responsibilities to its wards, through the medium of his department.

Mr. ROCHE: There will be a thorough investigation and our inspector will have power to remedy anything that is wrong.

Mr. OLIVER: I may as well place before the department some other matters contained in this correspondence which relates to other reserves. There is a charge in regard to the West Bank reserve. I am not aware of what reserve that is, or whether it is part of the Okanagan reserve. The first charge is:

> That one Galfeately has with the apparent approval of our agent, Mr. Brown, and Inspector Megraw, diverted, taken from our reserve, by flume, all the water which we have used for the purpose of irrigation on the reserve from Cedar Creek. That flume was built over and part in the ditch, constructed by us 45 odd years since.

The second charge is:

> That white men's fences have been allowed to encroach upon the reserve at West Bank. That similar encroachment has been permitted on upper reserve. Repeated requests to agent to have fences removed. Nothing done to date.

The removal of a number of men from the Okanagan reserve is requested. They are referred to as Indians from the United States and local British Columbia half-breeds and Indians, their names being as follows:

[Mr. Oliver.]

Frank Godfresson, Jimmy Marchell, Willie Ashton, Louise Brasere, Frank Marchand, Pere Louie, Alex Sen, Johny Martins, Narcisse Baptist, Luke, Pere Like, John Ophenheirmer, Joe Parker, Ernest Brewer, Bono, Alexander, Alex Edward, Billy Brewer, Billy Lixard, Francois Gregoir, Paul Nelson, Basil Smithins, Isaac Harris, Jimmy Logan, Scottie, Louie Chacko, Pere Michell, Billie Swallwall.

These are claimed to be intruders in the Okanagan reserve. There is also a complaint here of irregularities in the surrender or expropriation of the Trout Creek experimental farms, in respect of the method of valuation and the amount paid. It is asserted that the matter was not placed fairly before the band and that Inspector Megraw threatened the displeasure of the Government upon those opposing the surrender. With regard to the railway right of way, they want to know the area, the valuation, the amount paid and to whom it was paid. There is also a query in regard to water deflected from Snake Creek and a complaint of trespass on and deflection of all water from the reserve adjoining the townsite. This complaint is signed by Mitchell Jack and Cosmos Sam. The Indians of the Salmon River reserve also complain that there has never been any effort on the reserve to prevent crimes and to secure order. They claim that the impracticability of meeting the agent at Enderby has not been considered by the officials of the department; that the Chief maintains an American Indian on the reserve and that they desire his removal as an undesirable trouble-maker. They complain that moneys for furnishing church or for sale of logs is not accounted for; that Enderby men receive permission to cut their timber; that their timber is not conserved; that a resident of Enderby has by permission fenced a great portion of remaining timber on reserve and claims personal ownership. The Indians at Salmon River Indian Reserve signing this complaint are: William Nonish, Jim Haskit, Jimmy Felix, George Potice, Andrew Morris , François Thom, Alex Nahaskit, Mc Phillips, Dan Phillips, Dennis Jim, Harry Bill, Billie Felix, Andrew George. I am aware of the impossibility of satisfying all the varying demands and aspirations of the Indians on the different reserves, but apparently in connection with the latter matters that I have mentioned, there is a question of encroachment of outsiders upon the reserves and of intruders in the ranks. These are matters of administration and claim the careful consideration of the department.

Indian education, $734,115.

Mr. OLIVER: Is any capital expenditure included in this item?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. OLIVER: This is simply to carry on the schools for another year?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister make some statement in regard to Indian education?

Mr. ROCHE: The appropriation for this year is divided as follows:

Residential schools.		Per capita grant.	
Ontario,	Boarding schools	$35,200	
	Industrial schools	51,000	
			$ 86,200
Manitoba,	Boarding schools	68,805	
	Industrial schools	27,950	
			96,755
Sasktchewan,	Boarding schools	67,425	
	Industrial schools	29,250	
			96,675
Alberta and N. W. T.	Boarding schools	104,725	
	Industrial schools	23,400	
			128,125
British Columbia	Boarding schools	50,600	
	Industrial schools	73,320	
			123,920
Yukon	Boarding schools	7,000	
			7,000
Total per capita grant, residential schools			$538,675

Day Schools.	Teachers' salaries	
Ontario	$22,425	
Quebec	14,515	
Nova Scotia	5,400	
New Brunswick	5,000	
Prince Edward Island	600	
Manitoba	22,000	
Saskatchewan	16,620	
Alberta and N. W. T.	3,400	
British Columbia	35,590	
Yukon	3,700	
Total salaries teachers, day schools		129,250
Inspector British Colombia schools:		
Salary and Expenses		2,500
Assistance to ex-pupils		8,000
Buildings and repairs		55,690
Total appropriation, 1917-1918		$734,115

In the year 1910 a new arrangement was entered into by this Government with the various denominations which have charge of these schools. The schools were divided into three classes. A certain standard as to accommodation, equipment, etc., was decided on at a conference between the Government and the different denominations, and the denominational schools which complied with this standard received the highest per capita grant. Then there were departmental schools on which the department had stood the original outlay and which were to be brought up to this standard. Then there were the class 2 churcn schools, somewhat inferior in character and quality, which did not draw as large a per capita allowance as the other two classes. This has increased the grant for education considerably by materially increasing the per capita grant, and by raising the standard of the schools and giving more room, better equipment, and more sanitary methods. Any schools that are under that system are most creditable indeed. The pupils are attending the schools in increasing numbers. We have put a check on capital expenditure during war time, and are simply keeping the schools in repair, although we have been strongly pressed to make capital expenditures by denominational schools at various points where they are really in want of better accommodation.

Mr. OLIVER: I am in sympathy with the minister in his decision not to invest

in any capital expenditure during war time. The Anglican bishop of Athabaska, however, has brought to my attention the fact that the increased cost of the necessaries of life is pressing very heavily upon the resources of the church having charge of the schools in his diocese. I understand that he has applied to the department for some recognition of the more difficult conditions. Has any such application been made, and if so, has any recognition been granted?

Mr. ROCHE: Requests of that description have come from that bishop and from several other bishops. They say that the present high cost of living is such that the existing per capita grant is not sufficient to prevent them from going behind. In some instances we have been asked to make up the deficit. We have not done so as yet, and we have not promised just at present to increase the grant.

A delegation of representatives of almost all the schools was to have interviewed the department some time ago about this matter, but they did not turn up according to programme. So far we have not passed favourably on any requests for increased assistance.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know that I would suggest to the minister either the assumption of deficits or any very large increase in the grants, but it is a fact that in the north country especially, where the cost of living is at a maximum and transportation very expensive in proportion to the amount of actual supplies consumed, the present conditions bear very heavily upon the schools, and I would respectfully suggest that temporary assistance in the way of a grant be given to them to meet the increased cost of the actual food consumed. It could be a special grant during this period of stress.

Mr. ROCHE: Per capita?

Mr. OLIVER: It would, of course, be per capita. I think the department would not be doing substantial injustice to the country at large if it specially recognized the schools in that part of the country where the difficulties of carrying on the work are so great. If the minister saw fit to consider this suggestion favourably in respect of the schools in the Anglican and Roman Catholic dioceses of Athabasca and Mackenzie, assistance would have to be given as soon as possible because supplies for the winter are now going forward. The other schools which are accessible by rail could be dealt with at any time, but the schools in the more remote outposts of civilization, where the work is particularly arduous and expensive, have to make their arrangements very far in advance, and it would really be deplorable if, the department having decided to assist them, the assistance came too late to benefit the schools this year.

Mr. ROCHE: I will consider my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. KYTE: Has a teacher been engaged for the Indian school at Salmon River in the place of Ernest McNeil, who resigned a few months ago?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, Miss Maud E. Brennan. I think she is there now.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the curriculum at these Indian schools? What standard of education are the pupils supposed to reach?

Mr. ROCHE: I understand that the Indian schools are conducted on much the same lines as the public schools of the province. The teachers have to be qualified under the provincial laws, and it is sometimes rather difficult to get them for isolated places, but we do the very best we can. The same subjects are taught as in the public schools, and the same text books are used. The schools are inspected by the public school inspectors, and the pupils are supposed to come up to the standard required by the provincial educational authorities.

9 p.m.

Mr. McKENZIE: Have the pupils any aptitude for arithmetic, reading and writing? How long do they continue their studies, and what are the results obtained in these schools? I do not for a moment suggest that we should drop them, but I wish to know whether the Indians appreciate the educational advantages placed at their disposal. There are small Indian schools in my part of the country, but they are not up to the high school standard. Is it the same in other provinces? Do any of the pupils take up teaching themselves?

Mr. ROCHE: It varies with the different provinces. I believe the Indian schools in Ontario have been very successful, the pupils attending school about as long as the pupils at the public schools, and sometimes competing with the white children in the entrance examinations for the high schools. I do not think the Indian schools in Nova Scotia have been quite as successful, but on the whole we cannot complain very much about the results. In the Maritime Prov-

inces the attendance has not been so good as in some of the other provinces.

Mr. MARCIL: What about the Indian schools in Quebec? Are their studies confined to one language?

Mr. ROCHE: In the province of Quebec there are twenty-eight day schools. There are 609 boys on the roll, and 647 girls, total 1,256. The average attendance is 802. There are no boarding or industrial schools in that province. In the French districts the Indians are taught in French, and in the essentially English districts in English.

Mr. MARCIL: To what districts does the minister refer as English districts?

Mr. ROCHE: Such as Caughnawaga and Oka.

Mr. MARCIL: What about the schools in Bonaventure county?

Mr. ROCHE: I have not that information before me.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister give me information on that point later?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the position of the school at Hay River on Great Slave lake?

Mr. ROCHE: They have put up a new school quite recently at their own expense. There are 25 pupils, and they get the usual per capita grant of $125, and have drawn, on that account, $3,125.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any special reason why there should not be industrial schools in the East as well as in the West?

Mr. ROCHE: I do not know of any reason.

Mr. MARCIL: Industrial education is coming to be recognized as a necessity.

Mr. ROCHE: They have not sent in requests for these schools.

Mr. MARCIL: Does not the minister think that the department should take the lead in this matter, the Indians being the wards of the Government? If the Indians made a success of the industrial life as a result of proper training of the young in their schools, it would be a great credit to the departmeent.

Mr. ROCHE: Perhaps the Indians are getting more civilized——

Mr. MARCIL: But civilization goes hand in hand with industrial efficiency. The trained man is more useful to society than the untrained. I think this matter is well worthy of consideration.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there an industrial school at Fort Simpson carried on by the Roman Catholic church?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. OLIVER: Then, Fort Providence is the furthest north school?

Mr. ROCHE: There are schools at Hay River, Fort Resolution, and Fort Providence.

Mr. OLIVER: Nothing below Fort Providence?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the standing of the Fort Providence school?

Mr. ROCHE: There are sixty-five pupils, and they get the usual grant.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a school at Fort Resolution?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes—sixty pupils.

Mr. OLIVER: And there is a day school at Fort Smith?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes. The day schools do not get a per capita grant, but this school is given a grant of $500.

Mr. OLIVER: Are there both Protestant and Roman Catholic schools at Fort Vermilion?

Mr. ROCHE: At Fort Vermilion there is a day school with twenty pupils. It is a Roman Catholic school.

Mr. OLIVER: There is no boarding school there and no school carried on by the Anglicans?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. OLIVER: And at Wabiskaw?

Mr. ROCHE: There is a Roman Catholic school with 25 pupils and a Church of England school as well. Both are boarding schools.

Mr. OLIVER: And at Lesser Slave Lake and Grouard?

Mr. ROCHE: There is a day school and a boarding school of Roman Catholics, the latter with 25 pupils; and an Anglican school as well.

Mr. OLIVER: And at Fort Chipewyan?

Mr. ROCHE: There is a Roman Catholic boarding school.

Mr. OLIVER: No Anglican school there?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. OLIVER: There was formerly an Anglican day school there.

Mr. ROCHE: I do not think there is any day school at Fort Chipewyan.

Mr. MARCIL: Are there any Indian schools in the Ungava district in the province of Quebec?

Mr. ROCHE: No.

Mr. MARCIL: Are there no Indians there?

Mr. ROCHE: There are scattered nomadic tribes, but no treaty Indians.

Mr. MARCIL: Are they not under the charge of the department?

Mr. ROCHE: We have to care for them sometimes—give them provisions, and so on.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there an Indian boarding school in operation in the Yukon?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes, there is a Church of England boarding school at Carcross with 35 pupils.

Dr. NESBITT: Do they attempt to teach agriculture in the various Indian schools in addition to the ordinary English education?

Mr. ROCHE: At some of the schools, yes. In several of these places they have farms attached to the schools and teach them agriculture.

Mr. MACDONALD: How many Indians are there in the Yukon?

Mr. ROCHE: 1,528.

Mr. McKENZIE: In connection with industrial education the teacher in the Indian district of Eskasoni, I understand, has made application for assistance in building a barn. He has a small barn some 15 feet by 20 feet, but is anxious to have a larger one, as by working the land he is enabled to eke out his small salary.

Mr. ROCHE: The matter has been brought to our attention and is now being considered.

Indians generally. Advances to Indians surrendering their lands under provisions of section 89 of the Indian Act, which will afterwards be repaid from the avails of the land $25,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Are there any surrenders in progress or in prospect?

Mr. ROCHE: We have been trying quite recently to get a surrender of a portion of the Blood Reserve which, as my hon. friend knows is a very fine agricultural district, and at least a preliminary meeting has been held, so that there is a chance of a surrender being secured.

Indians generaly to prevent the spread of tuberculosis, $10,000.

Mr. NESBITT: Has the minister any statistics to show whether tuberculosis is increasing or decreasing among the Indian tribes of Canada?

Mr. ROCHE: I cannot say it is on the increase but, as the hon. member knows, it has been very prevalent. We have been trying to educate them to better sanitary conditions and have endeavoured, by a system of education, to get them to take better care of themselves. I cannot say that so far the diseases has diminished to any great extent, but it certainly has not increased.

Mr. NESBITT: The minister sends a doctor among the tribes, treating the Indians for various diseases, and would it not be well to have some one spend some time among them educating them to improve their living conditions and so check the spread of tuberculosis among them? I think that at the present rate it will ultimately destroy them in most places.

Mr. ROCHE: We are doing all we can to educate them along sanitary lines.

General.—Surveys, Ontario, Quebec and Maritime provinces, $3,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the purpose of that general item for surveys?

Mr. ROCHE: It is generally to subdivide surveys into farm lots.

General.—Relief to destitute Indians in remote districts, $60,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the method of distribution of relief to destitute Indians in the country north of Edmonton?

Mr. ROCHE: The department sends in supplies to the various posts. In some instances the Hudson's Bay Company supplies goods on request of an Indian agent or a missionary, and in some cases the mounted police are utilized for the purpose of distribution.

Mr. OLIVER: There are rival trading posts and trading companies. Does the department recognize the existence of these rival traders, or does it deal with only one trading firm?

Mr. ROCHE: They divide up the order. Sometimes it goes to the Hudson's Bay Company and sometimes to Revillon Freres.

They do not go to one firm only for supplies, each firm gets its share.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it divided up in this way, that at one post the Hudson's Bay Company and at another some other trader?

Mr. ROCHE: Not always, no.

Mr. OLIVER: The facts are that, in the north country the Indians trade just as people in other parts of the country trade, some with one firm and some with another. If there are two rival traders at a certain point, some Indians will trade with one and some with another. It is not usual for the Indians to trade promiscuously. They have their ideas in that regard, and, generally, an Indian family will trade with one firm or with the other, and it is recognized that there is that division of the trade. If one of these trading firms is given a monopoly of the distribution of the Government supplies in that locality, they have a huge advantage over their rivals, and, while I suppose the Government is not bound to take cognizance of that condition of affairs, I take the liberty of pointing it out. Of course, I speak only of those who are unquestionably responsible, but if there is any desire to act fairly as between the rival traders, I think it would be fair to make some arrangement whereby each of those rival traders would be responsible for some part of the distribution; otherwise it would be hardly just. Trade rivalry is just as keen as in the far north country as it is in the east, perhaps a little keener. I do not know how far the Government is cognizant of that condition and recognizes it.

Mr. ROCHE: We recognize where the Indian trades, and allow him to purchase from the firm he has been accustomed to deal with.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Micmacs, in my county, live near the mouth of the harbour, and, although, at one time, they went from their summer homes to various camps in the winter, they have now abandoned their old habits in many ways, and live in one settlement contiguous to the mouth of the harbour. There is a large tract of land reserved there. I should like the minister to state whether this land is held in the same manner as the western lands which belong to the Indians, or whether it is Dominion Government property, on which the Indians are living, and whether the Government are able to deal with it the same as with other property.

Mr. ROCHE: Those reserves are held in the same manner as reserves are held in other parts of the Dominion, namely, in trust, and before we can sell the lands, we have to obtain a surrender.

Mr. MACDONALD: We have not a regular band and chief—just an isolated group of Indians who happen to be living at this particular point. The Government has purchased land in the vicinity of the coal piers where the Indians reside, and the Indians have completely deserted all their old habits and have been engaged largely as freight handlers. Where the Government purchase lands which the Indians are permitted to use, is the purchase made out of a trust fund belonging to the band, or how does the Government make the purchase? Some reservations in the West have been set aside for the benefit of the Indians, but I do not think that is the case in this particular instance.

Mr. ROCHE: Some reserves in Nova Scotia have been purchased by Parliamentary appropriation.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the minister take a note of this particular case, and I will take occasion to communicate with my correspondent later on, with regard to the changed conditions.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the rule of the minister's department in regard to interference by agents in politics, or is there any rule?

Mr. ROCHE: There is no different rule in the Indian Department from any other department. The hon. gentleman is aware of the rule laid down by Parliament that officials of the Government, whether they are Indian agents or others, in the employ or on the pay list, are not to engage actively in politics. No different rule is applied to Indian agents than to other officials. Of course, there may be some agents who regard their agency work as a side line, drawing very little salary from the Government, and I presume they consider themselves free citizens, but our agents who devote their whole time to the work of the agency are expected simply to perform their duties as agents.

Mr. OLIVER: I am somewhat surprised to hear the minister say that there is a rule that there shall be no interference, and that the rule which applies in other departments, applies to this department, because, in the elections held recently in Alberta, one of the homestead inspec-

tors, Ambrose Grey, was a candidate, and ranch inspector George Cloakley, was candidate in another constituency. It is true that Mr. Grey had resigned a few days before the election. Mr. Cloakey resigned, but I am not sure whether it was before nomination. They held their positions so close to nomination day that they certainly must have been using their positions for the purpose of advantaging themselves in the political contest which took place on the 7th June. It is true they were both defeated by rather large majorities, but certainly it was a very plain instance of officials of the Department of the Interior using their position, while under salary, to advantage themselves, at any rate, they hoped to advantage themselves politically, and, if I am not too far out of order, I may say that another appointee of the Government, Dan Minchen, timber inspector in the Grande Prairie country, is now official candidate of the Conservative party in the constituency of Peace River at the deferred election to be held shortly. Here are three instances in which officers of the Land Department have certainly been taking a very active part in provincial politics. Evidently the rule that my hon. friend says applies to all the departments does not apply to the Indian Department as, apparently, it does to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. ROCHE: There has been no rule in the past that would prevent a Government official from accepting nomination at the hands of a political party, as long as he resigned his Government position. If it was wrong for these gentlemen to have accepted nominations, it is to be noted that they resigned their positions in all cases. To my knowledge, no person occupied a Government position and was at the same time a candidate for election. But, if that is wrong, it is a practice that has been in existence for many years. While the member for Edmonton was Minister of the Interior, two homestead inspectors were candidates in elections in my former constituency, one of whom ran against myself and the other against Mr. Glen Campbell. One of these gentlemen occupied his position right up to the time of nomination, but I did not hear any adverse criticism from any hon. gentlemen opposite. If the gentlemen to whom reference has been made are doing wrong, certainly the same thing was done under the administration of the late Government, and without any protest from hon. gentlemen opposite.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. OLIVER: It may be just as well to say that one of the gentlemen to whom I refer, who had been a homestead inspector, resigned to become a candidate in the provincial election, was defeated, and was promptly reappointed by my hon. friend as soon as the election was over. After having used his position during the intervening period of over four years for the purpose of political canvassing, he again becomes a candidate and is again defeated—and I suppose, will again be reappointed. I submit that such a case is simply a scandal. If my hon. friend thinks that what took place in former years will justify what is taking place now. I can only say that I do not think the public will accept it as justification. Certainly I do not intend to abate my criticism of an action that is absolutely unjustifiable, simply because of previous acts on the part of anybody else. Two wrongs do not make a right. I do not admit it, as a matter of fact, but admitting for the sake of argument that wrong was committed on a previous occasion, I still say that that does not cure the evil, which is that public money is being used for the purpose of maintaining in the field a band of active political agents and canvassers, who, after having suffered defeat at the polls, may be reappointed to their positions, as they, no doubt, expect to be reappointed.

Mr. KNOWLES: I should think that there is a distinction between the case mentioned by the minister and the case referred to by the member for Edmonton. In this case evidently the political aspirant in Alberta was acting in conjunction with the minister. The minister was probably aware of the purpose of the man's resignation, but he does not say that he will not continue to play the game by reappointing that man. Unless the minister assures us that he is not going to reappoint him he will have to stand convicted of acting in harmony with this manipulator and of being a confederate —I say it not offensively—with him in what we consider to be very improper procedure. The case in question, therefore, is very different from the case the minister has mentioned.

Mr. ROCHE: Can you answer for the case that I quoted.

Mr. KNOWLES: I would have to be convinced that in the other case the then Minister of the Interior had knowledge as to the reason for the resignation before I would consider the cases analogous. Anyway, if any minister has an understanding with an employee that the employee may

resign the day before nomination, and that if at the election seven days afterwards he is defeated, the minister will re-appoint him, that minister is not using good judgment and should be criticised. If the minister says that he disapproves of that procedure, then we shall know where he stands in the matter. It is of no use to say that such and such a thing was done previously. If I understand the minister aright, his statement is that he has full knowledge of all the circumstances connected with these cases which the member for Edmonton—to our surprise, but not to the surprise of the minister—has brought to the attention of the committee. The minister is well informed in the matter, explains the circumstances and attempts to justify them, and, so far as we know, proposes to re-appoint these men. I think that the minister should be in a position to tell us that he had not knowledge that the men were resigning for the purpose in question, that he was not co-operating with them, and that he will not under any circumstances re-appoint them to their positions.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. gentleman has recently taken a very virtuous turn. I did not know anything about these gentlemen having accepted nominations until their resignations came in, except in one instance. When in that case it was brought to my attention that one of my homestead inspectors had accepted a nomination and had not sent in his resignation. I wired him to send it in. I had no knowledge whatever of these candidates being in the field until their resignations came to the department. As to whether these gentlemen intend to apply for reappointment, I know nothing whatever. They may not have any such intention, but when the application comes in, that will be the time for me to say what I shall do. But it is strange that in a parallel case which occurred under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, where a homestead inspector who remained in the field canvassing up to the date of nomination, resigned his position, suffered defeat and was promptly reappointed to his position, no fault was found by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I am not saying that it was so very wrong. At any rate, the hon. gentleman has not pointed out any gross abuse that has arisen out of the candidature of any of these men who resigned their positions, who have been defeated, and concerning whose future intentions I know nothing whatever.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister says that I have suddenly become virtuous; he is quite unwarranted in making that assertion. The minister has given us information which he withheld in the first instance, and for which I now give him credit. He did not tell us that he disapproved of a homestead inspector being a candidate and at the same time retaining his position. The member for Edmonton raised that question, but the minister did not say what he was afterwards good enough to tell me—that as soon as he learned that one of the men had been nominated by a political party and had not resigned, he wired him for his resignation. It was in the absence of that information that I made the remark that I did. I have no apology to make for doing so, but in fairness to the minister I say frankly that that eliminates the first part of my criticism. The minister cannot be said to be co-operating with these men at any stage of the game if he had no knowledge as to the purpose of their resignations. But I do say that the minister should assure us that he will not co-operate in the matter by reappointing these men. It is a brazen thing that a man should become a political candidate, remain in the public employ as long as he possibly can, and then be reappointed when he is defeated. I say that this should not happen, I care not what any other minister ever did. Other ministers stand on their own reputations and their own records. To reappoint men under such circumstances as these would certainly be against public policy. But the Lands Department is administered so viciously and violently along partisan lines that it is scarcely worth our while going into the many things that we might have occasion to refer to.

In the by-election that occurred in Moosejaw county when the Hon. J. A. Sheppard was appealing to that riding after he had resigned his seat because his name was connected with some of the disclosures in the Saskatchewan commission, that district was alive with his employees; in fact, in some of the small villages you could not get a bed at night, because of the number of men pretending to be collecting for seed grain and relief in those places, but really collecting votes. If you put a question on the Order Paper, you do not get an answer and you become discouraged. I should like to have the diaries of those seed grain and relief collectors who were in that county during that election. I could take the minister to a small place called Spring Valley and other stations on

the Canadian Northern railway between Avonlea and Gravelbourg where there were four or five of his collectors frightening the people out of their lives by stating that if they voted against the Conservative candidate everything would be taken away from them and their liens collected, and promising them everything in their favour if they would vote for the Conservative candidate. If their diaries contain a true account of their doings, the minister will find that my statements are correct. Do those collectors keep diaries of what they do?

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. gentleman is speaking of men working in connection with the seed grain accounts?

Mr. KNOWLES: And relief.

Mr. ROCHE: When did this by-election take place?

Mr. KNOWLES: Last fall.

Mr. ROCHE: Just at the time the collectors were out on the road?

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes.

Mr. ROCHE: And because a collector showed his nose in a constituency where there was a by-election, the hon. gentleman jumps on the department for allowing a homestead inspector to go into that county during a by-election to collect seed grain accounts.

Mr. KNOWLES: What a statesmanlike answer to what I have said.

Mr. ROCHE: The system that we had adopted a year ago last winter by means of which we were to collect through the elevator companies was not a success, and therefore last summer we opened an office in Moosejaw and established a chief inspector of land agencies there who engaged a staff, largely utilizing the existing staff of homestead inspectors, in order to keep down expense. These men were alloted certain districts, and before there was any thought of a by-election in Moosejaw, they were instructed to collect seed grain personally from the farmers who had got seed grain relief and had failed to pay within the time promised, and no doubt these men were doing certain collections in Moosejaw county, because there was a very large amount put out in Moosejaw during 1915. I am not in a position to say whether those men kept diaries that they sent into the department as to what they did from day to day; in fact I would not be surprised if they did not keep diaries, although in their ordinary work as homestead inspectors they do keep diaries. I will make inquiries in regard to that.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister has surely misunderstood what I said. I told him what I thought about the men who had camped in Moosejaw county in order to intimidate the farmers, and the minister says that the Government has lent so much money there and tries to put me in the position of saying that the money should not be collected. I did not say that at all. The money is lent and is repayable and will be repaid. I did not object to any one representing the Government putting his nose into the Moosejaw district; I objected to these men interfering in the by-election. I was speaking about the introduction of petty politics under the guise of those men doing their work in their capacity of collectors. I am not criticising the system of collection at present; I may have something to say about that at the proper time. It is necessary to collect that money, and the minister is making a defence out of the fact that the money should be collected. My point was that the men who should have been busy collecting that money in the proper way were all centralized at one pivotal point, namely, the Moosejaw county seat, whence they could intimidate the farmers of the district into voting for the Conservative candidate.

Mr. DOHERTY: We will take up the Post Office Estimates.

Mr. MACDONALD: As the Post Office Estimates have not been brought up before, the minister cannot take them up on a Thursday. Where is the regular Postmaster General? I understand he is in Ottawa, and if so, why should he not be here?

Mr. DOHERTY: The Postmaster General is at present on active military service. I am the acting Postmaster General, and I do not know that the hon. member is in order to question my right to introduce these Estimates.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is not in order to take up any Estimates on Thursdays or Fridays unless they have been begun on a Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Estimates of the Post Office Department have been taken up and, as regards the Inside Service, have been passed, so that I am quite within the rule. I am only proceeding to continue to deal with Estimates already begun.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was distinctly understood that, when the Estimates were allowed

to be taken up, it was not to be held that they had been taken up under the rule. Before the long adjournment we allowed certain Estimates to go through on the understanding that no minister would claim that his Estimates had been taken up under the rule.

Mr. DOHERTY: My information from the deputy minister is not that merely one-fourth of the Estimates which were passed, as I understand it, under the arrangement, have been passed, but that the entirety of the Estimates for the Inside Service of the Department have already been passed. If what the hon. member says is correct, I, of course, do not want to break any understanding that has been arrived at, but my information is that with the exception of this one Estimate, the Post Office Estimates have all been passed.

Mr. MACDONALD: If the minister will look at Hansard of February 1 at page 353, he will find that the statement of my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is verified. The report reads:

Supply—Interim Vote.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the chair.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: We will not go into any particular estimates, but we will give you what you want; we will give you a quarter of the total amount in these estimates.

Sir George Foster: They are just the same as the usual estimates.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: Yes.

Sir George Foster: We have usually put through the vote for civil government.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: I have no objection to your putting through the estimates that you want to put through, but you know there is a rule that on Thursday and Friday the Speaker leaves the chair without any motion, and the House can only take up such Supply as is to be taken into consideration. If we were to pass all the estimates to-day, when we begin after the adjournment we could not take up any of the estimates upon any day, and therefore we cannot consent to that. But if it is understood that the rule will not apply, then we will pass the estimates.

Sir George Foster: I think that can easily be understood on both sides of the House.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: All right; go on.

Mr. DOHERTY: If that is all that was done, I do not claim that these Estimates were begun, but my information—and I have sent to make quite sure—is that all the Post Office Estimates for the Inside Service have already been passed, and that there remains but the Outside Service. If that be correct, it means that these Estimates have been proceeded with otherwise than under that arrangement. Of course, if any information is shown to be mistaken, I do not want to insist upon going on with these Estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM: If no Post Office Estimates have been put through since the two months' adjournment the minister would not be in order in going on with these Estimates, and my recollection is that no Post Office Estimates have been put through since the adjournment. Certain Estimates were put through before the adjournment to enable the Prime Minister to go to England, on the distinct understanding that no advantage would be taken of that technical violation of the rule.

Mr. DOHERTY: All I can say is that the officer tells me he understands that the whole of the Inside Service Estimates were put through one evening by the Minister of Finance. I cannot undertake myself to say positively whether that was so or not, and if objection is taken I suppose I shall have to yield to it.

Mr. GRAHAM: The members of the House have certain rights in regard to moving resolutions on going into Committee of Supply, and we shall be deprived of one opportunity of moving a resolution on the motion to go into Supply if the minister goes on with these Estimates to-night. The whole object of the new rule was to give members an opportunity to move a resolution on the motion for Supply. My recollection is that the Post Office Estimates have not been before the committee, technically speaking, and consequently they cannot be taken automatically on a Thursday or Friday.

Mr. DOHERTY: In the Votes and Proceedings of the 20th of April it appears that Post Office Estimates were passed as follows: Salaries $842,820, Contingencies $125,000. That seems to confirm what the officer told me. I am not invoking the fact that before the two months' adjournment one-quarter of the Estimates were passed.

10 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: The estimates the minister has quoted were for civil government.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, but not on the occasion to which my hon. friend has referred.

Mr. MACDONALD: The 20th of April was on a Friday.

Mr. DOHERTY: The question is, have these Estimates been taken up? I understand that if they were taken up we have a right to go on, and they must have been

taken up because on that day the committee consented to go on with them.

Mr. MACDONALD: On the motion of Sir Thomas White for Committee of Supply on April 20, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

I do not object to the House going into Committee of Supply. I understand that we are to take up the Civil Government Estimates, but this will not interfere with rule 17 (c) which requires that the Estimates of any department shall be first taken up on a day other than Friday.

Mr. GRAHAM: That was the very day. It has been admitted, I think, by both sides of the House that civil government form one Estimate and the regular Estimates another, for the purpose of this rule in regard to going into Supply. The taking up of Civil Government Estimates does not mean, technically speaking, that we are going into Supply on the General Estimates. I think the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition have agreed as to that on several occasions.

Mr. DOHERTY: If there is any objection to our proceeding with these Estimates to-night I have no desire to go on with them. I have no desire to violate any understanding.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a little more than an understanding. The leader of the Opposition called attention to the rule on that occasion.

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, then, I have no desire to break any rule. Unless, however, there is some objection other than the formal one I shall be glad to go on.

Mr. GRAHAM: The objection I have is this: Members of Parliament not on this side alone, but on the other side also, were protected by the new rule in their privilege of presenting a resolution on going into Supply. If we go on with these Estimates we shall be depriving ourselves of one opportunity of making such a resolution, and we have not many opportunities left.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. member does not see his way to withdraw his objection I shall have to acquiesce.

Mr. MARCIL: In justice to the Postmaster General, would the minister inform the House as to his exact position at the present time? Those who read the Montreal papers have seen that the Postmaster General offered his resignation to the Prime Minister, but it was not accepted. Then the Hon. Mr. Blondin undertook, with General Lessard, to raise a regiment in Quebec, and met with substantial success all through the province. When conscription was adopted by the Cabinet we were told that Hon. Mr. Blondin would discontinue his recruiting efforts. The papers now announce that he is coming back to Ottawa to take over his former department and to be Acting Secretary of State. I think it is in the public interest, and only doing justice to the Postmaster General that the House should know exactly what is his position.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know that I should be in order in answering my hon. friend. If I am not entitled to proceed with my Estimates there is nothing before the committee. If it is not in order for me to answer questions, I do not see how it is in order for hon. gentlemen to ask me questions. However, I have no objection to stating that the Hon. Mr. Blondin is still on service, and the fact of my being here as Acting Postmaster General indicates that the newspaper report that he had returned to resume his duties as Postmaster General is incorrect.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Doherty, the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Friday, June 15, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

PROCEEDINGS OF IMPERIAL WAR CONFERENCE, 1917.

PAPERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE CONFERENCE PRESENTED.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I beg to lay upon the table of the House a despatch from the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies to His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting copies of a parliamentary paper containing extracts from the minutes of the proceedings of the Imperial War Conference, 1917, and papers laid before the conference. If my right hon. friend has no objection, I would move:

That rule 74 be suspended in order that the documents so laid upon the table of the House be printed forthwith for the information of the members.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no objection.

Motion agreed to.

IMPERIAL WAR CABINET.

STATEMENT BY BRITISH PRIME MINISTER.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With the consent of the House, it might be

appropriate for me to read in this connection the announcement in the House of Commons of the United Kingdom by the Prime Minister with respect to the holding of an Imperial War Cabinet during the present year, and the proposal that it should be held annually in future. That announcement would not be readily available unless it is placed in Hansard, and as the announcement is of some importance, I think it might be well to record it in that way. The report reads:

Mr. McKenna: May I ask the Prime Minister whether he has any statement to make in regard to the Imperial War Cabinet?

The Prime Minister (Mr. Lloyd George): I think that I ought to report to the House a very important decision that was arrived at as a sequel to the recent meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet. It is desirable that Parliament should be officially and formally acquainted with an event that will constitute a memorable landmark in the Constitutional History of the British Empire. The House will remember that in December last His Majesty's Government invited the Prime Ministers or leading statesmen of the Overseas Dominions and of India to attend the sittings both of the Cabinet and of an Imperial War Conference to be held in this country. It is to the former body which assembled in March, and held fourteen sittings before separating, that I desire to refer. The British Cabinet became for the time being an Imperial War Cabinet. While it was in session, its overseas members had access to all the information which was at the disposal of His Majesty's Government, and occupied a status of absolute equality with that of the members of the British War Cabinet. It had prolonged discussions on all the most vital aspects of Imperial policy, and came to important decisions in regard to them—decisions which will enable us to prosecute the war with increased unity and vigour, and which will be of the greatest value when it comes to the negotiations of peace. I should like to add on behalf of the Government that the fresh minds and new points of view which our colleagues from over the seas have brought to bear upon the problems with which we have been so long engrossed, has been an immense help to us all. So far as we are concerned we can say with confidence that the experiment has been a complete success.

The conclusions of the Imperial War Cabinet are of necessity secret, but there is one aspect of them which we feel ought to be communicated to the House without delay. The Imperial War Cabinet was unanimous that the new procedure had been of such service, not only to all its members, but to the Empire, that it ought not to be allowed to fall into desuetude. Accordingly, at the last session, I proposed formally on behalf of the British Government that meetings of an Imperial Cabinet should be held annually or at any intermediate time when matters of urgent Imperial concern require to be settled, and that the Imperial Cabinet should consist of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and such of his colleagues as deal specially with Imperial affairs; of the Prime Minister of each of the Dominions or some specially accredited alternate possessed of equal authority; and of a representative of the Indian people to be appointed by the Government of India. This proposal met with the cordial approval of the overseas representatives and we hope that the holding of an annual Imperial Cabinet to discuss foreign affairs and other aspects of Imperial policy, will become an accepted convention of the British Constitution.

I ought to add that the institution in its present form is extremely elastic. It grew not by design, but out of the necessities of the war. The essence of it is that the responsible heads of the Governments of the Empire with those ministers who are specially entrusted with the conduct of Imperial policy should meet together at regular intervals to confer about foreign policy and matters connected therewith, and come to decisions in regard to them, which, subject to the control of their own Parliaments, they will then severally execute. By this means they will be able to obtain full information about all aspects of Imperial affairs and to determine by consultation together the policy of the Empire in its most vital aspects, without infringing in any degree the autonomy which its parts at present enjoy. To what constitutional developments this may lead we did not attempt to settle. The whole question of perfecting the mechanism for continuous consultation about Imperial and foreign affairs between the autonomous nations of an Imperial Commonwealth will be reserved for the consideration of that special conference which will be summoned as soon as possible after the war to readjust the constitutional relations of the Empire. We felt, however, that the experiment of constituting an Imperial Cabinet, in which India was represented, had been so fruitful in better understanding and in unity of purpose and action that it ought to be perpetuated and we believe that this proposal will commend itself to the judgment of all the nations of the Empire.

Mr. DEVLIN: Was there any discussion as to what would be the best form to be adopted in prosecuting the war for a concerted action on the part of the different Dominions beyond the seas?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The institution of the Imperial Cabinet itself was entered upon with the view that the consultation thus brought about would result in greater unity of purpose and in more effective cooperation.

Mr. DEVLIN: Was any decision reached by the members of that Committee or Cabinet as to what concerted action should be taken by the Dominions beyond the seas?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No special consideration beyond what I have already explained on another occasion was given to any matter of that kind. The deliberations were of a general character with regard to the conduct of the war and the task that had to be accomplished, and the best means of fulfilling that task.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

CANADIAN TROOPS IN FRANCE, ENGLAND AND CANADA.

Hon. A. E. KEMP (Minister of Militia): The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) asked the number of Canadian troops in England, the number in France and the number in Canada. The answer is as follows:

1. On the 4th June, 1917, there were 136,400 troops (all ranks) in France; there were also 747 in the Near East, and 130 at St. Lucia.

2. On the 4th June, 1917, there were 108,736 troops (all ranks) in England—not counting those in hospitals and convalescent homes, but counting those on passage from Canada to England.

Of the foregoing total, however, only 26,000 men were immediately available for reinforcing purposes.

3. On the 1st June, 1917, there were 17,353 C.E.F. troops (all ranks) in Canada.

I have a document illustrating the manner in which troops are classified in England, dated 14th May, 1917. I shall lay about sixty copies of it on the table of the House for the use of members.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would it be possible to have this statement giving the clasification of Canadian troops inserted in Hansard as part of the hon. gentleman's remarks this afternoon? These sheets are destructible, while if this were placed on Hansard it would be available for all time.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no objection to that. With the consent of the House, it will be embodied in Hansard.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I presume the Speaker will direct accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it would meet the wishes of the House, I think it would be preferable if the motion were made to have this statement printed as a separate return. I think the custom of placing documents on Hansard should be curtailed as much as possible. I do not press the point, but simply make the suggestion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am quite agreeable.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the consent of the House, Mr. Maclean of Halifax moves, seconded by Mr. Guthrie, that Rule 74 be suspended, and that this statement be printed forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: In connection with a statement of the Prime Minister a few days ago in which he mentioned the number of Canadian casualties I think about 100,000, I do not recall that the right hon. gentleman stated how many of these may have returned to the trenches as efficient fighting men.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, I did not.

Mr. MURPHY: Can such a statement as that be prepared?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I could not say, but I shall ask the Minister of Militia to give his attention to it. Some of them undoubtedly have returned.

Mr. MURPHY: I submit that that information is necessary before we enter upon the discussion of the right hon. gentleman's Conscription Bill. I would ask the minister to bring down a statement showing the number of men struck off the strength as being medically unfit, either in Canada or in England, all of whom, I understand, may possibly have been rated as casualties at one time or another. That information I understand is necessary in order to apprehend the numbers of men in different classes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not understand that persons struck off in that way are included in the casualties I mentioned.

Mr. MURPHY: Not as mentioned by the right hon. gentleman, but I understand that any man who, by reason of illness or some other cause, is considered medically unfit and as so is regarded as imparing the fighting strength of the force, is rated as a casualty, although he may return very soon to the ranks.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I will get the information, so far as possible.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 82 to provide for the time in Canada being in advance of the solar mean time during the summer months.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Would my right hon. friend explain?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The explanation is simple: the purpose of the Bill is to have the clock advanced one hour and thus gain an hour of daylight during specified times in the season.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Within what months?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: By proclamation of the Governor in Council. We cannot predate the Bill in respect of time which is passed, but September is the time which is contemplated in the autumn.

Mr. MACDONALD: The subject is one of some interest ,and the minister's explanation has not been very full.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I shall give a full explanation of it on the motion for the next reading of the Bill.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is the Bill to apply to the year 1917 or the year 1918?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Bill is for 1917.

SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 83, relating to the Honorary Advisory Council for Scientific and Industrial Research.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will the minister kindly explain?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This Bill provides in statutory form for the constitution and powers and duties of the Advisory Council, which now rests upon Order in Council. It follows entirely the Order in Council which has already been brought down.

WESTERN COAL MINERS STRIKE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): What can the Minister of Labour tell us with regard to the progress being made in settling the western coal miners' strike? I observe an item in the press this morning to the effect that the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Green) will return unsuccessful. What has the minister to report about the mission of that hon. member?

Mr. CROTHERS: I received a message from Calgary this morning stimulating the hope that an agreement may be very soon concluded.

IMMIGRATION OFFICERS AT WINDSOR.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Has the Minister of the Interior heard of any difficulty at the frontier at Windsor, Ontario, in regard to immigration? Information comes to me that the mayor of Windsor has lodged a complaint in regard to the action of J. G. Gardner, special immigration officer, who is charged with using violent and abusive language, and with doing real injury to Canada by his harsh administration of the law, which has the effect of driving American residents at Windsor back to Detroit, and is calculated to injure the Canadian summer resorts in that locality. On account of the action of Mr. Gardner, conditions are not very pleasant at Windsor.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE: A telegram has been received from Dr. Walker, president of the Chamber of Commerce at Windsor, not complaining of Mr. Gardner especially, but of the too drastic action of some outside officials who were sent to Windsor. Owing to the rush backward and forward between Windsor and Detroit, we have had to send some additional officers to control the exit from Canada, and we employed a few returned soldiers, and complaint has been made in regard to the conduct of these soldiers. We have instructed our inspector to proceed to Windsor immediately to investigate.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. leader of the Opposition has requested that we should not move the second reading of the Military Service Bill this week, and I assented to the request. It has been suggested that we should let the second reading stand till Tuesday next, but, with every desire to meet the hon. gentleman's convenience as far as possible, I think it would be better to proceed with the Bill on Monday, if possible. I purpose, therefore, to take it up as the first order of business on Monday.

HON. ROBERT ROGERS.

THE SITTINGS OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I inquired yesterday with regard to the proceedings of the McLeod-Tellier Commission. I read a statement in the press that the commission was sitting in Montreal. Is that correct?

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Yes, I believe the commission has commenced its work in Montreal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Are the sittings public or private?

Mr. DOHERTY: The right hon. gentleman will, perhaps, recollect that, under the commission, the first duty imposed on the commissioners was to examine the reports and the evidence, with a view to determining whether there was evidence to justify the observations in the report with regard to the Hon. Mr. Rogers. That operation, of

course, involves an examination of the reports and a study of the record, and I understand the commissioners are occupied in that work at the present time. In the nature of things, that work could not be done in public.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it the intention that the further sittings of the commission shall be conducted in public or in private, and will counsel be allowed to appear before the commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: I would assume that if, upon the question which comes first in order, as to whether there is evidence to justify the report, the commissioners should be of opinion that the assistance of counsel will be useful, they might, either on their own motion, or on the application of anybody who desires to be represented, permit the appearance of counsel. I am not aware that they have yet come to deal with that question. If I were called upon to express my opinion, I should think it would be a proper thing that a hearing of that kind should be held in public. If the commission should find it necessary to proceed with the additional inquiry which they are empowered to make, in the event of their reaching the conclusion that there is evidence to support the report—with regard to which they might think it necessary to hear further evidence for the purpose of determining its truth or otherwise—I should think, though I am not speaking on their behalf, or giving their view, because I have had no communication with them, that it would be a proper thing that such an inquiry should be held in public.

STEAMSHIP SERVICE BETWEEN RIVIERE-DU-LOUP AND THE NORTH SHORE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOS. GIRARD (Chicoutimi-Saguenay) (translation): Mr. Speaker, before taking up the Orders of the Day, I desire to give a few personal explanations on some remarks that were made in this House on the 13th of June, and in which my name was mentioned, in connection with an item of $6,000 for a steamboat service between Rivière-du-Loup, Tadoussac, etc. In the course of his remarks on that occasion, the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) used the following words:

> But, unfortunately, politics carried weight even in so serious a matter as this. In 1912, Mr. Bérubé was elected to the Local Legislature for Temiscouata and he happens to be a Conservative. Being unfriendly to the management of the company, he started at once to oppose it. Then, there was the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard), a Conservative member on the North Shore. With these two warring against it, it is no wonder that the poor company was killed. The contract with that company was cancelled, and a contract was made with the Quebec and Levis Ferry Boat Company.

I wish to state to the House that my hon. friend's reference to me is utterly groundless and contrary to the facts.

The hon. member for Temiscouata is aware that at the request of the Trans-St. Lawrence Company I went to the cost of a trip to Fraserville in order to meet the officers of the company at the house of Dr. Perrot himself, who was, I surmise, president of the company, with a view to discussing the means of forestalling what did happen later on, the condemning of the boat by the Government officials. The meeting prepared a statement which I forwarded myself to the minister strongly urging its favourable consideration, I really did all I could to get the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) to comply with their request, but he could not see his way to do it because it would entail an expenditure much greater than the appropriation. Some time later the Government officers pronounced the boat unfit for service naturally without my being advised or having any control over the matter. The company refused to put on another boat, and the Minister of Trade found that he could make arrangements with the company previously referred to, The Quebec and Levis Ferry Boat Company, who took over the contract which the Trans-St. Lawrence Company could not carry out. An accident happened, true, but the new company put another boat on the line until the expiry of the contract. I think it only fair to state that the accident referred to could have happened to the Mahone, which had less power.

The member for Temiscouata further stated that the second boat was wrecked in St. Catherine's bay, I fail to see where he got that information, as no such thing ever took place.

Later on, the Government called for tenders for that service; tenders were put in but all for a larger amount than the appropriation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to have to interrupt the hon. member, but in making a personal explanation he should adhere as closely as possible to the statement complained of.

Mr. GIRARD: I am just about finishing, Mr. Speaker.

The minister always refused to consider any increase of the subsidy because at the present time the Government does not wish to incur new expenditure. Jointly with the Government I tried in every possible way to meet the needs of that district, of both the counties of Temiscouata and Saguenay, but up to date, we have been unable to find a man or a company who cared to take up the contract for the amount of the subsidy.

Such are the facts, and I wish to deny most emphatically the imputation against me of the hon. member for Temiscouata, namely that party politics are responsible for the failure of the company.

I, for one, and my constituency, are above such petty tactics; as to what is the rule with him, I have no idea and leave him to settle the matter with his own electors.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Legislation—House of Commons, salaries, etc., $449,412.50.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a reduction of $4,387.50 under the heading of salaries. This is largely accounted for by the fact that there is no Clerk of Routine and Records, the work of that office being performed by the former assistant, who still holds the rank of Assistant Clerk of Routine and Records. So far as I can ascertain, the work of the office is being satisfactorily performed by the present staff, and unless some good reason arises for an additional appointment, this saving may be continued indefinitely. Further, according to the Civil Service regulation, the salary of the Assistant Clerk begins at a certain figure and increases by increments of $100 a year. His salary, therefore, is not as large as was the salary of the Assistant Clerk whom he succeeded. These two items account largely, if not entirely, for the reduction.

Mr. OLIVER: The reduction in this vote is a temptation to us to appoint a permanent Speaker. A reduction of this amount in the expenses of the House at the hands of our Speaker is, in my view, a strong recommendation for the continuance of that gentleman in office.

Mr. MARCIL: Could the Speaker give us an explanation of the circumstances under which the Chief French Translator, Mr. Laframboise, was superannuated?

Mr. SPEAKER: That was done before I took office, and I am not familiar with the circumstances. If the hon. member wishes me to do so, I shall make careful inquiry and advise him later.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that Mr. Laframboise is still in splendid health, quite capable of doing his work, and probably as efficient as ever. Can the Speaker tell us who replaced him, and what changes were made in the office?

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Desaulniers, next in rank, was promoted to the position formerly occupied by Mr. Laframboise. I must make further inquiry before I can give my hon. friend a satisfactory answer.

Legislation—General, $346,600.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are two increases here, one of $6,000 and another of $2,000. They arise solely on account of the increased cost of paper and of printing, larger sums being required to do slightly less work and to furnish less supplies than in former years. Further, the stock was considerably depleted by the fire.

Mr. OLIVER: Would it not be possible for the Speaker to appeal to the Minister of Finance for a restriction on the high price of paper, so that this estimate might show the same good tendency towards reduction as the previous one?

Mr. SPEAKER: These items come from the office of the Secretary of State. My information is that the Speaker has never been responsible in any degree for their amount. To be perfectly candid, I never saw these items until they appeared in the Estimates.

Mr. OLIVER: It might be a good idea to suggest that this vote be placed under the control of the Speaker in the future.

Mr. SPEAKER: The work under this vote is done by the Printing Bureau, which, as the hon. member knows, has always been under the Secretary of State; and which accounts for this item appearing in the Estimates as coming from that branch of the Government. It is somewhat of an anomaly, I must admit, that work for which the Speaker is not responsible should appear in the Estimates in this way.

Mr. OLIVER: In this and the preceding item the Speaker has been able to effect a substantial reduction, but as soon as we pass to an item not under his control the cost increases. It almost looks as if the Department of Public Printing and Stationery were trying to put one over the House of Commons and the Speaker, and I would respectfully suggest that in the future this item be placed under the control of his

Honour, so that he may deal with the department from an independent standpoint and secure the same measure of economy and efficiency he has brought about in other departments under his control. There is no reason why the House of Commons should allow the Department of Public Printing and Stationery to take advantage of circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall send a marked copy of Hansard containing my hon. friend's remarks to the chairman of the special committee which has now under consideration means whereby a saving in the expenses of Parliament may be effected.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Post Office—Outside service—Salaries and allowances, $8,447,264.25.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Prime Minister spoke to me yesterday with reference to this department, and I thought there would be no objection to going on with the Estimates, provided the right were reserved to us of making a motion on going into Supply on a Thursday or Friday, but as most hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who are particularly interested in these Estimates are absent, not knowing they were to come up, I wish the Government would go on with some other Estimates.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Minister of Inland Revenue is ready to go on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no objection, providing that we can claim one Thursday or Friday on which to make a motion on going into Committee of Supply.

Civil Government, Department of Inland Revenue—Salaries, $180,412.50; contingencies, $22,000.

Mr. DEVLIN: Does this cover increases in wages for any of the employees of the department?

Hon. ALBERT SEVIGNY (Minister of Inland Revenue): Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: What classes of employees will receive increases?

Mr. SEVIGNY: All classes receive the statutory increase.

Mr. MARCIL: Do the statutory increases account for the whole of the increase of $7,162.50 in the vote for salaries?

Mr. SEVIGNY: No, we have three or four new appointments.

Mr. MACDONALD: There are five, according to the Estimates.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who are they?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Three stenographers, one analyst, and one clerk.

Mr. MACDONALD: Here we have an increase of over $7,200, in war time, when we ought to economize. I understand that the consumption of liquor, the inland revenue taxes upon which are collected by the department, has greatly decreased. What, then, justifies this increased expenditure?

Mr. SEVIGNY: In the Inland Revenue Department we economize as much as possible, but one result of the war is to increase our necessary expenditure. Laws have been passed by Parliament for the collection of special revenue, and to administer these laws we must have more employees

Mr. MACDONALD: What laws?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I refer especially to the War Revenues Act of 1914; and it is for the administration of that law that more employees are required.

Mr. MACDONALD: In what way?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Three stenographers, one analyst, and one clerk.

Mr. MACDONALD: What has the analyst to do with the War Revenues Act?

Mr. SEVIGNY: The analyst, I understand, has nothing to do with the War Revenues Act.

Mr. MARCIL: Whom does the analyst replace?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Mr. Kitto, who has been in the department for the last four years, and who is to be promoted.

Mr. MARCIL: The work of the department must have been considerably curtailed by reason of the wave of prohibition which has passed over the country and the laws to restrict the liquor traffic that have been passed in seven out of the nine provinces. Does not that make possible a decrease in the number of employees of the department?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I think the department will have to reduce its outside employees in many of the provinces.

Mr. MARCIL: And will there be no reduction in the Inside Service?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, in some cases.

Mr. MARCIL: Could the minister state in what cases?

Mr. SEVIGNY: We have dispensed with the services of seven or eight men in Ontario alone, so far.

Mr. MARCIL: What about Quebec?

Mr. SEVIGNY: In Quebec, we still have the liquor traffic, and it is not possible to dispense with employees there.

Mr. MARCIL: As a matter of fact, have not the employees been increased last year and the year before.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, in Montreal. The district of Montreal under my department is the largest in Canada. In that district we collect over $10,000,000 a year, which is more than we collect in all the other districts of Canada combined. We have been compelled to increase the number of our employees in the district of Montreal.

Mr. MARCIL: Could the minister give us the names of the new appointments? Or I would ask that later if he would prefer it.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I would prefer that. Meantime I will get the names from the department.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would suggest that the minister should stick to the item before us, which is the vote for the Inside Service for his department. In his Excise Branch, he has added two employees with an additional charge for salaries of $2,588 a year. In his Laboratory Branch, he has three new employees with an addition of $3,750. Then under the head of contingencies, he has an increase of $1,900 for printing and stationery, and $100 for clerical assistance. I would like the minister to take up each of these branches and explain who has been added to the staff, and why. He tells us generally that the increase is on account of the War Revenues Act. That, I suppose, means the collection of stamps. But that does not seem to me any particular reason for adding to the number of the Inside Service. Every minister except the hon. gentleman himself has decreased his Estimates, while he has made an increase of nearly $10,000.

Mr. SEVIGNY: As to the increase of $100 for clerical service, I am told by my deputy minister that that is only to make a round figure.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why did you not make it "three hundred," it would look just as pretty?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I admit that, but that would be more than sufficient for our requirements.

Mr. MACDONALD: What about the $6,000 for printing and stationery?

Mr. SEVIGNY: In some of the departments the expenditure has been reduced, but the Customs Department and my department, since the war broke out, have been called upon to supply a large amount of money to the Government, and our revenues have increased to a large extent. In my department, as in every other business, when affairs are prosperous and we are making money, we have to spend more money. We require more stationery on account of the new laws which have been passed and the new revenues which we have to collect.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Customs Department is not asking any more for printing than they did last year, and it is making more money than your department.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I suppose the Customs Department had everything it wanted before. The other item, $12,000, is the same as it was last year.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I saw in a newspaper the other day that Mr. Raoul Renault of Quebec had been appointed an accountant in the Department of Inland Revenue. Is that true?

Mr. SEVIGNY: No, Mr. Raoul Renault was recommended for the position, and the Civil Service Commission refused to give him a certificate.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Did the minister recommend Mr. Renault himself?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I thought that Mr. Renault was perfectly qualified for the position, and I made the recommendation, but the Civil Service Commission refused to accept him.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I suppose the recommendation made by the minister of Mr. Renault does not mean that he endorses Mr. Renault's ideas as expressed in his newspaper in Quebec with regard to recruiting and other matters relating to the war?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I do not know Mr. Renault's opinions on the war. I know that on many occasions he has condemned some papers of our province for the expressions of opinion on the war, and from what I can gather, Mr. Renault is willing to support every measure submitted by the Government to aid the Allies in this war.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Did the minister read Mr. Renault's paper, Le Franc Parleur, last year?

Mr. SEVIGNY: No.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I know that Mr. Renault, especially with regard to the recruiting of the 171st Regiment, under the command of Sir William Price, had very violent articles against that officer, and strongly advised people not to enlist, at least in that regiment.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I am not surprised at that because Mr. Renault and Sir William Price are not very good friends; in fact, they are the reverse; but if any attacks were made by Mr. Renault upon Sir William Price, I do not think the Minister of Inland Revenue is responsible for that. Sir William Price is a good friend of mine; he has my admiration, and when he was raising his regiment, I endeavoured to assist him. Now, my hon. friend can put any more question about Mr. Renault, but that gentleman is not appointed, and the Civil Service Commission having refused to give him a certificate, he will not be appointed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): Shall the item be carried?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): Section 5 of rule 13 states that:

> Speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

I do not consider that these statements come under that rule.

Mr. OLIVER: Are we not discussing an item relating to salaries of the department of which the minister is head?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: And is not this discussion relating to the merits of appointments to that department?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): The item before the committee is "Department of Inland Revenue, salaries, $180,412.50, and contingencies, $22,000." Speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration. I do not think that a discussion on statements in regard to Mr. Renault's opinion on the war published in his newspaper would come within the rule. I understand the minister to say that the gentleman spoken of is not in the employ of the Government.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister said that he recommended Mr. Renault.

Mr. OLIVER: Inasmuch as this is an item covering salaries in the Department of Inland Revenue, the appointment of men to serve in that department is necessarily pertinent to the discussion of the appropriation. In regard to the gentleman under discussion, I understand from the minister that he considered him a suitable person for employment in the department, and that, as a matter of fact, he did appoint him, but that his appointment was not confirmed by the Civil Service Commission. The point taken by my hon. friend from Kamouraska, as I understood it, and certainly the point that I would wish to take, was that a gentleman, who is the editor of a newspaper and who uses that paper during this time of war for discouraging efforts towards the winning of the war, is not a suitable person to be recommended by the minister for a salaried position under this Government, and we take exception to the minister's recommendation of that gentleman for that position.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Mr. Renault was not appointed by me; he was recommended by me. It is true that a certain paper, Le Franc Parleur, was published in the city of Quebec.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the translation of that name?

Mr. MARCIL: The Plain Speaker.

Mr. SEVIGNY: In my judgment, it was certainly regrettable to have in that paper, especially during this crisis, certain articles, and to put an end to that, I thought it would be a good thing to close the paper.

Mr. MACDONALD: To give him a good job.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Not necessarily a good job, but at the same time it would be in the public interest if papers like Le Franc Parleur or La Liberté at Montreal or some other papers were closed at the present time and if such papers——

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Are you going to give him a job too?

Mr. SEVIGNY: No, if I give him a job it will be in jail.

Mr. KNOWLES: Perhaps he is not yet thirty years of age, he may be a young man.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Perhaps. Mr. Renault was mentioned for a position in my depart-

ment, not a new position, but that of accountant, which is vacant, and I can assure my hon. friend that I made that recommendation especially for one reason. I owed nothing to Mr. Renault, but I thought that it would be a good thing if such a paper could be put out of existence in this crisis.

Mr. MACDONALD: Hear, hear, instead of putting him in jail——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Make Bourassa a deputy minister.

Mr. OLIVER: I should like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that there are other means of dealing with newspapers which make improper references at this particular time. I have in mind a newspaper at Sault Ste. Marie which was suppressed by the authorities because of the character of its utterances, although I have no knowledge of the nature of those utterances. It is certainly a somewhat remarkable fact that at Sault Ste. Marie a newspaper is suppressed because of its utterances, and in the favoured locality that my hon. friend has the honour to represent, in a general if not in a particular way, such utterances are suppressed by appointment to a Government position, or by recommendation for a Government position, at, I presume, a fair salary. That appears to me to be such a wide difference of treatment between parallel instances that it surely cannot be allowed to pass without unfavourable comment at the hands of this Parliament.

Mr. SEVIGNY: First, perhaps, it would be better to know what the utterances of the paper in Quebec were. Perhaps there was some animosity between Mr. Renault and Sir William Price, but, as I said at first, I think that Mr. Renault, since the beginning of this war, has always been well disposed to do everything possible to help the Allies, and I do not think that paper, La Franc Parleur, ever criticised our participation in this war. Perhaps some articles in that paper were not in the public interest, especially in the city of Quebec. I do not know if they were written by Mr. Renault or by some other man.

Mr. COPP: He would be responsible for them if they were in his paper.

Mr. KNOWLES: Along what lines did the articles proceed?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I am going to ask the committee to assist the Chair in keeping somewhere near the subject before the committee. I am sure hon. gentlemen will do that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The committee, of course, desire to keep within the rules, and we will not refuse to abide by the ultimate decision of the Chair; but the ruling should at least be fair. We are simply discussing what is the policy of the department.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): Does my hon. friend say that the ruling is not fair?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, I do not say it is not fair. We are now discussing the policy of the department in respect to the appointment of officials. The minister has declared, in a fair manner, that it is his policy to bring into the service persons engaged in newspaper work who might possibly be charged with writing seditious articles. Apparently it is the minister's policy that it is in the interest of the country to withdraw these dangerous men from their profession and put them into the public service. If a man is engaged in a dangerous propaganda in these days, in newspaper work, it is a question of policy, a fair question of argument for the committee to decide whether the policy of the department is right or wrong, and whether such men should be introduced into the public service. The salaries of the department are being voted, and surely it is a fair thing for us on this side to say that the minister has enunciated a very improper policy. Some men would argue, and with fairness I think, that if a man is engaged in writing seditious articles in the press he should be prosecuted or should be put in jail. The minister says: I will take them into the service and let them become servants of the King. I submit that that is a fair mattter for discussion, and I say that the policy of the minister is wrong. I was going to ask the minister if he had any understanding with Mr. Renault that, if he came into the service of the Crown, he would abstain from writing questionable or seditious articles. Did the minister discuss it with the commission?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I wish to say this: I do not think it is fair for the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to say that Mr. Renault, to the knowledge of the Minister of Inland Revenue, was writing seditious articles. That is not true. If seditious articles were written by Mr. Renault, it is not to my knowledge.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will withdraw the word "seditious;" perhaps that is not correct. But the minister himself expressed the view that he was engaged in writing

articles of some nature that were objectionable to him, and he deemed it advisable to withdraw him from that sphere of activity and put him into the public service. The articles were apparently with reference to recruiting. I withdraw the word "seditious," but that does not detract from the position I take.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I am going to ask the committee to decide whether or not they think this discussion is on the item before the Chair, and if there is any hon. gentleman who wants to appeal from the Chair's decision, he has a perfect right to do so. But I propose to stop this kind of discussion.

Mr. OLIVER: Then I would desire to make the appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Perhaps you will bear with me while I say in justice to Mr. Renault that while I believe he would be a qualified officer so far as aptitude and abilities are concerned, I really think that his opinions at the present time, and the opinions he has avowed for the last two years, are not of a nature to recommend him to my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue since his conversion from Nationalist principles.

Mr. McKENZIE: It would be well for the committee to understand just what this ruling is. I do not understand the Chair to make any particular decision, but to leave it open to himself to decide when a discussion is germane to the point. I would think it a dangerous ruling to say that we are not permitted to discuss the policy of appointments.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I will leave it to the fair play of the members in the House, to say whether they propose to discuss under this item, newspaper articles on the war.

Mr. MACDONALD: We were not discussing newspaper articles.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): Order. Or whether we shall discuss matters dealing with the war.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the chairman state what his ruling is?

The CHAIRMAN: My ruling was given and it is not for the hon. gentleman from Pictou to say.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes it is.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I am in the Chair. I call "Order," and the hon. gentleman can appeal to the Speaker. I have given my decision, and I will leave it to the House to say whether a discussion of this kind, dealing with newspaper articles or the expressions of the editor in regard to the war, comes within the item before the Chair. If my hon. friend wishes to appeal from my decision, he has the right.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not familiar with the rules of the House, but I desire to appeal, and take a vote of the committee. I was under the impression that an appeal must be taken without discussion. If there is opportunity for discussion, I wish to place before the committee, as shortly as possible, my view of the subject.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): The appeal is to the Speaker, and not to the chairman.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I have no objection to give all explanations required from me as to this recommendation.

Mr. KNOWLES: But the chairman will not let you do so.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister admits he recommended this gentleman for appointment. I think, in doing so, he was helping a good cause, namely recruiting, by putting an end to a certain campaign in Quebec more or less injurious to recruiting.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I understood all that.

Mr. MARCIL: The question the committee is discussing is whether the minister was wise in recommending such a gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I have already decided that the statement of the minister, and the other statements in answer, are out of order, and I appeal to the good sense of the committee to say whether they think this kind of discussion should continue.

Mr. MACDONALD: We are appealing.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I am quite willing you should appeal.

Mr. KNOWLES: How is the newspaper article mixed up with it?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would the Chairman explain in what way the newspaper becomes part of this point of order?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): A statement was made by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) that a certain

newspaper article expressed an opinion of a man who made application to the minister for a position, and the point in the hon. gentleman's statement was his expression in regard to the war, whether it was for the war or against the war, and I ruled that that kind of discussion was out of order.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is not the point.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I know that is not my hon. friend's idea, but I am giving my decision. If the hon. gentleman from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) wishes to appeal from my ruling, he can do so.

Mr. OLIVER: I desire to appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and I ask the privilege of stating my view of the subject

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): The hon. gentleman can state it to the Speaker.

Mr. OLIVER: I move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): All those in favour of the motion say, Aye.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not familiar with the rules. I understood an appeal from the Chairman's ruling went automatically to the House.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): There is a motion before the committee.

Mr. OLIVER: I move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): Is it the pleasure of hon. gentlemen that the committee rise and report to the Speaker?

Mr. MARCIL: According to the procedure, when an hon. member appeals from the Chairman's decision, it is the duty of the Chairman to report to the Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I am not very familiar with the rule myself. I will report to the Speaker.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I ask the Chairman to read the report he proposes to make to the Speaker because we may not be agreed on the statement.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): My report to the Speaker reads as follows:

On the debate on the resolution No. 14, which reads as follows:

That a sum not exceeding $202,412.50 be granted to His Majesty for civil government.

Department of Inland Revenue—Salaries, $180,412.50; contingencies, $22,000.

Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska) referred to certain articles published in Le Franc Parleur, a newspaper published in Quebec, and the Chairman ruled him out of order under Rule 13, paragraph 5. Mr. Oliver appeals to the House from this decision.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It seems to me that that is hardly a sufficient reference. I was not in the House, but I understand that the minister was questioned as to his recommendation of the appointment of a certain Mr. Renault.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I do not wish to be discourteous to the right hon. leader of the Opposition, but I hardly have opportunity of discussing the matter with him. I made this ruling much against my will, but we must maintain order in the committee.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not able to agree that the statement presented by the Chairman is a correct one. The subject of discussion was the proposed appointment of a gentleman to earn part of the salary being voted, and his fitness for the position as shown by articles published in a newspaper which he edited.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): On that point I did not rule my hon. friend out of order. When he reached the point where he stated that the article expressed an opinion on the war I then ruled him out of order. I did not rule the hon. member out of order on the question of his discussing the fitness of the man for the position; on the contrary, I decided that that was perfectly in order.

Mr. OLIVER: Our point was that this man, in his newspaper, used language that was not in the public interest, and that that was the reason given by the minister for recommending his appointment. We considered that that was an objection to his appointment, not a recommendation, and we were arguing accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): I ruled that all out of order, the minister's statement as well as my hon. friend's.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I took the precaution to say that I did not know what articles were published by Mr. Renault in Le Franc Parleur. If reprehensible articles were written by Mr. Renault, I have no knowledge of them. I said only this: That there were some difficulties between Mr. Renault and Sir William Price. Sir William Price is not the people of Canada, nor is he to decide whether or not we are to participate in this war. If there is a difference between Sir William Price and Mr. Renault, that does not mean that Mr. Renault has written sedi-

tious articles against our participation in the war.

Mr. MACDONALD: You prevent him from writing any more by giving him this job.

Mr. OLIVER: If I may refresh the minister's memory, the discussion was in this form: Sir William Price was raising a regiment, and the criticism offered by this man in his paper against the raising of a regiment by Sir William Price was the cause of his being recommended for the position—on the understanding that he should not publish such articles. Surely my hon. friend does not wish the committee to understand that he used the public service as a means of preventing discussion among his friends. He surely gave us to understand that he recommended the appointment because it was in the public interest that such discussion should be suppressed.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Mr. Renault was recommended to me by the best business men of Quebec city, who told me that he was a very good accountant. Besides, I know personally that Mr. Renault has good qualifications as an accountant. An accountant is required in my department; the position is still vacant. I have recommended Mr. Renault, because he is perfectly qualified for the position. If some articles were written by Mr Renault in Le Franc Parleur, I do not know of them. I know that there is in Quebec a weekly newspaper called Le Franc Parleur. I do not know who is the owner, but I can say this: If such a paper—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): Is it the pleasure of the committee that I report this ruling to the Speaker?

An hon. MEMBER: Not in that form.

Mr. Speaker having again taken the Chair, the Chairman reported as follows:

In the debate in committee on resolution No. 14, which reads as follows: "Resolved that a sum not exceeding $202,412.50 be granted to His Majesty for civil government, Department of Inland Revenue; salaries, $180,412.50; contingencies, $22,000;" Mr. Ernest Lapointe referred to certain articles published in Le Franc Parleur, a newspaper published in Quebec, and the Chairman ruled him out of order under Rule 13, paragraph 5. Mr. Oliver appeals to the House from this decision.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the decision of the Chairman?

Mr. SPEAKER: I must accept the report which comes to me from the Chairman of the Committee.

[Mr. Sévigny.]

Mr. KNOWLES: I want to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The rule is clear that the question must be determined by the House without discussion.

Mr. KNOWLES: I simply wanted to ask a question.

The House divided on the question: Shall the ruling of the Chairman be confirmed? And the same was confirmed on the following division:

MESSRS.

Yeas:

Armstrong (Lambton),	Henderson,
Bennett (Calgary),	Merner,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Morris,
Best,	Nickle,
Boys,	Paquet,
Brabazon,	Rainville,
Bradbury,	Rogers,
Burrell,	Schaffner,
Clark (Bruce),	Sexsmith,
Cochrane,	Shepherd,
Cromwell,	Smith,
Doherty,	Steele,
Donaldson,	Stevens,
Edwards,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Fisher,	Sutherland,
Foster (Sir George),	Wallace,
Fripp,	Webster,
Girard,	White (Sir Thomas),
Hanna,	Wright.—38.

MESSRS.

Nays:

Boivin,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Copp,	Macdonald,
Cruise,	Maclean (Halifax),
Douglas,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Fortier,	Oliver,
German,	Pacaud,
Guthrie,	Ross,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	White
Kyte,	(Victoria, Alta.)—18.
Lapointe (Kamouraska).	

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Blain in the Chair.

Department of Inland Revenue—Salaries, $180,412.50.

Mr. MARCIL: As a matter of procedure I should like to know whether, if the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole is in the House, he should not occupy the Chair.

Mr. Rainville takes the Chair.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Has anybody been appointed as accountant yet?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Not yet.

Mr. MACDONALD: I understand that the chief qualification of Mr. Renault, beyond being an accountant, was that the minister desired to remove him from the

political arena where he was writing letters for the purpose of discouraging enlistment in the regiment of Sir William Price. If that is the policy of the Government—to recommend for positions under the Government, people who write articles seeking to discourage voluntary recruiting and aiding Great Britain in the war—it is a policy that deserves the condemnation of the people of this country. If the ministers of the Crown are thus putting a premium on the conduct of men who are asking the people of the province of Quebec not to enlist, it readily explains the state of recruiting in that province. This method of dealing with people who make seditious speeches or write seditious articles in the province of Quebec will put this Government in a very peculiar position before the people of this country.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Mr. Renault was recommended to the position because he was an accountant of long experience. He is about 50 years old.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think most of his time he has been editing a newspaper.

Mr. SEVIGNY: No. During the last few months Mr. Renault has been writing certain articles in a weekly newspaper in Quebec.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Does my hon. friend say he has been editor of that paper for only the last two months?

Mr. SEVIGNY: The last few months.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: He has been publishing that newspaper for at least three years.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I do not know about that. I recommended him because in my judgment he was very well qualified for the position of accountant.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who recommended him to you?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Mr. J. Gignac, one of the largest lumbermen in the city of Quebec, J. B. Letellier and J. M. Fortier.

Mr. GERMAN: Is it true that this man has been writing articles in the press against recruiting in the province of Quebec?

Mr. SEVIGNY: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: You said so yourself just now.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I said just the contrary. I said that since the war broke out I understood that Mr. Renault had approved of Canada's participation in the war to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. MACDONALD: I cannot permit the minister to change his statement. He said that this man had written articles in this newspaper with the object of discouraging enlistment in the regiment of Sir William Price.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I did not say that. I said there was a quarrel between Sir William Price and Mr. Renault, that Mr. Renault had said some things about Sir William Price that perhaps were not over nice, and that Sir William Price may have reciprocated.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister certainly stated that this man had written articles urging men not to enlist in Sir William Price's regiment.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I have never seen any of these letters in Le Franc Parleur.

Mr. MACDONALD: Now you are dodging.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I do not know that Mr. Renault ever advised anybody not to enlist in that regiment.

Mr. MACDONALD: You said so just now.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I did not. My hon. friend suggested that I recommended Mr. Renault because recruiting was not very active in the province of Quebec.

Mr. MACDONALD: Did not the minister say he thought it well to give Mr. Renault this position, to prevent him writing further articles in that newspaper?

Mr. SEVIGNY: If the appointment of Mr. Renault had that effect, I think it would be a good thing. If recruiting has not been satisfactory in the province of Quebec it may be because of certain appeals which have been made, not by Mr. Renault, but by other people—for instance, the Liberal candidate in Dorchester at the recent election.

Mr. GERMAN: Did Mr. Renault own or control the newspaper in which these appeals were made?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I do not know.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister suggested that the discouraging recruiting figures in the province of Quebec are due to certain statements made by the Liberal candidate in Dorchester.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, Mr. Cannon.

Mr. KNOWLES: Did not the minister himself state in that campaign that when he was only 30, he had made anti-British appeals which he afterwards regretted? He has nothing on Mr. Cannon on that score.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Since the war broke out I have done the best I could to secure Canada's participation in this war, and I intend to do so in the future. I hope my example will be followed by many hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not think the time will ever come when hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will sit at the feet of the minister, learning how to aid the Empire. Does not the minister think that the appeals he made five years ago against aiding Great Britain may still be having their effect, and possibly furnish an explanation for the failure of recruiting in Quebec?

Mr. SEVIGNY: In 1910 I was very strongly opposed to the naval policy of the Liberal party, but I have never at any time made any appeals against Great Britain.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: In justice to Mr. Cannon, who is a friend of mine, I must protest against the hon. member for Moosejaw comparing his utterances in the recent election with those of the Minister of Inland Revenue in 1911. During the Drummond-Arthabaska election the present Minister of Inland Revenue said, "The Bill refers to the navy of His Majesty. Who is His Majesty? We have no Majesty in Canada." Mr. Cannon never said anything like that in Dorchester or anywhere else. He was one of the men who fought against the Minister of Inland Revenue and against the Postmaster General and the Nationalists in 1911.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am afraid that the ruling which has just been confirmed by so large a majority is in danger of being toppled over if this discussion continues. Do not hon. gentlemen think that we have had enough of this and that we had better go on with salaries?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rainville): I would ask the committee to confine itself strictly to the item under discussion.

Mr. MARCIL: How far can we go in a discussion of a recommendation for an appointment of this kind? What are the rights of the committee?

[Mr. Knowles.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) has been Speaker of the House and he ought not to put queries such as that. He knows very well.

Mr. OLIVER: It is only fair to say that the ruling which has been given, and which has been supported by a majority of the House, disarranges all former ideas as to what the Rules of the House mean.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If it is a matter of disarranging some of the talk that goes on upon the Estimates, do not we know in our hearts that it is a good disarrangement? Why not get on with the Estimates?

Mr. BLAIN: The remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), I think, call for a statement to be made by somebody. The decision of the Chair, sustained by a vote of the House, was, briefly, on the question whether a reference to the opinion of an editor on the war published in a newspaper was relevant to a discussion of the estimates of the Department of Inland Revenue.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD: Nobody knows better than the gentleman (Mr. Blain), who has just spoken, that the way in which he put the question to the House was not the way in which the question was raised.

Mr. BLAIN: I put the question exactly as it was, and my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) knows it just as well as any other member of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Rainville): I wish the committee would keep to the Rules.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the Chairman ruled I put the question straight, whether it was open to us to discuss the policy of appointments by the minister, and the answer was that that was open to us. I take this to include the character and record of the men selected for appointment. I understood the Acting Chairman to say that we were within our rights in calling attention to these matters. But he objected to a certain newspaper article being mentioned, and the House sustained him in his ruling—I will not say whether I think that was right or wrong. The principle was admitted by the Acting Chairman (Mr. Blain), and I presume will be admitted by you, Mr. Chairman, that we have the right to discuss the policy of any minister as to the kind of people that he will call to the Civil Service of this country. And that is what we are doing. I was startled by the announcement, made by the minister, that he thought it

was necessary to put an end to the articles appearing in a newspaper in Quebec which were detrimental to the best interests of recruiting and to the winning of the war, and the way he took to stop them was to bring the author of them into the Civil Service and into the heart of his department. That was to me startling—that any man whose conduct was such as to make him a danger to the country, a firebrand, had to be given the King's money and the King's appointment in order to take him out of the way. That is what started the discussion here to-day. But we need hardly be surprised that the minister followed that course, for he is a product of that line of action himself; he owes his position in the Cabinet to just such reasoning. When the right hon. gentleman (Sir George Foster), who leads the House, gave out the slogan in 1910, "Anything to beat Laurier," he announced a policy the chickens of which are coming home to roost. It would be a strange thing indeed if we are not permitted in this House to call the attention of the minister to the fact that he is giving the reward of iniquity to the man he is calling to be an officer of Government. If this man, who was threatening sedition, did not come into the Service, it was not because the minister did not try to bring him in. He went as far as he could, but a commission, whose members, perhaps, knew more than the minister, turned him down. The fact that this man is not to-day receiving a reward for his flagitious conduct is not the fault of the minister; he was willing that such a man should come into his department, and possess the secrets of that department, to spread them abroad, perhaps, against the interests of recruiting and to neutralize the efforts put forth to win the war. I hope we shall not hear again of efforts of that kind by the Minister of Inland Revenue, or any other minister.

Mr. SEVIGNY: The hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) has referred to what took place in 1910 and 1911. In 1911, I was elected in the county of Dorchester. Two years after I came to this House I was asked by the Prime Minister to vote a contribution of $35,000,000 to help the British Navy and increase the strength of the British Empire. At that time the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny), the French-Canadian, the "bad Nationalist," as he had been called by certain members of this House, voted for this contribution of $35,000,000 to help the British Empire, but the records show that there were members of this House sitting on the other side who refused to vote for that contribution. I repeat what I said a few minutes ago, that since the war broke out I have done everything possible to help recruiting and to promote the participation of Canada in the war; and it is my intention to do the same in the future. If the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) turns his attention to current events in the province of Quebec, he will see that the press of his own party in that province is doing worse than was done in 1910 and 1911. The excuse that might be pleaded for the people of 1910 and 1911 was that we were not at war; nobody knew what was coming. Nobody knew what was coming, but at the present time every one knows what is going on and that we are in the greatest crisis of our history; and yet all the French press of the Liberal party in Quebec is repeating exactly—

Mr. KNOWLES: It is out of order to refer to the press.

Mr. SEVIGNY: —the same things which are published every day by Mr. Tancrede Marsil and Mr. Bourassa.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The minister is certainly not representing the facts as they are when he dares to say in this House of Commons that the Liberal press of the province of Quebec is to-day using the same line of abuse that he used in 1910 and 1911.

Mr. SEVIGNY: The Liberal press is using it.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I challenge my hon. friend to show any newspaper representing Liberal opinion in the province of Quebec which has ever published, either before the war started or during the war, such statements as I have mentioned a few minutes ago to have been uttered by the hon. gentleman and his friends in that province. The reverse is the case. The Liberal press, from the outbreak of hostilities, has always advocated the participation of Canada in the war. The doctrine that the Liberal press is preaching to-day in Quebec is the same doctrine as that on which we went to the people in 1911, and upon which we asked the people of Quebec to return to this Parliament members supporting the right hon. gentleman who, in that province as throughout the rest of Canada, advocated the participation of Canada in the wars of the Empire in time of danger, and the taking of the necessary steps for giving adequate defence to Canada at any time.

Mr. EDWARDS: What about the Liberal clubs?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The minister is speaking to-day of those who are using violent words in Quebec. Who are they? They are those who were going on the platforms with the minister in 1910 and 1911.

Mr. SEVIGNY: All Liberals.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend speaks of Mr. Tancrede Marsil. He was the Conservative Nationalist candidate in the county of Bagot in the election of 1911, and he said there what he is saying to-day in the city of Montreal. Who is using those violent words to-day of which my hon. friend is complaining? Mr. Lavergne.

Mr. SEVIGNY: A good Liberal.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Mr. Lavergne was my hon. friend's friend in 1910 and 1911.

Mr. SEVIGNY: He is your friend now.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: He was your leader. He is not my leader. I have a leader of whom I am proud; I supported him in 1911; I have followed him in opposition, and to-day I am proud to follow him in the stand he has taken since the beginning of the war. I did not want, Sir, to be responsible for the little storm that has occurred in the House to-day, I assure you, but unfortunately the very innocent remarks I made gave rise to this debate. I simply asked whether Mr. Renault had been appointed to the Department of Inland Revenue, because I saw that statement in the press the other day, and my hon. friend said that Mr. Renault had not been appointed; that he had been recommended by the Minister of Inland Revenue, but that the appointment was refused by the Civil Service Commission on account of Mr. Renault's age. I did not say anything against Mr. Renault's qualification, but I thought it rather strange that Mr. Renault, whose opinions, which are absolutely on the side of nationalism, and which have been of that nature since he started publishing his newspaper, are well known in Quebec, should have been selected by the minister for such an important position in his department. I did not say that Mr. Renault had been seditious; it is the minister who has insinuated and hinted that to this House by saying that Mr. Renault's paper has been publishing articles that were an obstacle to recruiting in Quebec, and that it was in order to stop that, that the minister recommended his appointment to a position in the department. I think the minister is responsible for what has happened in this committee this afternoon.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I understand why these attacks are made by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe). I stated a few minutes ago that the Liberal party in the province of Quebec are much worse than the Nationalists of 1910 and 1911 were; that in 1910 and 1911 no one knew what was coming, but that to-day every one knows that we are in a crisis of our history.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The attitude of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec has nothing to do with the item before the Chair.

Mr. SEVIGNY: That is true—

Mr. McKENZIE: I ask for a ruling on that point. We have already been requested to adhere to the item under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask the minister a question with regard to what he stated before he sat down? When he stated that the Liberal party in the province of Quebec—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. KNOWLES: —was more disloyal than the Nationalists in 1911, did he mean all the Liberal party or how much of it?

The CHAIRMAN: Order. That is absolutely out of order.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I am willing to answer the question.

Mr. KNOWLES: The whole Liberal party?

Mr. SEVIGNY: The Liberal party of the province of Quebec, and I can prove my statement in two minutes from the newspaper I have in my hand.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. This is out of order.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is the minister going to prove that some one else was more disloyal than he was in 1910?

Mr. KNOWLES: That is what he said.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to know why Mr. Renault was recommended by the minister. I have here Le Franc Parleur, and I could read an extract from it to show that Mr. Renault did not oppose recruiting in Quebec at all. What Mr. Renault opposed

in Quebec was the way in which the Militia Department treated the French Canadian regiments in the district of Quebec. He said that Sir William Price had been given preferential treatment, and that with all the support of the department he had been able, after two years' efforts, to recruit only 550 men in the whole district, and that the French Canadian regiments commanded by Col. Readman and Col. Piuze had not been given fair treatment and still had done better than Sir William Price had done. He stated that both these regiments had been disbanded, and that the soldiers who had enlisted in them had been drafted under false pretenses after a formal promise had been given that they would go to the front under French Canadian officers in French Canadian regiments, preserving their own identity. In this edition of his newspaper of the 9th of June, Mr. Renault objects to the recruiting methods of the Militia Department in the district of Quebec, and not to recruiting per se. In justice to this newspaper man—I belong to the craft—I thought I would make his statement plain. If the minister wishes to aid recruiting in Quebec, he should read what Mr. Renault says and apply his methods, so far as recruiting is concerned, to the Militia Department.

Mr. MACDONALD: If the Board of Civil Service Commissioners should report Mr. Renault as qualified for the position, will the minister still appoint him?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I do not see what is the purpose of that question. I have given my answer that Mr. Renault was not the accountant of my department, that he was not appointed, and the matter is ended there.

Mr. KYTE: Was the minister aware when he made the recommendation that according to the regulations of the Civil Service no person over thirty-five years of age could be admitted into the service of his department?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, I was aware of that, but in certain cases, as my hon. friend probably knows, when it is a technical position, this rule does not apply.

Mr. KYTE: Does the minister think that the service of an accountant comes within the meaning of section 21 providing for the appointment of experts?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, it is considered as such by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. KYTE: Then why did not the Civil Service Commission accept the appointment?

Mr. SEVIGNY: If I remember aright, they declared that Mr. Renault had not had enough experience to take the position.

Mr. KYTE: Then he was not an expert in the opinion of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SEVIGNY: He was not well enough qualified for the position.

Mr. KYTE: Then the minister admits that he tried to impose upon the department an expert who was not an expert.

Mr. SEVIGNY: The minister is not an accountant himself; but Mr. Renault was recommended to the minister by the best business men of the city of Quebec who told the minister that Mr. Renault was a very, very good accountant. The Civil Service Commission have declared that Mr. Renault had not enough experience in departmental affairs.

Mr. MARCIL: What has become of the appointment, who got the office?

Mr. SEVIGNY: It is still vacant.

Mr. MARCIL: No appointment was made from Ottawa of Mr. Laverdure?

Mr. SEVIGNY: No.

Mr. KNOWLES: Even if the committee is not divided on this vote, I wish to place myself on record against passing this item. I do this for two reasons. In the first place, I am against voting money to the minister to be expended under a policy such as has been laid down. Humble member as a person may be, every one of us stands on an equal footing when he comes to register his vote, and I wish to be no party to voting money to be placed in the hands of this minister if he is going to alienate the people's money for reasons and on policies and principles such as he has laid down. He is the judge, and he is responsible. I will not say an unkind word about him, but I say that for my part I disapprove of money being voted under these circumstances. He told us clearly and plainly that the reason he recommended this gentleman was that he was writing certain articles which he thought were against our country's interest.

Mr. SEVIGNY: That is not fair.

Mr. KNOWLES: I heard the minister say—

Mr. SEVIGNY: That is not fair, and you know it.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister can say it is not fair. I am saying what I understood him to say, and we will have to be judged by Hansard when it is issued. He certainly stated that he himself desired to appoint this gentleman that there might as a result be a cessation of certain articles of some kind, which articles he gave us to understand were objectionable to every one who wished the best interests of this country. I wish to place myself on record as disapproving of voting to a minister the people's money, to be used for such a purpose as that. If other people in this country are to be told that all they have to do in this country in order to get a fat Government job is to make a nuisance or a national peril of themselves, we will be a laughing stock in expending the people's money, and that is what we are as a Parliament and as a committee when we adopt the system by giving the minister the vote he asks. I am absolutely against giving the minister the money to be spent, when he declares that to be his policy. He has endeavoured to justify it by abuse of other people in the province of Quebec; far, far more than one-half the people in the province of Quebec have to-day had thrown at them from this Government the insult of being called disloyal in everything but in name. Absolutely, more than one-half of the people of Quebec. He says that the people of the province of Quebec who belong to the Liberal party were more disloyal than he himself was in 1911, and I say that is an insult to the great majority of his compatriots in the province of Quebec. I give that as my second reason for opposing this vote. I say that instead of being a reason to induce me to accept this vote it is a stronger reason for my not doing so. I wish to place myself on record as against voting any money to this hon. gentleman, not in a personal way to him, but I say that any minister of the Crown, speaking for himself and, for the time being, speaking for the Government, who says of his fellow British subjects in the province of Quebec that they are disloyal and that they desire to be opposed to Great Britain, our Mother Country, in this war —that he is a member of the Government whose influence makes towards disunity and discord and faction in the Dominion of Canada to-day, when above all else we need unity. And therefore I say that I not only oppose giving this vote to the minister but I am opposed to joining, or co-operating, or concurring in any vote to this minister, so long as he throws this insult out, because so long as he is minister administering a department he is a standing offender against the people of that province. It was a very unfortunate remark. I think that it was the most terrible remark I have heard a minister make about other citizens of Canada since I have been in the House, saying what he has said about the people of Canada in a day when we require harmony among ourselves, when we need all the unity we can have, because in unity there is strength. So, whether there is to be a division on this item or not, I place myself on Hansard as disassociating myself from this vote, disapproving of this vote, and of any vote wherein the hon. gentleman will have any part in the expenditure of the money.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I know my province better than the member who has just spoken.

Mr. KNOWLES: Surely you do.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I know my people, too, and I tell him that the great majority of my people are as loyal to the British Empire and as anxious to help the Allies in this war as he himself or anybody in his riding.

Mr. KNOWLES: You did not say that a minute ago.

Mr. SEVIGNY: That is what I say, and I repeat it. I say that the Liberal press in Quebec, and I say the Liberal organization of the province of Quebec are playing politics only, politics first—and the press will prove it. I take up this paper, Le Soleil, the strongest Liberal paper, the organ of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec. It is the organ of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec, as the Globe is the Liberal organ of the Liberal party in Ontario, or the Winnipeg Free Press the organ of the Liberal party in Manitoba.

Mr. MARCIL: The Globe does not always speak for the Liberal party, nor does the Winnipeg Free Press, nor does Le Soleil. I represent a riding in that district, and Le Soleil never spoke for me, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to find a word from me in my career that will support the contention he has laid before you.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Does the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) say that Le Soleil is not the organ of the Liberal party?

Mr. MARCIL: I am not responsible for what Le Soleil says. It does not represent my views in any respect.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Does—

Mr. MARCIL: What the minister said was that the Liberal party in Quebec was more disloyal than he had been. I do not know what Le Soleil says.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I hold in my hand the file of Le Soleil. At the top of the editorial page I find the words " Organ of the Liberal Party." And it is true. It is the organ of the Liberal party. What do you see in the Winnipeg Free Press, in the Toronto Globe? Those papers are recommending as strongly as possible to their party a support of conscription. Here is Le Soleil, of Quebec, which says last night:—

The French Canadian Conservatives only can save the country; their vote can kill conscription.

Here is an appeal in bold-faced letters made by Le Soleil of Quebec. And if you take Le Canada, another organ of the Liberal party in Quebec, you will see the same things repeated every day. And now take all of those meetings that we have in the province of Quebec—

Mr. KNOWLES: Before the minister puts that away—

Mr. SEVIGNY: I have the floor, and it is my intention to defend myself.

Mr. OLIVER: I ask for a decision on the ruling made by the House a short time ago.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I have been attacked, and I am simply defending myself. The great majority of the population of my province is as loyal as the majority of the people of any other province in this country, but the trouble comes from certain people whom we have in Quebec at the present time. The Liberal press, Le Canada of Montreal, Le Soleil of Quebec, Le Devoir and La Liberte of Montreal, have caused the trouble. Hon. gentlemen opposite will probably say they are my friends.

Mr. KNOWLES: Sure—carried.

Mr. SEVIGNY: You will see in Le Devoir, Bourassa's paper, very strong attacks against the Minister of Inland Revenue, and you will see words of praise for Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I am told—I do not know whether I am right or not—that these words of praise in Le Devoir have only appeared since Sunday last. There was a meeting recently in Montreal between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Bourassa.

Mr. KNOWLES: Who told you?

Mr. MACDONALD: It is absolutely untrue.

Mr. SEVIGNY: That is what I am told. The hon. member from Pictou says it is not correct.

Mr. KYTE: Sir Wilfrid Laurier was not in Montreal last Sunday, he was in Ottawa.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I said they had an interview in Ottawa.

Some hon. MEMBERS: The hon. minister said Montreal.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I am told it was in Ottawa.

Mr. KNOWLES: Who told the hon. gentleman?

Mr. EDWARDS: The statement which the hon. gentleman from Moosejaw was so anxious to make, on which he dwelt so eloquently and forcibly, was that the hon. minister had committed the crime of saying that the Liberal party in Quebec was more disloyal than he was. In order to make any point of that statement, the hon. member from Moosejaw would have to accuse the hon. minister with being disloyal in 1911, because, if the hon. minister was not disloyal then there is nothing in the statement that the Liberal party was more disloyal than he. But he abandons all that argument, and goes into an harangue about the accusation against Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. KNOWLES: Oration, if you please.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the hon. gentleman from Moosejaw and the members on the other side of the House want to invite comparison of the records of the party on this side of the House and the party opposite, they will get that record straight from the shoulder, and we will begin dealing with the records by referring to the leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. When members refer to the operations of men like Bourassa and Lavergne and others in Quebec, who have been preaching treason, let them look back on the record of their own leader, and they will find the counterpart for these treasonable utterances in the words uttered time and again by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It does not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) to read a lecture to any person in this House. The hon. gentleman took an active part in Dorchester,

bringing forward a candidate who was preaching treason on the platform, backed up by him and his leader. If these gentlemen desire to go into the records of their party, they will get all the record they want and more.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I should have been surprised if a debate took place in the House, in which the province of Quebec was in the limelight, without my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) taking a part. He is always on hand when something is said about Quebec, especially if it is derogatory to that province.

Mr. EDWARDS: What did I say against Quebec?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Neither the hon. gentleman nor anybody else would ever frighten me, or the people of my province, either in this House or outside of it, and the sooner he takes that for granted the better. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue quoted one Liberal newspaper (Le Soleil) as backing up what he said about the Liberal party in the province. He said, "Here is Le Soleil, the organ of the Liberal party, and here is what that paper says." Have hon. gentlemen found anything very extraordinary in the utterances of Le Soleil? He said the Manitoba Free Press was preaching for unity in the country, and Le Soleil and Le Canada were against conscription. Does my hon. friend take the position that any man in this country who is not in favour of conscription is not loyal? Does he say that the Liberals of Quebec are disloyal because they are opposed to conscription? I am opposed to conscription.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Order.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend before indicting the Liberal party of Quebec, and charging Sir Wilfrid and the province with disloyalty, should have something else on which to base his statements than newspaper articles stating that the people were opposed to conscription.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the hon. minister say that, because a newspaper or individual opposes conscription therefore they are disloyal?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is the hon. Secretary of State, who is opposed to conscription and has resigned his portfolio, disloyal?

Mr. MARCIL: We might get back to business, and find out what the minister is going to do about this appointment. Who is filling the office in the meantime?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Mr. Lemay.

Mr. MARCIL: Is he recommended by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SEVIGNY: He was in the department. He is an accountant, and the intention of the Civil Service Commission is to recommend him within six months.

Mr. KYTE: How long has Mr. Lemay been assistant accountant?

Mr. SEVIGNY: He came into the department two years ago.

Mr. KYTE: Does the minister think it would be a good thing to adopt the principle of promotion in his department?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, and that is what will be done in this case.

Mr. KNOWLES: The question has not yet been answered. Does the minister mean to say that opposition to conscription means disloyalty? That is a fair question.

The CHAIRMAN: That is absolutely irrelevant.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am bound to bow to your ruling, but I wish to state my position.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Inland Revenue has been given a latitude to defend himself, because he felt he was accused, but all the discussion up to that point was absolutely out of order.

Mr. MACDONALD: He gave the reasons why he made this appointment.

Mr. BOIVIN: The Chairman has just stated that the Minister of Inland Revenue, having been attacked, was given a great deal of latitude by the Chair in order to defend himself, which I think is quite proper, under the rules of the House. But in defending himself, should he be permitted to attack the whole province and brand that province which he represents as disloyal?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I never did that.

Mr. BOIVIN: He said the Liberal press of Quebec were preaching disloyalty, because Le Soleil said the Liberal press was against conscription. He has been asked a fair question, whether a man opposed to conscription is necessarily disloyal, and that has been ruled out of order. The general discussion which took place this afternoon must have been in order,

or you, Mr. Chairman, would not have permitted it. The question which has been put to the minister, therefore, must be in order. It is only fair to the province of Quebec that the minister should let us know whether or not he really thinks that that province is disloyal because it opposes conscription.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister answer the question?

Mr. SEVIGNY: If the question were put in a fair way, I should be very glad to answer it.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the minister suggest a fair way?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I have just said that the great majority of the people of my province are perfectly loyal.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister said that the Liberal party was disloyal.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I said the Liberal press.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Because it is opposed to conscription.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I did not say because it is opposed to conscription. I say that the Liberal press is trying to make trouble in the province of Quebec. I have not all the newspapers with me, but here is one which was published last night—LeSoleil, of Quebec—which makes an appeal to the French Conservative members on this side of the House, saying they should kill conscription.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is that disloyal?

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I never said that Quebec was disloyal.

Mr. BOIVIN: Is the statement in the press disloyal which the minister has just mentioned?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, it is.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish members of the committee to take note that this whole discussion is out of order and against the rules.

Mr. KYTE: Will the minister explain why he did not recommend Mr. Lemay for promotion to the position of accountant?

Mr. SEVIGNY: When I came into the department I was told that the position was vacant. I did not know at the time that Mr. Lemay was mentioned for promotion.

Mr. KYTE: Who informed the minister that the position was vacant?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I do not remember.

Mr. KYTE: Was the position vacant when the minister came into the department?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes.

Mr. COPP: What caused the vacancy?

Mr. SEVIGNY: The death of Mr. Vallin.

Mr. KYTE: Did the minister ask his deputy, before he recommended Mr. Renault, what was the practice of the department with respect to promotions?

Mr. SEVIGNY: When I came to the department in March or April last I said to Mr. Vincent, the deputy minister, that I had recommended Mr. Renault for the position of accountant in my department. If I remember rightly, Mr. Vincent mentioned to me the name of Mr. Lemay.

Mr. KYTE: In what connection?

Mr. SEVIGNY: For the position in question; but before I spoke to Mr. Vincent I had already recommended Mr. Renault.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the minister take any stock in promotions in his department?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Did he think of recommending any deserving official in his department instead of hunting up this poor, foresaken journalist in Quebec?

Mr. SEVIGNY: It was for—

Mr. MARCIL: Political reasons?

Mr. SEVIGNY: The vacancy was mentioned to me before I had a conversation on the subject with the deputy minister. As I have said, Mr. Renault was recommended to me by good business men in Quebec city. I told them that if Mr. Renault was qualified to fill the position I would recommend his appointment.

Mr. MARCIL: Surely the minister does not take it for granted that he can run his department upon the recommendation of the good citizens of Quebec?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I do not.

Mr. MARCIL: I can quite understand that the deputy minister would favour the appointment of an outsider, because he himself came into the department in the first instance to occupy the position which he now holds. I assume that the minister wishes to help the civil servants; if he does, he should consider the advisability of promoting deserving officials rather than taking men from outside for political reasons

simply because they are recommended by so-and-so.

Mr. SEVIGNY: It is my intention to promote employees wherever possible.

Mr. MARCIL: I understand that the minister has quite recently appointed to positions in his department three men from outside the service. I should be obliged if the minister would give us at eight o'clock a list of appointments made to the Inside Service in his department either by him or by his immediate predecessor, noting especially those brought in from the outside.

Mr. KYTE: Who first suggested Mr. Renault to the minister as a competent person to fill the position of accountant?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I do not remember.

Mr. COPP: What salary attaches to the office?

Mr. SEVIGNY: $2,800.

Mr. BOIVIN: I should like the minister to make clear to the committee the reason why Mr. Renault was not appointed. Aside from any other consideration, the minister recommended Mr. Renault's appointment upon the assumption that he was a good accountant. I understand also that owing to the position being a technical one, the age limit was not considered by the Commissioners. Mr. Renault, therefore, was turned down either because he was incompetent, or because he wrote seditious articles. Why was he turned down?

Mr. SEVIGNY: When he was turned down there was no mention at all of articles published in newspapers. The reason, if I remember correctly, was that he was not well qualified for departmental business.

Mr. BOIVIN: Which means that the minister recommended the appointment of a person who was not competent to fill the position.

Mr. CURRIE: A certain position is vacant and the minister recommends the appointment of a man who is believed by leading men in Quebec city to be competent to fill the position. The person recommended goes before the Civil Service Commission, who, coming to the conclusion that he is not as well qualified as the duties of the position require, refuse to sanction the appointment. That is all there is to it—with the exception of the attempts of hon. gentlemen opposite to make a good deal of capital out of it.

Mr. COPP: It was stated during the progress of the Estimates of the other ministers that, wherever possible, it was the policy of the Government to appoint returned soldiers to all vacant positions. This recommendation of the minister was made within the last month or two, since he took charge of the Department of Inland Revenue. Since that time there must have been available a large number of returned soldiers who are professional men, or men of ability and education, and who could perform the duties pertaining to such positions as the one in question. May I inquire, therefore, if the minister is following up the announced policy of the Government in the matter of appointing returned soldiers? Did he make inquiries with a view to finding out whether a returned soldier could be obtained to fill this important position, to which is attached a salary of $2,800?

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 51, for the relief of Delbert Ralph O'Neil.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill No. 52, for the relief of Edward Austin Barnwell.—Mr. R. B. Bennett.

Bill No. 61, for the relief of Charles Frederick Reuben Jones.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 63, for the relief of John Bassnett Parker.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill No. 64, for the relief of Amy Beatrice Mathews Hilton.—Sir Herbert Ames.

Bill No. 70, for the relief of Colin Darrach Poole.—Mr. A. H. Clarke.

Bill No. 71, for the relief of Thomas Edwin Jory.—Mr. Nickle.

Bill No. 72, for the relief of Florence Evaline Snyder Lockwood.—Mr. Kay.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill No. 39, respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. T. J. Stewart.

SECOND READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 76, for the relief of George Walter Sherald Garrett.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 77, for the relief of Gertrude Ellen Beal.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 78, for the relief of Donald George Whibley.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 79, respecting a patent of Ernest Mead Baker.—Mr. Robb.

Bill No. 81, respecting a patent of James B. King and others.—Mr. Macdonell.

SUPPLY.

House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Inland Revenue, before dinner, made the statement, based on a rumour, that an interview had taken place between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Bourassa at Montreal, or at Ottawa. I am authorized by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to say that the statement is untrue and incorrect; neither at Ottawa, nor at Montreal, nor anywhere else, was there such an interview.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister having made the statement—no doubt in good faith—which is now proven to be erroneous, I think he might, in deference to the committee, withdraw that statement.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I was told that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had met Mr. Bourassa in Ottawa on Sunday last. I did not say that it had been proven that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Bourassa had met. I accept the statement of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald).

Mr. KNOWLES: The hon. minister will remember that he stated that the tone of a newspaper which he named had changed very much on account of the interview which he alleged had taken place. Thus, he not only gave that which was rumoured, but he gave evidence as to the truthfulness of the rumour. I think that he ought to withdraw his insinuations that there was some connection between the attitude of the paper and an alleged interview with Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I have nothing to do with Le Devoir; I am not responsible for the articles published in that paper.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will not the minister withdraw his statement that the alleged change in Le Devoir was due to an interview with Sir Wilfrid Laurier?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The minister has accepted the denial made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and having done that, I think he has done all that is necessary. I suggest that is quite a sufficient withdrawal.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am authorized by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to make the statement I have made. I ask the minister to withdraw his statement absolutely, and to state frankly in the House that he made it on no other basis than that of rumour.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I have been told that an interview took place between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Bourassa last Sunday. I do not know whether or not it is true that an interview did take place, but now I accept the statement made by the hon. member for Pictou, and I suppose it is not true that an interview took place.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the minister withdraw his statement based on that rumour?

Mr. SEVIGNY: It is impossible for me to say that there is no rumour to that effect.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the minister withdraw his statement made on the foundation of that rumour?

Mr. SEVIGNY: If Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the leader of the Opposition, says that no such interview took place, I am ready to accept his statement, as I am bound to do so.

Excise—$1,300,318.75.

Mr. KYTE: Some weeks ago the Minister of Customs intimated to the House that it was his policy to fill all vacancies in the Outside Service of his department by appointing returned soldiers. Is that the policy of the Minister of Inland Revenue?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, it is the policy of my department as much as possible to give positions to returned soldiers. I am informed by my deputy that we have appointed about twelve returned soldiers.

Mr. KYTE: Where were the appointments made?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I expect to have some particulars about that in a few minutes.

Mr. KYTE: I desire to call the attention of the minister to a vacancy in his department in the town of Arichat in the county which I represent. Captain Laurence Gerrior, preventive officer at that point, died some years ago. The position is still vacant owing, I understand, to the difficulty experienced by the controller of patronage in that constituency in making a selection from the numerous applicants for

the position. Will the minister fill that office by the appointment of a returned soldier?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I am told by my deputy that we have no vacancy in my department at Arichat.

Mr. KYTE: Are preventive officers at Arichat in the department of the minister?

Mr. SEVIGNY: No, in the Department of Customs.

Mr. KYTE: Have there been any complaints of infractions of the law with reference to the use of war stamps on patent medicines?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, we have many complaints.

Mr. KYTE: Have there been any prosecutions for those infractions?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, a great number.

Mr. KYTE: Will the minister furnish the committee with a list of the prosecutions and the amount of fine collected in each case?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, I am willing to furnish a list. I expect to have it in about twenty minutes or half an hour.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is the cause of the increase of $54,000 in the item preventive service salaries?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I am informed by the officers of my department that last year an error was made by the accountant of the department in making an estimate of $101,000, and that we have had, on account of that error, to make an expenditure from the War Fund. It is to meet the exigencies of the service that we ask for $155,000 this year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Why from the War Fund? Was the work in connection with war expenditures in any way?

Mr. SEVIGNY: It was on account of the application of the preventive service to the War Revenues Act?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That would only refer to stamps?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What was the amount of the item in 1915-16?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I will give the information to my hon. friend later on.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Can the minister explain why the estimate of last year was $50,000 below the corresponding item of the preceding year?

Mr. SEVIGNY: We have been obliged to appoint a certain number of additional officers to see to the execution of the War Measures Act in my department.

Mr. MACDONALD: Did the minister get an Order in Council for these appointments, or was there a Governor General's warrant to pay the officials? What authority had the minister to take money not voted by Parliament unless he had a Governor General's warrant?

Mr. SEVIGNY: The war fund was at the disposal of the department for all expenses required on account of the war.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who gave authority to the department to take any money at all, to divert money that ought to have gone into the treasury without the consent of council? Was there a Governor General's warrant or an Order in Council, or did the deputy minister and the minister simply take the money?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I am told that everything was done in the regular way.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no doubt about it, the war fund appropriation is distributed by Order in Council, and if, in my department for instance, there should be a piece of service that is directly connected with the conduct of the war or which is imposed by the war, I could go to Council, represent the case, get an Order in Council and pay for that service out of the war fund appropriation. I imagine that this is the same thing.

Mr. OLIVER: There does not seem to be any parity between the two cases.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think so.

Mr. OLIVER: I judge that in this case, according to the minister's explanation, he simply was short $50,000 in his estimates. There was no question of war fund or anything else, and he took the money out of the war fund.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He did not take the money out of the war fund. The money did not come out of the war fund except through an Order in Council. No minister has the right to use it by himself or through his department. Such an expenditure must be authorized by Order in Council, and must be for war purposes, and I imagine that this arose from the administration of the war tax on drugs, etc.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not as familiar with the matter as the ministers, but this item is preventive service, salaries, and the minister explained the increase of $54,000 as between last year's Estimates and this year's Estimates by stating that last year's estimate was too low simply because of an error in making the estimate too small; and when asked how he met the requirements of the department, he said he took money out of the war fund. I must say that if it is the habit of the Government to take money by Order in Council out of the war fund to carry on the ordinary business of the department—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not the ordinary business.

Mr. OLIVER: —that is hardly as we understand proper administration. This is not war service. Salaries for the preventive service of the Inland Revenue Department do not come under war service; that item is the ordinary administration of the department, as I would understand it, and the money that we vote for war purposes has no right in the world to be used even by the Government to make up a deficiency which occurs as my hon. friend has said this did.

Mr. SEVIGNY: When it was realized in the department that we were short of money to pay those employees, the accountant of the department laid the question before the Auditor General, and I am told that he was authorized by the Auditor General to take the necessary amount from the war fund. At the time, those officials were employed to see to the proper execution of the special War Revenue Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That would not be a proper expenditure from the war loan.

Mr. SEVIGNY: They were looking after the administration of the War Revenue Act and we had not enough money to pay them; so the accountant of my department was authorized to pay those employees with the money of the war fund.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This explanation, if correct, is very irregular, and it is only proper that Parliament should express an adverse opinion upon doing public business in that way unless the whole matter is susceptible of some different explanation. I do not think it would be fair to pay out of the war fund anything in connection with the collection of revenues. The Inland Revenue Department has to do only with the collection of revenues from excise duties on tobacco and liquor, and the war stamp tax. There was an ample vote for the collection of the war stamp tax, so that if this advance from the war fund, so-called, was on account of preventive service, it really was not properly a war expenditure. It is not fair that expenses should be met in this manner from the war account. Perhaps the minister is wrong, perhaps it was not paid out in that way at all. Is he sure of that? It may have been paid by a Governor General's warrant out of consolidated fund account.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I am told that we have prosecuted about 400 persons since the application of the special War Revenue Act all over the country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What for?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Not affixing the seal.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is included in the next item. $125,000 was voted for that.

Mr. SEVIGNY: We took the money out of that vote last year to pay for the preventive service, because we had not enough money.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is not what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. SEVIGNY: That is the war fund.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, no.

Mr. OLIVER: What did my hon. friend do to meet the deficiency in the vote, created thereby?

Mr. SEVIGNY: This item of $125,000 reads as follows:

> To provide for stamps, stationery, salaries, travelling expenses, in connection with war tax.

This service was performed by our preventive service officer, and when we saw that we had not enough money to pay the amount, the accountant of my department met the Auditor-General, and the accountant was authorized to pay the money out of this item of $125,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand you to say the Auditor General has authority to order a payment of that kind? I always understood the functions of the Auditor General were, particularly, to see that moneys were paid out according to the authority of Parliament. I may be wrong, but I never understood that he had any authority off his own bat to say that moneys could be appropriated in a certain direction, and paid out, without consulting the Government or Parliament.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I do not say the Auditor General had authority to do it, but he could tell us whether it was right or wrong to make certain payments.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The minister surely knows whether he has authority to spend the money, when he goes to the Auditor General. I understood he had to point out to the Auditor General that he was spending the money under a certain rule, or authority of Parliament, or Governor General's warrant. I suppose, if the minister were foggy about these things, he should go to the fountain head of all knowledge in finance matters, the Departmeent of Finance, and find out what he should do, and that the Finance Minister would tell him the proper steps to take, in order to obtain money for payments of this kind. I appreciate the fact that the minister is quite new in the office, and he is giving evidence of being very new. I think he should be excused for not knowing everything about the department, but he should be expected to know something about it, and I think, in the case of an extraordinary expenditure of this kind, he should be on pretty solid ground before coming to Parliament and asking to have the payment sanctioned. I understood the procedure to be that the minister would apply to the Department of Finance for money, and the Department of Finance, would either procure it through Parliament, in an Estimate, or take the necessary steps by Governor General's warrant to procure the money. He seems to have struck out in a new course of his own, and relies upon the Auditor General. I question the authority of the Auditor General to give him any money, without its first being voted by Parliament.

Mr. MURPHY: Do I understand from my hon. friend that the Auditor General authorized the payment of this sum out of the war vote?

Mr. SEVIGNY: He was consulted, and said that was the correct procedure.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That cannot be right, because according to a statement made by the Prime Minister in introducing the War Loan Bill, it appeared that in the Department of Inland Revenue up to the 20th of January of this year only $522.50 had been expended out of that fund; so that, I think, it is hardly likely the minister got the money from that source. I suppose there is some explanation of this matter.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. SEVIGNY: The work was done by our preventive officers, and we had to pay them their salaries. When we realized that we had not enough money in the item of preventive service to pay their salaries for the work they were doing, by the War Tax Measure we were authorized to pay their salaries out of the item of $125,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The hon. minister should have said that long ago.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is not the war vote.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is perfectly evident that my hon. friend cannot expect this committee to vote this item, No. 327, on the information which he has presented to us. I suggest that this item stand until the minister is prepared to give an intelligent explanation. We are only groping in the dark. He said his accountant had made a mistake, and therefore there had to be certain juggling with funds, and he cannot tell us where the funds came from, whether from the war fund which he speaks of, in the sense we understand it, or whether from the receipts of certain war stamps in his office which were diverted. It is, therefore, impossible to pass the item now.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Perhaps there is some misunderstanding in reference to the words "war fund," which I used. This item in the Estimates to provide for stamps, stationery, salaries, travelling expenses, etc., in connection with war tax, is called the war fund in my department.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Was the deficit in the item for preventive service paid out of the surplus in the item of $25,000? There was evidently an under expenditure in that item.

Mr. OLIVER: I think the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman from Pictou should be adopted. It is, after all, a very serious matter and it is desirable there should be no misunderstanding in regard to it. Unfortunately the minister's explanation has led to a great deal of discussion and questioning, which certainly does not tend to satisfy the public mind in regard to the administration of these funds. We do not wish to put the minister in a bad position, but we are desirous that he should place himself right in regard to this expenditure.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We can pass the other items under that head.

Mr. OLIVER: We can discuss the other items now and possibly when we reach them later they will not require further discussion. I suggest that the item "Preventive service, salaries, $155,000," should stand until we have a fuller explanation.

Mr. MURPHY: Some of the items are interlocked with the others.

Mr. OLIVER: The items of $150,000 and $125,000 might stand for the present, and we can proceed with the discussion of the remaining items, so as to save time later on.

Mr. BOIVIN: How much of that $125,000 vote was expended last year?

Mr. SEVIGNY: We have spent $32,000 for stamps and $35,000 for salaries, a total of $67,000. We were authorized to use a portion of the balance remaining unspent to cover the deficit on the other item.

Mr. BOIVIN: How much of that balance was taken to cover the deficit?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I will give the information on the items of preventive service and war stamps.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If the minister expended only $67,000 last year out of that vote of $125,000 he should not ask for a vote of $125,000 this year unless there is a probability of that amount being required.

Mr. MURPHY: I suggest that the minister bring down the details suggested by the member for Halifax as to why he is asking for $125,000 when the department did not spend anything like that amount under this head last year. I suggest, also, that he bring down any correspondence with the Auditor General on the subject of taking the money from one vote and applying it to another.

Mr. KNOWLES: There is no reason why the department should be blamed because an estimate proves insufficient. It very often follows that votes prove insufficient; otherwise the estimates would be of no use. But if the amount voted proves to be more than sufficient it is quite at variance with the principle upon which we vote particular amounts to divert the money to other purposes. We ear-mark the money for a particular purpose, and if there is a surplus in one vote it is absolutely foreign to the making up of a deficit in another. The fact that about $50,000 was left over in one vote shows that we were called upon to vote a much larger sum than was necessary, but certainly a surplus in one vote should not be used to make up a deficit in another.

9 p.m.

The minister has beclouded the matter somewhat by his statement that the difficulty was initiated by an error on the part of his accountant. That is something that ought to be cleared up. If it was an error on the part of his accountant, the error should have been rectified in the proper way by Governor General's warrant. Is that not the only way? I think we ought to hear from some of the experienced members of the Government on that question. The Finance Minister is with us; perhaps he will tell us.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As I have not been occupying myself with the discussion, I must plead that I am not familiar with this particular item. I understand, however, that generally you are discussing the payment out of funds. So far as the general funds are concerned, moneys are paid out by the departments under the supervision of the Auditor General. It is quite impossible for any error to occur; the money must be voted, and only the amount that is voted can be used. All the money that is paid out under the votes is paid out under proper safeguards.

Mr. KNOWLES: And is to be used for the specific purpose for which it was voted.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes. If it chances that a particular expenditure does come under two headings or may be embraced within each, the Estimates would authorize the payment out for that necessary expenditure, provided there was sufficient money. I should think, however, that cases of that kind very seldom occur. Question has been raised as to the payment out of money voted under the War Appropriation Act. No money can be voted under that Act unless upon the express authority of the Governor in Council. In other words, if a department finds it necessary to make an expenditure which is properly payable out of the war vote, the minister gets an Order in Council which authorizes the payment from that vote. Needless to say it must be for purposes immediately connected with the war.

With regard to Governor General's warrants, it sometimes occurs, but not frequently, that there are no funds for some necessary service that must be performed. In cases of that kind of extreme urgency, a Governor General's warrant may issue for the amount in question. I am sure it is common knowledge amongst members of the House that payment of moneys in con-

nection with all departments is surrounded by every safeguard that experience has found necessary, in order that there may be no misappropriation of funds.

Mr. MURPHY: Which minister has charge of the war appropriation vote?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is for purposes connected with the war. The ordinary departments, apart from the Department of Militia and Defence and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, have almost no war expenditure at all.

Name.	Date.
M. F. Gallagher	Nov. 1, 1915
L. E. Westman	Oct. 1, 1915
J. A. Magnan	Feb. 23, 1916
M. Morissette	May 9, 1916
E. Rooney	June 10, 1916
E. A. Kinsman	Oct. 1, 1916
J. M. Danis	Jan. 1, 1917
A. J. I. St. Marie	Feb. 1, 1917
N. Chassé	Mar. 22, 1917
Dr. M. Brot	Sept. 1, 1916
R. M. Rowat	Dec. 1, 1916
J. C. Breton	June 1, 1917
G. E. Grattan	June 1, 1917
J. A. Gunton	June 1, 1917
O. G. Lye	June 1, 1917

Mr. MARCIL: What are Mr. Magnan's duties?

Mr. SEVIGNY: He was superintendent of the Patent Medicines Branch, but has resigned. No successor has been appointed yet.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the minister consider appointing a returned soldier to the vacancy?

Mr. SEVIGNY: A doctor is required for the position. If my hon. friend will give me the name of a returned soldier who is a good doctor and well qualified for this position I shall be only too pleased to appoint him.

Mr. KYTE: How many of these men were appointed under the provisions of Section 21?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Messrs. Westman, Magnan, Morissette, Kinsman, Brot, Rowat, Breton, Grattan, Gunton and Lye. Mr. Lye is a returned soldier, Mr. Kinsman an electrician, and Mr. Morissette a translator.

Mr. KYTE: Does the minister put a translator and an electrician in the category of experts?

Mr. SEVIGNY: These men were considered technical officers by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MURPHY: They did not use to be so considered.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. KYTE: How many persons have been appointed to the Department of Inland Revenue during last year, and what are their salaries?

Mr. SEVIGNY: The list of employees appointed since October 1, 1915, is as follows:

Salary.	Remarks.
$2,100	Transferred to Secretary State.
1,300	
3,300	Resigned.
1,600	
800	
1,500	Transferred to Inside.
2,100	Transferred to Outside.
500	
2,100	
1,300	
1,300	
1,200	
1,300	
1,300	
1,300	

Mr. SEVIGNY: They did not have to pass the Civil Service examination.

Mr. MURPHY: Most of them could not.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: The minister states that Mr. Danis, his private secretary, has resigned. Is he still in the employ of the department.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, as preventive officer at Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan. He also acts as food inspector for that province. His salary is $1,800.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Was he a resident of Saskatchewan?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: I notice that a very curious practice has crept in this year in passing the items of one or two departments. Some of these votes are made up of a number of items, each of which should be considered separately, and until each has been so considered and approved the vote should not be passed. Am I to understand that when the Chairman of the Committee calls "Carried" the whole vote passes?

The CHAIRMAN: In every case I have read each item separately, and asked the Committee to express themselves on it.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am not complaining about you, Mr. Chairman. We are considering Resolution 327; the whole vote cannot pass so long as these one or two items remain outstanding.

Mr. OLIVER: The whole item stands because no part of it can finally pass without the whole of it passing, but for the sake of convenience and to advance discussion separate items do not pass, of course, until we pass from one item to another. The the whole vote is passed

Weights and measures, gas and electric light inspection, $393,950. Salaries of officers, inspectors and assistant inspectors of weights and measures, $155,250.

Mr. MURPHY: What accounts for the increase of $10,000?

Mr. SEVIGNY: This is for the regular statutory increases. Besides, we were short of money last year, and this is to make sure that we shall have enough this year.

Mr. MACDONALD: How much were you short last year?

Mr. SEVIGNY: About $10,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: You have statutory increases again this year, and with these and with a shortage of $10,000 you will need $20,000.

Mr. SEVIGNY: We expect that with $10,000 we can give the statutory increases. And we will have to ask for more money in the Supplementary Estimates—about $5,000.

Mr. MURPHY: The civil servants paid under this item are members of the Outside Service and no increase is provided by statute for them. So this item cannot apply to them.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Every day I am in receipt of letters from good employees, who complain—and I think they are right in complaining—because their salaries are too low. It is true, there is no statutory increase allowed to the Outside Service, but in many cases we have done the best we could to give increases of salaries when we thought it was fair to do so. And it is our intention to do the same for many of the Outside Service this year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will the minister make the increase general, or will it be a selective increase?

Mr. SEVIGNY: If I have enough money it is my intention to give an increase to all the employees of the Outside Service. But if I have not enough money I shall have to make a choice of the best employees.

Mr. KYTE: This vote includes::—

Provisional allowance, not more than $150 each to officers in Manitoba and provinces west thereof, whose salaries do not exceed $2,500 per annum. (Weights and Measures).

Why is not this made applicable to officers in the other provinces?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Such an allowance is not confined to my department, but applies to the Post Office and Customs Departments also. It is considered that the cost of living is higher in the West than in the East. But, in my judgment, the cost of living at present is as high in the East as in the West.

Mr. KYTE: Whatever reason there may have been in former times for this discrimination, I am sure there is none at present. In the Maritime Provinces the cost of living has gone up twice as much as in any part of Canada. As the minister is making special provision for the officers in the Western provinces I think it only fair that similar provision should be made for those in the East.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman talk that way, and I hope that when my Supplementary Estimates are before the committee he will be willing to give me enough money to give increases to all the employees of my department throughout the Dominion.

Mr. NESBITT: Deserving and undeserving?

Mr. SEVIGNY: They are all deserving; otherwise we would not keep them.

Mr. McKENZIE: In considering the merits of a member of the Inside Service, the minister has the advice of his deputy minister and of the head of the branch. But how does he get information as to the merits of officers in the Outside Service? I am afraid that in the Inland Revenue Department we shall see what we have seen in other departments—a certain class of the public servants are found to be most deserving, and others, for some reason, not so deserving. Up to 1911 the money was distributed equally, but since then, and now, only a certain class can get it. I urge upon the minister that when he gives increases he should try to get some positive information about the officer concerned, so that there may be no unfair discrimination —that the rain, as it were may fall on the just and the unjust. I hope especially that those who are receiving small salaries will be among those given increases, and that in dealing with this matter the minister will beware of the leaven of politics.

Mr. SEVIGNY: When I receive a request for an increase of salary, I place it before my deputy minister, and if I decide to give an increase it is because it is re-

commended by the officers of the department. I can assure the hon. gentleman, Mr. McKenzie, that many of the employees who were in the department before 1911 have received some increases, when we have enough money to give them. This has been true under Mr. Blondin and Mr. Patenaude, and it is true under my own administration of the department.

Mr. McKENZIE: I heard on very good authority that for the fifteen years that the Liberals were in power we had in some departments Tory heads who had a free hand, and who were giving preference to their Tory friends during those fifteen years. When the change came, matters became worse; we had not only a Tory deputy head but a Tory head, so that it was a case of bringing in seven worse devils than there were before, and the class of civil servants to whom I have referred are getting it going and coming. If any deputy head or head of a department thinks he is doing these things under a bushel, I want the minister to know that we know about these things, and I hope that this manner of dealing with officials will not find place nor part in his department.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister has not told us the exact meaning of the two extra amounts he is asking for under this item. The minister is more extravagant in his department than any other minister. He is asking for an increase of $142,442.50 in excise, of $26,000 in weights and measures, and of $10,000 in adulteration of food. The weights and measures business of the country is surely not of such a pressing character in war time, when men have to be conscripted to win the war, that the minister should ask the people to be taxed this extra amount of $26,000. The same is true with regard to the adulteration of food item. Why should there be an increase of $36,000 in these two branches? The minister is asking for $10,000 for increases of salaries of officers, inspectors and assistant inspectors of weights and measures. He told us a few minutes ago that they were all statutory increases.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I made a mistake. I thought that was the Inside Service. There are no statutory increases for the Outside Service.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the minister give us the names of those whose salaries are to be increased?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Generally speaking, we desire to give an increase to every one of our officials of the Outside Service, and I hope we shall have enough money for that.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are you going to appoint any new officers?

Mr. SEVIGNY: That is not the intention of the department.

Mr. MACDONALD: Have you appointed any new officers within the last six months?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Not in the weights and measures branch. Perhaps we have appointed a few men, but the appointments have been to fill vacancies.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am speaking of additional appointments, not to fill vacancies.

Mr. SEVIGNY: During the last six months we have appointed, throughout the whole country, five or six men.

Mr. MACDONALD: To new positions.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who are they?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I will get the names for my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why should there be an increase of $15,000 in rent, fuel, travelling expenses, etc. for weights and measures?

Mr. SEVIGNY: We were given $65,000 last year by Parliament, but we were short by $15,000, and it is to cover that deficit that we are asking for $15,000 more this year.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am at a loss to understand why in a department such as this of weights and measures where everything runs along in a groove absolutely certain and definite, that does not involve any eruptions of any kind in the service, the minister should require such an increased expenditure as $15,000 that could not be foreseen. I am at a loss to understand why his predecessor spent so much more money than was voted. We have received no explanation from the minister. The minister may be paying the penalty for the sins of his predecessor who has passed on to some other department. I can understand that in a department where flexible conditions exist, where unusual and unexpected demands may be made, a minister may be called upon to meet expenditures which, I presume, would have to pass the gauntlet of an Order in Council, and in such a case he might come with the explanation that the present minister has given. Either the minister's prede-

cessor must have been a spendthrift, or the minister must have been. If the minister is going to spend $15,000 more, he should tell us what he is going to do with the money.

Mr. SEVIGNY: When the amount of $65,000 was submitted to the minister, we thought that such an amount would be sufficient to meet all the requirements, but I understand that the department, as everybody else, has suffered on account of the high cost of everything. This item is for rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, etc., for weights and measures, including amount for purchase of standards of the metric system, salaries and other expenses of inspection. Last year we spent $80,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Where did you get the money?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I am told that on the 6th of February of this year a vote was passed by this House, number 386, for rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, for weights and measures, including an amount for the purchase of standards of the metric system, salaries and other expenses, further amount required, $20,000. We required that amount to pay our officials, and we came before Parliament and were given the money.

Mr. OLIVER: As the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has already said, this is a department of service which has not been the subject of expansion for any special reason during the past several years. It is obvious that the predecessor of my hon. friend, for whose action he must answer to the House, simply went on and spent $15,000 that he had no authority to spend, that this House had not authorized him to spend.

Mr. SEVIGNY: We did not spend it until it was voted in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. OLIVER: The service was incurred before any Supplementary Estimates were voted. There has been no change of conditions that warranted such an expansion of expenditure; it was simply $15,000 of extravagant expenditure on the part of my hon. friend's predecessor in office. Last year Parliament was asked for a certain vote on the representation that that amount would be sufficient to carry this service through the year, and the department incurred this additional expenditure of $15,000. It is for the minister to show the committee, not only where he spent this money, but why he spent this money. It is quite true that the over expenditure made by the department was provided for by Parliament, as the minister has said, by the passing of the extra Supplementary Estimate this year. But the committee are now asked to assent to the Main Estimates for the coming year, and this is the time and place when the Government ought to be prepared to state to the country, through the committee why an increase of expenditure has been made. Such explanations are not generally asked for or made on the occasion of what are called the extra Supplementary Estimates. Why was that expenditure made? Was it a provident, economical and necessary expenditure, or a wasteful, extravagant and unnecessary expenditure? The country is entitled to that information.

Mr. SEVIGNY: The greater expenditure was necessary on account of the increase in the service. The industry of the country, generally speaking, was never so prosperous as since the outbreak of the war, and owing to this great increase and development of industry in Canada, the weights and measures service has greatly increased. It is only on account of that increase that this additional amount has been required; there was no extravagant or useless expenditure.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister makes a broad, general statement that an increase in the cost of administration of the weights and measures naturally follows the expansion of industry. I am at one with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) in the belief that it does not necessarily so follow. The provision for the inspection of weights and measures is made, and there would have to be a very large expansion of industry indeed to require a large further expenditure by the department in that connection.

That is, unless this minister acts on the principle that money is free just now, and that the Inland Revenue Department should spend money liberally, as other departments of the Government have done; and possibly the other departments have not been as severely criticised for it as they should have been. The lines of expenditure in the Inland Revenue Department are laid down very closely, and there is not the same occasion for expansion as in other departments. A general statement is not information. We should have a detailed statement as to what appointments it is necessary to make, whether they were made

and what they cost the country, because it appears to me that there has been a sufficient staff of weights and measures inspectors and officials of this department generally, as well as other departments of the government, appointed since 1911, to take care of any expansion of any industry which has taken place, or that we may hope to take place for a long time to come. In other words, the staff has been kept at full strength, and has been increased, although the business has admittedly gone down. That being the case, a general statement on the part of my hon. friend is not an explanation, and he should be prepared to give us the actual details as to how the increase took place.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I will not be able tonight to give my hon. friend all the details of that increase, but we have had that increase because it was required. I will have prepared in my department a detailed statement of all the increases that were required, and I hope that will be satisfactory to my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: This large increase of $15,000 expenditure for this service apparently took place in the fiscal year ending 30th March, 1917. Will the minister be good enough to prepare the detailed statement as to the increase, and why it was necessary?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: The item will stand in order to get information.

Mr. KYTE: Has the hon. minister the information he promised in regard to prosecutions for infraction of the War Stamp Act?

Mr. SEVIGNY: We prosecuted about 400 persons for infraction of the Act all over the country. At first we were very lenient and our officers conducted a campaign of education, but since the war broke out we have instituted 400 prosecutions.

Mr. KYTE: Does the department prosecute all persons against whom complaints are made?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, through our officers.

Mr. KYTE: Will the hon. gentleman have a list prepared of the complaints received in regard to parties who have violated the provisions of the Act, and a list of prosecutions?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: I presume this is called preventive or detective work. Under what system is the work performed and paid for? Is it by salaried officials permanently appointed by the department, or by men temporarily appointed, who work on commission, receiving a portion of the fine?

Mr. SEVIGNY: We have employees who receive an annual salary, and in each case the official is entitled to half the fine, in addition to their salaries.

Mr. OLIVER: In addition to salary and travelling expenses?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Are these permanent or temporary employees?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Most of them are permanent.

Mr. OLIVER: About what is the average salary paid?

Mr. SEVIGNY: $900 now. The officers say it is not enough, and desire an increase.

Mr. OLIVER: There was some complaint made in the House a little while ago by the member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig) in regard to the administration of this part of the Inland Revenue service. He complained of the character of the service rendered. I think that it is objectionable to pay for service of this character by giving a percentage of the fine. No doubt many unjustifiable cases occur under that system. Some of these cases were mentioned by the hon. gentleman from West Kent, which certainly reflected very seriously on the administration of the department. It is generally accepted that the principle of paying the informer a part of the fine is not a good one, and is not to the credit of those in authority who administer the law in that way. It would be very much better to employ more highly salaried officials, who would be men of higher standing and character, who would administer this part of the work of the department in a much more effective, and creditable manner.

Mr. SEVIGNY: The experience of the department is that the present system is the most effective.

Mr. OLIVER: How many such appointees are there in the service of the department?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Over a hundred, all over the country.

Mr. OLIVER: I think the member for West Kent, in speaking of this matter, suggested that there were occasions, within his knowledge, in which the detective was the

instigator of the offence. What is the policy of the department in that connection? Does the department consider it legitimate for the detective to instigate the offence, or, in any degree, to become a party to it?

Mr. SEVIGNY: We have never credited that statement, and I certainly would not tolerate such conduct. If the hon. gentleman has complaints to make against the officials who are doing that work, I would be very glad to receive them.

Mr. MURPHY: The member for West Kent made certain complaints.

Mr. SEVIGNY: It would be better if he would give the names. When did he make the complaints?

Mr. MURPHY: Last week, I think; it is in Hansard.

Mr. OLIVER: He was discussing the possible regulation of cold storage and he instanced certain cases of hardship that had occurred under the administration of the Inland Revenue Department. It is not the policy of the department, then, to encourage this method of enforcing the regulations. How far would the department go in the way of discouraging such methods? Would they be willing to dispense with the services of a detective who had been a party to such a transaction?

Mr. SEVIGNY. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: That is definite.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes.

Adulteration of food and the administration of the Act respecting fertilizers, fraudulent marking and commercial feeding stuffs, $50,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the work of the department in this connection?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Samples of food are collected by our officers throughout the country and sent to Ottawa, Halifax, Vancouver and Winnipeg for analysis. If they are adulterated, prosecutions are taken against the persons offering such foods for sale.

Mr. OLIVER: There is an increase of $10,000 in this vote. Is this a case of the expansion of industry?

Mr. SEVIGNY: Yes, the service is increasing very much. Last year we were voted $40,000, but we did not have enough money.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is evident that the minister's Estimates are not properly prepared, and for this somebody in the department is censurable. For instance, why should $125,000 have been asked for last year for excise when $67,000 was enough to cover the expenditure for the year? This year the same amount is required. Some man in the department is responsible for this. Either the minister is not properly instructed, or he has not given enough attention to the preparation of his Estimates. Or, perhaps, the officers of his department do not properly prepare him for asking the committee to pass his Estimates.

Mr. SEVIGNY: In the case of the item of $125,000, in 1916 the amount asked for was $175,000, and last year it was reduced to $125,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: More ought to come off.

Mr. SEVIGNY: We shall probably have to buy machines to emboss cheques; the matter is under consideration. We are required by the Banking Association to do that work, and it is practically decided that we shall have to buy the necessary machines.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am disposed to be generous with my hon. friend, because I know that he has not been long in office. But apparently his predecessor has overspent the money that was voted by Parliament. My hon. friend tells us that he wants $10,000 more under this
10 p.m. item, and so on—and this in respect of a department the operations of which are limited. What is the explanation of this $10,000 increase?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I shall be only too glad to give this information to the committee with the other information that I intend to bring down.

Mr. OLIVER: The main point is, why was this over-expenditure made, and what, if any, justification was there for it?

Mr. SEVIGNY: I will have a statement prepared in my department.

Mr. OLIVER: In the three divisions of my hon. friend's department there are increases over and above the vote of Parliament and beyond what the minister says has been the increased expenditure. As the matter stands it simply means that my hon. friend's predecessor in office did not pay any regard to the vote of Parliament, but simply spent as much money as he desired and then asked Parliament to pay the bill. I submit that that is not a reasonable or proper way to administer the affairs of the country, and if the minister could

show that his predecessor did not conduct the affairs of the department in that way it would be very much to his credit. But according to the explanation of the minister the situation is as I have described, and it looks as if the minister having conducted the affairs of his department in that manner for a certain period, stepped out and allowed the mantle to fall on the shoulders of my hon. friend.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I think it would be more satisfactory for the committee to have a statement of the expenditure made on all these items. I have no hesitation in saying that my predecessor was very careful in the administration of his department, and it is my intention to be the same. Mistakes may have inadvertently been made in the preparation of the Estimates, and we are now asking Parliament for the necessary money. Instructions have been given to practise economy throughout the whole department, and it is certainly my intention to follow that practice particularly during the war.

Mr. MURPHY: The instructions cannot have been properly given because the conditions which hon. gentlemen have brought to the attention of the committee have evidently prevailed in the department for some time. At the beginning of the session supplementary Estimates were brought down to make up the deficiencies in the three branches of my hon. friend's department, Weights and Measures, Excise, and Adulteration of Food. Already this session $95,000 have been passed in that way, showing that these shortages in the Estimates at all events, have continued for some time. I am pointing that out to my hon. friend that he may bear it in mind when he is preparing the statement he is to make to the committee.

Mr. SEVIGNY: A mistake was made in the preparation of the Estimates last year, and as we do not wish to repeat the mistake this year. We are asking for an increased amount.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend has not shown the committee that what he is asking for will be sufficient.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Without any facts before me I must say that it looks as if the officers of the department had not prepared the Estimates properly, and as if the department was badly administered. Does the minister know whether these officers know what Estimates mean? Perhaps they have the idea that they can spend as much money as they like, and then ask Parliament for money to liquidate the over-payment.

Mr. SEVIGNY: After the explanation given by the Minister of Finance a few minutes ago, I think my hon. friend will appreciate that it is not an easy matter for the officers to spend as much as they like. I have been in the department only five months.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We are not criticising the minister.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I have some very well qualified officials, and am perfectly satisfied with their services.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You should have been a little better posted.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I admit that. I shall be ready to give the committee all the information they desire when the Estimates are up again.

Mr. McKENZIE: In Volume I of the Auditor General's Report for last year, in certain correspondence running from pages 537 to 543 between the Auditor General and the Inland Revenue Department, the Auditor General charges that quite a number of servants are being maintained by the department contrary to law. Perhaps when the minister's Estimates are up again he will explain why these assistants are kept on without having passed the proper examination.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I will make a note of it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I know the minister has the horse races to-morrow on his mind, and I would suggest that the committee rise.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I was entirely innocent of horse racing until my hon. friend put the notion in my mind. I have no objection to the committee rising.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

Monday, June 18, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.—CASUALTIES.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy)

asked a question on Friday last in regard to casualties. The answer to his question is as follows:

"Casualty" is the conventional term applied to the following categories: Killed in action, died of wounds, died of sickness, presumed dead, wounded (gassed and suffering from shell shock), missing, prisoners of war. The term does not apply to unwounded men in hospitals and convalescent homes.

For the whole period of the war, up to the 5th June, 1917, the number of casualties reported to Militia Headquarters came to 99,639.

That total includes 68,629 in the "wounded" category. This does not mean that 68,629 men have been wounded. Men wounded on more than one occasion are counted twice, or oftener.

Of the total sick and wounded, some have died, and some are still under treatment overseas. On the 4th June, 1917, there were 23,265 patients C.E.F. in hospitals and convalescent homes in the United Kingdom.

As to the remainder: Some have recovered and returned to duty in England or France, but the number of them actually serving in the trenches has not been reported; according to latest returns, upwards of 1,500 medically unfit for further service, have taken their discharge in the United Kingdom, and more than 12,600 invalids have been evacuated to Canada.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

Correspondence in connection with the resignation of Hon. E. L. Patenaude as Secretary of State for Canada.—Sir Robert Borden.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 84, to incorporate The Canadian Division of the Aerial League of the British Empire.—Sir Herbert Ames.

Bill No. 85, to incorporate The Canadian Council of The Girl Guides Association.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 86, respecting The Western Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Schaffner.

Bill No. 87, respecting The Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 88, for the relief of George Maisey.—Mr. Wilcox.

Bill No. 89, for the relief of Herbert Featherstone Conover.—Mr. Henderson.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 80, respecting a certain patent of the Sharp Rotary Ash Receiver Company, Incoporated.—Mr. Currie.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

VIOLATION OF FISHERY LAWS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Have fines been imposed upon Wm. H. David and Lawrence David of Port Felix, N.S., for violation of the fishery laws?
2. If so, what was the date and the amount of said fines?
3. Was any property forfeited? If so, what?
4. Have the fines been collected? If not, why not?
5. If property was forfeited, how was it disposed of?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. November 6, 1915. $50 each.
3. Yes, a boat.
4. Fine imposed on Lawrence David has been paid, but that imposed on Wm. H. David has not yet been paid, but proceedings to collect it have not been dropped.
5. By sale.

SALE OF LANDS—BLACKFOOT INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What were the terms of payment to the auctioneer who conducted the sale of lands of the Blackfoot Indian Reserve?
2. What was the total amount received by the auctioneer in commission or salary for his services?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. One-half of one per cent, not to exceed $200.
2. Payment not yet made; will receive $200.

OGILVIE FLOUR MILLS COMPANY—BUSINESS PROFITS TAX.

Mr. KYTE:

1. What were the net earnings of the Ogilvie Flour Mills Company, Limited, and the profits distributed, for the accounting period ended August 31, 1915?
2. What was the amount of Business Profits Tax levied upon the Ogilvie Flour Mills Company, Limited, for accounting period ended August 31, 1916?
3. What were the net earnings and the profits distributed by the said company, for accounting period ended August 31, 1916?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Net earnings $1,519,594.04; net profits $1,517,116.04. Dividends amounting to $2,478 were deducted from the net earnings under the provisions of sub-section (b) of section 3 of the Business Profits War Tax Act.

Profits distributed. According to the annual statement of the company the dividends distributed were as follows:

On preferred stock.. .. ..$140,000 00
On common stock.. .. .. 200,000 00

Total.. .. ..$340,000 00

2. The returns for accounting period ended 31st August, 1916, have not been received. Section 10 of the Business Profits War Tax Act provides that returns shall be delivered to the minister on or before the first day of July in each year.

3. No information.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. What are the names and addresses of the parties on Prince Edward Island who have been engaged or who are now engaged in recruiting for the army and navy or doing other work of a like military character, since August, 1914?

2. What remuneration or pay does each of the said parties receive, and what allowance is given for travelling or other expenses?

3. What is the total amount each person has received up to the 1st of June, 1917?

CORRESPONDENCE RE CONSCRIPTION.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has there been any correspondence between the Government or any member thereof, and any Prelate or Prelates in the province of Quebec on the subject of conscription?

2. If so, will the correspondence be laid on the table of the House, and when?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no official correspondence on this subject, and the Government have no information in regard to the private correspondence of any member of the Government.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. LANCTOT:

For a copy of all accounts, papers, claims and correspondence regarding demands put forward by all persons who have claimed to have sustained loss or damage by the fire in the Parliament buildings in February, 1916.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all telegrams, letters, petitions, etc., in any way referring to the appointment of the storm drum officer at Grand Etang for the present season.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

THE SECOND READING OF THE BILL MOVED.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on the introduction of this Bill I gave a pretty full explana-

[Sir Thomas White.]

tion of its provisions, and of the reasons and considerations upon which it is based, so that in now moving the second reading it will not be necessary for me to detain the House at any length.

According to the usage of Parliament, it is upon the motion which I am now presenting to the House that the principle of the Bill is to be discussed. I emphasize what I said upon the introduction of the Bill, that no new principle is invoked by the measure which is now presented for the consideration of the House. It is based upon precisely the same principle as that which was embodied in the Bill introduced in 1868 by Sir George Etienne Cartier and passed in the same year. The principle embodied in Sir George Etienne Cartier's Bill was renewed and affirmed when the Militia Act was re-enacted in 1904. The chief difference between the measure which has been presented to the House and the Militia Act is this: in the Militia Act the selection of men for military service in case of emergency is effected by the instrumentality of the ballot—in other words, of blind chance. We do not think that such a method could for one moment be justified under the conditions which now confront the country. Consequently, we have brought before the House a measure embodying the principle of compulsory service which was established in 1868 and which has ever since remained in force. But we have changed the method of selection from one of blind chance to one of intelligent selection, based upon a consideration of the need and of the present condition of the country. We have endeavoured to frame the Bill so that the tribunals which are to make that selection shall be absolutely beyond suspicion. If suggestions can be made to us from either side of the House the adoption of which would seem to surround the Bill with better safeguards, while not detracting from its efficiency, we shall be only too glad to consider them.

I wish to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the statistics which have been placed before the House and which have been compiled by Mr. R. H. Coats, head of the the Department of Census and Statistics, who is a very capable and careful official. In this statement Mr. Coats points out, under note 1, that under the heading "single" are included "widowed" and "divorced"; those whose conjugal condition was unknown are included under "married". In 1911 the total number of widowed and divorced males between

the ages of 20 and 45 was approximately 17,000, and of the "unknown" between the same age periods, approximately 14,000.

In note 2, he points out that the heading "foreign-born" includes all persons not born within the British Empire, whether naturalized or not. Of the total of 286,062 foreign-born in 1911, it is estimated that about 115,000 were naturalized.

In note 3, he points out that the figures of the table are those of the census of 1911. It is estimated that the increase since 1911 in the male population of Canada of ages 20 to 45 lies between 300,000 and 400,000. As approximately this number has already been recruited, the figures of 1911, it is thought, reflect rather closely present conditions in the Dominion as a whole, though changes have doubtless occurred in individual provinces.

I now come to the statistics which Mr. Coats has presented. Upon the principle which he has adopted, he estimates that between the ages of 20 and 45, both inclusive, there are in Canada 760,453 unmarried men and 823,096 married men, a total of 1,583,549.

He makes the following further estimates as to the number of married and single men of various ages at present in Canada. Between the ages of 20 and 24, both inclusive, 319,610 single men and 66,247 married men, a total between those ages of 385,857 Between the ages of 25 and 29, both inclusive, 205,125 single men and 165,369 married men, a total between those ages of 370,494. Between the ages of 30 and 34, both inclusive, 112,011 single men and 198,328 married men, a total between those ages of 310,339. Thus the total number of men, both married and unmarried, between the ages of 20 and 34, both inclusive, is 1,066,690, according to his estimate.

I come to another aspect of these statistics. He estimates, as I have already pointed out, that there are, between the ages of 20 and 24, both inclusive, 319,610 single men in Canada. The number of single men between the ages of 25 and 29, both inclusive, is estimated at 205,125 and, between the ages of 30 and 34, both inclusive, 112,011, making the total number of single men between the ages of 20 and 34, both inclusive, 636,746.

Taking the married men as distinguished from the single men, he estimates the number of married men in Canada between the ages of 20 and 24, both inclusive, as 66,247; between the ages of 25 and 29, both inclusive, 165,369, and between the ages of 30 and 34, both inclusive, 198,328, making the total number of married men between the ages of 20 and 34, both inclusive, 429,944. I need not remind the House that from this number there must be deducted those who would not be fit for military service when their condition was disclosed upon medical examination. My recollection is that of those who have volunteered in Canada for active service overseas, about 25 per cent have been rejected upon the first examination. A certain smaller percentage—I do not know just what it would be, but possibly 10 per cent— would also have to be deducted, representing those discharged as unfit for service after having been taken on. Then all the considerations have to be taken into account which are enumerated both in the exceptions embodied in the schedule to the Act and in the principles upon which exemptions are to be carried out. I went pretty fully into these matters on the first reading of the Bill, and it does not seem to be necessary to repeat now what I then said.

I will therefore conclude by commending to the House this measure, which has been prepared with great care and with an earnest desire to do justice to all classes of the people, I trust that it may be received in the spirit in which it has been prepared and presented. I do very earnestly hope that the opinion of the House with regard to it may be expressed as speedily as possible in order that whatever aid and support this country is capable of giving to the gallant men who are fighting to-day our battle and the battle of humanity shall be given with the least possible delay.

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.

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 never 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.

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 laches 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 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.

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.

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 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.

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 ser-

vice 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.

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 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:

4 p.m.

> 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.

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 number 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 those 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.

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 pretense. 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 when 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!

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.

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-two more seats to be filled which must be filled by the new provinces of the West whose population justifies this addtional 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? 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.

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.

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 that 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.

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 with him in 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. 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 country 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 I 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. 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 a 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 can no longer 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.

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.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

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 battlefields 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 figure 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. 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 English-speaking Canadians, who have been in the country not so long as the French Canadians, but longer than the British-born, have contributed the next lowest number of men, while the British-born, who have been in the country only a short time, have contributed the 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.

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.

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. 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.

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. 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 blesssed 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 says 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. 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 to 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 the 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.

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.

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 conductive 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.

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, 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 arbitratment 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.

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 Ontario, or Quebec, 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.

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. 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 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."

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.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more moderate or milder, than the tone in which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has taken part in the discussion this afternoon. I might say with equal truth that nothing could be much more indefinite than his argument and his conclusions. The most of his speech was taken up in threading old and long-used paths.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: They are the best sometimes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I had an idea that progress meant rather the blocking out of new paths. One would not have gathered from my right hon. friend's speech from beginning to end that a titanic struggle such as the world has never seen before is going on at this very hour on the plains of France or that 400,000 Canadians,
5 p.m. cheered by my right hon. friend, bidden God-speed by him as they paraded on Parliament Hill in this city on their way overseas were now fighting in the trenches and expecting as they have reason to expect help from their fellow Canadians, and support up to the final moment of triumph.

In all these long days of praise and admiration of the heroism of the sons of Canada, British-born and Canadian-born as well, there was no intimation from my right hon. friend that when in time of deadly peril their call for help came from the blood stained trenches he would wait to take a referendum to determine whether the sorely needed help should be forthcoming.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It seems to me that my right hon. friend is scarcely living in the atmosphere of to-day, but that he has transferred himself into historic times, and that his strong penchant for historic recollections and reminiscences has led him to pay too little heed to the strenuous issues, the tremendously grave conditions, that face us at this moment. I am not going to follow closely all the arguments he has made. I will, however, touch lightly upon a few. His first was the constitutional or legal

argument, which I am scarcely in a position to debate, because I have had no special legal training. But I have a knowledge of English and I think I know what English means. I read the section of the Militia Act to which my right hon. friend alluded:

> Her Majesty may call out the militia or any part thereof for actual service either within or without the Dominion—

That does not mean that the militia are to be called either within or without the Dominion, but that the militia are to be called out for service either within or without the Dominion. Surely that is a plain English statement.

> —whenever it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion, or insurrection, or danger of any of them.

I think that is a clear English statement

> And the militia men when so called out for actual service shall continue to serve, etc.—

There is the language itself, a common-sense interpretation conveys a clear meaning. I am supported also by legal opinion, the highest legal opinion that the Government has to guide it. Our Department of Justice—as it was constituted in 1904 in my right hon. friend's time, as, with its experience and knowledge and traditions, it is constituted to-day, both in 1904 and to-day—gave it and gives it as its opinion that the Militia Act under that wording did give authority that Canadian soldiers could be sent out of the country when the circumstances that are detailed there arose. My right hon. friend is a lawyer. There are other legal men in this House, but I think that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, who was Minister of Justice in 1904, and who gave that opinion, and the Minister of Justice of to-day (Mr. Doherty), and his able deputy, who gives the same opinion now, will be acknowledged by my right hon. friend to have come close to the real legal interpretation of this clause.

My right hon. friend is more optimistic and less fearful with reference to this great war and the perils which surround us on account of it than I could wish to be or than I would dare to be. He never has believed, he says, that there was danger of an invasion of Canada by the German power. He never believed that there was danger of invasion. But what is the purpose of a Militia Act? What is the purpose of a military force or an aggregation of military forces if it is not primarily and absolutely to defend the country, to

keep it intact from a possible or an actual enemy, wherever that enemy may be, and at any time that that enemy may threaten or wage war against the nation which is concerned? And common sense teaches me that if armies are for the defence of a country, their efforts should be applied at that point where there is emergency or danger, and where their efficiency would be greatest. So if there be menace (and my right hon. friend would not deny that there is to-day menace) we should surely do our utmost to meet it at the most effective point. A much more numerous people than ours, the nation to the south of us, with one hundred million and more of a population, with tremendous resources in men and material for the defence of their country, have, after nearly three years of patient consideration of all the conditions and the perils involved, come to the conclusion that it is wise for them (a great nation of one hundred and ten million inhabitants) not to wait until this struggle of to-day is decided, and chance the issue, but, to preserve and defend their country, its liberty and its ideals, by sending an army and a navy to the seat of war, and to participate with the other Allies in the defence of their country and of the liberties of nations, and of humanity. The people of the United States are not led away by simple hysteria, they are too strong to be frightened at imaginary perils or threatenings. That great nation, desirous of maintaining peace; democratic to the very centre, with all its races, and kindreds, and creeds, and denominations, after a three yers' contemplation of the whole question at issue, comes to the conclusion that to best safeguard itself, its liberties and its rights, it must send its army across the seas, and meet the enemy at the most advantageous point. If that is true of the United States, which might well have remained neutral, and, with its tremendous strength, defied any outcome of the war in favour of the central nations; if that country has come to a conclusion to participate in the distant conflict, how could we avoid coming to a like conclusion, as we did at the commencement of the war? We are a part of an Empire which is at war—an Empire which, taken altogether, is most dreaded and hated by the German power. As an integral part of that great Empire, how could we come to any other conclusion than that our best point of defence was on the far distant lines, where the vantage ground was held and could be held, and where the hordes of devastation could be kept far from our own home land?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It strikes me that common sense teaches us that if there is emergency, peril, or danger of an invasion, and if the integrity of the country is threatened, the place to do our fitting part in the contest is at the point where the ultimate decision is at last to be made. My right hon. friend would not let the militia stir hand or foot until the Hun was victorious in Europe, and Asia, and had made himself the predominant power, and then, with his navy and army, landed on the shores of the St. Lawrence. Then my hon. friend would admit that the Miliia Act should be called into force.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Therefore, it appears to me that neither according to legal interpretation, nor in a common sense point of view, is there anything to be said in favour of the proposition of my right hon. friend. If that Militia Act was framed for anything, it was framed for the defence of Canada. The framers of that Act saw beyond the conditions of that day, and placed within its sections the provision that the militia could be used in or out of Canada, on any invasion or any threat of an invasion, and, therefore, it was made wide enough to include the action which Canada has taken. And, in these three years of war, my right hon. friend has seen that action and he has not protested against it. He has only felt, it seems, that, at this particular moment of crisis, it is his duty now to question the Act, and its powers, and to present a new and dilatory solution of the difficulty.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition took up the pledge said to have been given by my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, and, at this late day, he challenges the course Parliament and the Government have taken in respect to the pledge of 500,000 men. It is within the fair knowledge of all in Parliament, and out of Parliament, that this war has been one of the most unexpected developments that the world has ever seen. No man skilled in strategy and military experience, no nation or empire, however far back its warlike prowess and warlike traditions might extend, and no nation or leaders of a nation anywhere, but have been absolutely surprised at the new and fresh develop-

ments which have taken place in this war. There is no need in an intelligent body like this to labour that argument for a single moment. Everybody has been surprised, and everybody has had to make change of methods and of ideas. Was there a nation more deeply embedded constitutionally, in experience, in traditions of the theory of the defence of Empire, even to strong and widely distributed offensive operations, by virtue of enlistment, and voluntary enlistment at that—than the Mother Empire of which we form a part? When that war commenced there were few men in Britain, statesmen or soldiers, who did not believe the contest could be fought and victory won on the old voluntary principle of the enlistment of British people for the defence of their country. War was commenced with that thoroughly embedded in their minds, and embedded in the practices and methods by which they sought to carry on the war. But experience is the mightiest teacher of all, and before necessity the most stubborn of inherited beliefs must give way, and the time came when Great Britain's statesmen, military men, business men, and working people as well, came to the conclusion that, if Britain was to be saved and the war was to be won, something other than voluntary enlistment must be appealed to, and applied, and it has been appealed to and it has been applied, and millions and millions of men from those little islands in the North sea have cheerfully submitted to compulsion, changed their beliefs and their methods, and did so because it was necessary for the defence of their country, and the victorious outcome of the war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And in Canada as well we had known nothing of compulsory enlistment. Ours had been the militia system, which is a voluntary system. We started in the beginning of this war with all our fervour, zeal, and devotion to principle, on the line of voluntary enlistment. We thought that would suffice, and if the war had lasted no longer than it was generally supposed at its commencement that it would last, voluntary enlistment would have carried us over the war, and would have brought us to victory. But it did not so pan out. The war did not end in six, twelve, twenty-four, nor thirty-four months. It is still continuing, and the principle of voluntary enlistment, if it was ever thoroughly tested in a country with confidence that it would do the work was so tested in Canada, and it has failed. It did not meet the continued stress of the war and the continued call for men. At the commencement of the war we adopted the voluntary system, in the belief that that system would be sufficient. We proceeded upon that line of action; we expected to continue it; we expected by it to gain the victory and to achieve the result for which we were striving. Proceeding upon that line of action, we sent forward 300,000 or 400,000 of the citizens of Canada. They marched towards the trenches; they went with our plaudits, our good will and our prayers. Not one of them left these shores with the least doubt in his heart that the people of Canada would stand behind the work to which he was devoting himself. My right hon. friend makes much of suggested cleavages, of possible dissensions, and of adherence to constitutional principles. But is there not an implied contract in the great deed of consecration of 400,000 of our men, who, putting their lives in the balance, went out with our plaudits—to do what? Flash a temporary spark of heroism into the atmosphere of the world, which would reflect credit upon Canada? No! This they were willing to do; this, indeed, they did. But they went forth to win a great world and Empire fight. That is what they went forth to do; that was our contract with them. Shall we make it good, so that as they fall something effective shall be done to guarantee that their heroic sacrifice shall not have been in vain and that the purpose for which they went forward shall be accomplished? That is my way of looking at it; is that not an eminently practical, a moral, and a fair way of looking at it? At this moment the men at the front look back and listen for the footsteps of comrades marching to the front to help them and to take on the work when their arm fails. Is there not in that all the sanctity of a contract which we must fulfil? And ought not that implied contract to count against little differences and little dissensions that may be caused here if we take the only step that will bring victory and that will achieve the results for the attainment of which we passed on all this precious and priceless material of manhood as of full weight and put it into the balance?

So, after nearly three years of trial, voluntary enlistment fell down, but not until it had been fully tried. In no country in the world was there a better class of men and women than those who throughout the

major part of Canada traversed every settlement, every town and every hamlet, and, by all kinds of appeal and encouragement, called for volunteers. There was the finest co-operation amongst the civilians of Canada, and it told mightily in the enlistments that took place. But the inevitable happened, and at last there came the dreary months when fresh enlistments were scarcely more than sufficient to make up the wastage among those troops in Canada who had enlisted for overseas service, but who were gradually subjected to weeding out. That went on from week to week and from month to month until those earnest souls who had in countless numbers spent their energies, their time and their money in attempting to bring about enlistment, came to us in one great body and said: we can do no more; we can go no further. Was that the experience in Canada, or was it not? It is open to us to answer that question for ourselves.

Then, Sir, still wishing to make full trial of the principle of voluntary enlistment, we designed a force of 50,000 men for home defence. It was honestly designed, I may tell my right hon. friend—although he casts some disparagement upon its motive. My right hon. friend must remember that some 50,000 men who had enlisted for overseas were kept here in Canada for purposes of guard and for home duty. The enlistment of 50,000 men for home defence would have liberated those 50,000 men who had been kept here for purposes of home defence. There was common sense; there was possibility of aid, in that arrangement. It was tried honestly and to the uttermost, and, for one cause or another, it absolutely failed.

Then the Prime Minister spent some weeks in England. He was at the very centre of the forces; he saw the very inner core of the conditions; he became acquainted with the precise nature of the situation at the front and with the matters reviewed in the councils of war in Great Britain and France. As Prime Minister he has, from the time war broke out, uttered no backward word; taken no retrogressive step. He has in season and out of season pressed the issues of this great conflict upon the people of Canada and unselfishly devoted his time and his energy to the great duty of carrying on the war. He came back from the front convinced that the necessities of the case, the peril of the occasion, made it absolutely necessary that our men should be sustained. Adding that conviction to the knowledge gained when he came home, he arrived at the conclusion —and we arrived at the same conclusion— that more would have to be done than could be done by relying upon voluntary enlistment.

And this measure is the explanation and the interpretation of the conclusions to which he and we arrived, and it is now before the House and the country. Because the Prime Minister, working along the lines which I have briefly indicated, wished to avoid compulsion or selective conscription, whichever you may call it as long as possible, and desired to work on the old voluntary lines, whilst they seemed possible of success, is it to be urged that he failed in duty if, in order not to injure to the least possible degree the fulness of the work that might be accomplished under the voluntary system, he had uttered no discouraging word? But at last he had to come to the conclusion that if the war was to be won he must pass over from the ground of voluntary enlistment and ask for a reasonable and intelligent application of the principle of selective service, and he is now here with that conclusion, forced upon him by the necessities of the case and the experience of three years of war.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, when we face such conditions as that, chops logic and talks of the Constitution. Logic is good in its place and constitutions are most excellent, but neither logic nor the Constitution is superior to the people, and they cannot be allowed to be a bar to the people's necessary defence and ultimate salvation. Constitutions are methods through which government of the people is carried on by themselves, in an orderly and methodical way. But the good of the people, the happiness of the people, the salvation of the people, are the basic things which are to be sought after, and just at this very moment it seems to me that in Canada, in the Empire, and throughout the world, we have a situation surrounded with conditions altogether unusual in the history of the world, and which demand action of the real strong red-blooded type for the support of the men we have sent to the front, and for the salvation of the country for which they have gone. My right hon. friend may talk about the Constitution and urge his points in a logical way, but that does not satisfy me. If necessity is upon us, we must act.

I will put this case to my right hon. friend. Suppose that what he hinted at as

not being possible, actually did take place and that to-morrow morning the German army convoyed by the German fleet menaced the shores of Canada and was about to land on the banks of the St. Lawrence. In such a case would my right hon. friend come down to this or any other Parliament and say, our men have not enlisted—the enemy is upon us but "You cannot constitutionally act unless you first have a referenum." Then he would propose a referendum, let the German fleet put into our harbours, and the peril march through our country. Nothing must be done to violate the constitutional principle that you must not act in any emergency unless you first submit a referendum to the people. Is that a forced comparison? I think not, because to many minds, and certainly to my own, it makes very little difference if we do not win this war whether the Hun to-day is three thousand miles away from Canada or only half a mile beyond our coasts. In either case if the Hun wins the ultimate result would be the same. So the peril and insistence of the time would temper my reverence and respect for what would be the proper procedure in normal times.

Compulsion or not; that is the issue, says my right hon. friend. Where does he stand on that? My right hon. friend is one of the most humble and obedient of public servants. It being demonstrated that voluntary enlistment will not save the issue, he will not to-day say to the people that the issue must be saved no matter what happens, that if it cannot be saved by voluntary enlistment and can be saved by selective conscription, he is for the saving of the country and is willing to advise and abide by selective conscription. If he would only do that, he would be giving a lead to the people. But this is the position he takes: "I will not declare myself definitely one way or the other; I am in principle opposed to conscription, but I think the best and the bravest way is to let every man, woman, and child in this country say what they want and I will accept their verdict." Suppose their verdict is asked as to selective conscription. Where does my right hon. friend stand then? While the referendum is on, his thirty years' experience, his high position in his province and in this country go out in the vanguard of that referendum, pleading that the vote be "No" instead of "Yes." Already through the province of Quebec noisy crowds have been hushed by the speaker's asseveration from the platform "Keep quiet, Laurier has this in hand. He will never let you be conscripted; just keep quiet; you are safe in his hands." While the referendum was being discussed and voted upon in this country every opponent of the 'war to a finish' would be quoting my right hon. friend, and saying that it was under his leadership that he was acting, and that we needed no conscription and should vote "No" on the referendum.

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. Because Canada is a democratic country, do we who have representative positions grow so spineless that we are unwilling to do anything from our superior position of light, and knowledge, to give the people a lead as to what in perilous times we think it best for them to do? The question is before this House; and that question will be decided in this Parliament, and it will be decided in this Parliament on a vote of its present membership. Having had three years of experience in this most wonderful and fateful period of Canadian and Imperial history, it is for us to give the guiding word. I would not be willing to go to the people with a blank sheet under these conditions, and without giving first my lead in the representative position I hold. A referendum will not be made with the consent of this Government on this important question and in this time of national peril. What we propose is to do, in the light of the experience and knowledge that we have, our plain duty, and let the people pass their verdict as they choose now, or in history. At least, we will stand as not having been afraid.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) deplores cleavage that may result in dissension if compulsion is brought in and selective conscription is made the law and enforced. There will be, undoubtedly, dissension. But I fail to read the people of this country aright, French or English, workingmen or employers, if dissension follows action which the necessities of the case demand and that is done which it is absolutely right should be done. Though there may be dissent expressed, and though there may be some dissension, the people of this country are a law-abiding people, and a discerning people, and they will hold to right ideals in this war and the necessity of pursuing them to the end, and will cheerfully obey that which is proposed as the

best and only solution of our present problem.

My right hon. friend tries to gather the workingmen under his arm, and proclaims himself the apostle of labor. Well, his hands are as white as mine, yet he and I are of the working classes, and have been all our lives. There is a toil of the hands and there is a toil of the brain, and there is travail of the heart as well. Some say only those are workingmen who work in one line, and that others are not workingmen. I think the definition of workingmen, of labour men, may well be widened to include by far the greater number of the people of this country. I take leave—and I say it with all proper respect, yet with all due frankness — to doubt if organized or unorganized labour in this country is not true to the purposes of this war for which they have given so much of their blood. They tell me that thirty thousand from the ranks of organized labour in Canada have gone to the front ready to make the supreme sacrifice —and many of them have made that sacrifice. I have some regard for the voice of these men when others say that organized labour is a unit against conscription. There is no finer page in the history of labour than that which has been written —wonderful in its terms and wonderful in its glorious results—by the action of the workingmen of Great Britain in this stupendous struggle. The workingmen of Great Britain, four millions of them, have stood by the Government; they have followed the Government from the path of voluntary enlistement into the path of compulsion; they have followed it in acceptance of regulations which led their organizations to drop all their distinctive rules and customs in order that production might be speeded up, in order that the men at the front might have the tools with which to save Britain and win the war. And to-day I say—I do not dilate upon it but I say—that the co-operation of the working classes in Great Britain in service both military and civil has been one of the most wonderful achievements of the many wonderful achievements in all the three years of this great contest.

Then I look to the United States of America. Are there no workingmen there? Are there no organizations of labour there? There are great organizations, and at their head is Gompers; and to-day, Gompers is in Washington and is in close and sympathetic action with the Government of the United States in its preparation for, and its conduct of, the warfare upon which it has entered. Surely our labouring men are not made of different stuff, I know they are not. I know that their ideals and principles are more than simply selfish, a fact which they have demonstrated in the short space of this war in having sent 30,000 of their men to the war for those principles and those ideals. Their comrades of labour in this country will not desert them now, I feel certain.

My right hon. friend has said that there will be considerable dissension and cleavage in the province of Quebec. He has discussed that matter frankly. We should all of us discuss it honestly and frankly. Members of Parliament just at this particular time have, to my mind, an imperious obligation to be frank and honest with each other and with the country. I am not a Frenchman and I have no French blood in my veins, but there is not an atom of prejudice in me against French blood and the French race. There is admiration for their splendid qualities, literary and artistic, in the line of progress and enlightenment, and in the line of warfare and deeds of prowess as well. Where is the part of the wide world in which the French flag has not been led to victory at one time or the other and in which there have not been deeds of prowess and splendid heroism which have contributed to the imperishable fame of the French nation and the French people? You cannot tell me that because the French nation is composed largely of peasants, these peasants are not brave. Who has held the long lines at Verdun?—the French peasant transmuted from his thrifty, lovable home-keeping atmosphere into an actor in a very hell of war where he has held on with tenacity, a heroism, that puts most peoples and nations to the blush. It is inherent in the French blood that they are brave and that they listen to, and act sympathetically with, great ideals and great principles. My right hon. friend has called for and received from me and all others a meed of praise for those French Canadians of our own country who have made themselves illustrious on the fields of France and Belgium this year, at Courcelette and elsewhere. The only regret with us is that there are not more of them, and we do not say that—God forbid—as a taunt or a sneer. We say it in the interest of enduring peace and unity in this Dominion of Canada. Frenchmen and Englishmen have been thrown together on this northern half of the continent. They have fought each other in war, they

have rivalled each other in peace; they have proved doughty assailants in war and they have proved strong and firm friends in peace. These men live in this country and we live in this country and the Dominion belongs to us both. Pity it is, pity it will ever remain, if because of this fight for freedom and high ideals and for the liberty and defence of our common country, we do not march more closely side by side with each other so that in the future we may walk more closely side by side when the war is over and the victory won, the country safe, and we are left to our long generations and centuries of mutual toil for progress and advancement in this country. No one hates dissension on this line more than I do. No one could wish more deeply than I do that we saw more eye to eye in this particular matter.

But, the French Canadian is a law-abiding citizen and if he is convinced that this war, to be won, must be won by throwing men into the contest more and more than we have; if the Parliament of Canada comes to that conclusion, and the people that is behind it arrives at that conclusion towards this measure, no one can convince me that the French Canadian will not walk side by side with his fellows in obedience to the law and in perfect unanimity therewith.

I have to speak now with complete frankness and without any other thought than to come to the right and the truth of the matter, and I put a question to my right hon. friend. In all these three years of the war, the French-Canadian has had less opportunity for learning the rights of this great cause and of this great contest, whether from his occupation and his rural habits of thought he is less in the sphere of information and of knowledge. I have just one thing to say, and it is that I believe that things would not be as they are to-day if my right hon. friend and his able, loyal and enthusiastic French followers had done something more than they have done to enlighten the masses of the people in Quebec with reference to the paramount issues of this war. The words gripped my heart and made me optimistic when my right hon. friend said on one occasion: "No danger from Germany, none, her policy is to be a friend of this country, but if she ever does show her teeth, if she ever does come in opposition to this country with her fleet or her army, then I will go down into the province of Quebec, and I will stump that province from one end to the other in order to rouse the people to the defence of the country." For three years this sanguinary war has been going on. I do not want to attempt to admonish or teach other people their duty; I simply state frankly that I deplore the fact that further means of educating the French people on the vital, paramount issues of this war, have not been put in operation in Quebec by its representative men. Whether it is the fault of Sir Sam Hughes, of Sir Edward Kemp, the English people or the French leaders themselves it is deplorable that more has not been done in that direction. If more had been done in that direction, we have the authority that was quoted this afternoon by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the French people would have risen en masse in favour of this war.

Now, putting all these things together, I come to the end of my remarks with one final reference to the referendum. It may be the practice of democracy. It has been occasionally the practice of statesmen in Canada, when subjects difficult of solution arose, that they did not wish to give a lead upon, to refer these subjects by referendum to the people, and do nothing thereafter, but the referendum moved on the second reading of this Bill, at this particular time in the crisis which is upon us is, to my mind, a miserable dilatory motion, and nothing else.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: With our men in the very front trenches, for members of Parliament and of the Government to down tools in the face of the trenches and enter upon a two or three months' excursion throughout the Dominion of Canada on the idle wind of a referendum, which would settle nothing, but would set us back four months or more, would be little short of criminal. We still would have to make laws, assume responsibilities and carry on in the best interests of Canada, referendum or no referendum. I can see some merit in an appeal to the country on a settled policy, either from this Government or from a coalition government such as was offered to my hon. friend a few days ago. I can see some finality to that, but to a referendum, none. It is a dilatory motion, pure and simple. It can result in nothing, but months of turmoil and bitterness at home and delay and confusion and loss abroad whilst the Hun wears down our sons and kinsmen at the front who call to us in vain for help. But I am not very much afraid on that score, because my faith is

constant that this House and Parliament will not give its assent to such a method of avoiding our responsibilities and shelving, for months the war and the most important question that the war has imposed upon us.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I was struck, as I am sure the House was intended to be struck, by the suggestion in the first sentences of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), that the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not know there was a war in progress. This Bill was brought before the House on its second reading, by the Prime Minister of Canada, without reference to its provisions, to its scope, to its possibilities; a Bill that, if it means anything, means the taking of son from mother, of husband from wife, of father from children, from one end of this Dominion to the other—and it is not worthy a word of explanation by the Prime Minister of Canada when he brings it before the House for its second reading. Does the Government of Canada know the meaning and effect of this measure that it is bringing before the House? Does it know that Canada is at war? We are in a world crisis, the greatest crisis in history. Canada is a participant in that crisis, and the first lieutenant of the Prime Minister, in addressing the Parliament of Canada, through all his rounded periods, through all his well-turned sentences, preserved an air of detachment as though the Government of Canada of which he is a member had no responsibility for the direction of Canada's affairs in this war. We are dealing with a measure for the conscription of men, of one hundred thousand men, to take part in this war, and this measure of conscription is passed over as lightly as though it meant nothing. If it is adopted, it must be adopted, because voluntary enlistment in this country has broken down in Canada. And why has voluntary enlistment broken down? Who is responsible for the breaking down of voluntary enlistment?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: Who is the Government of Canada, responsible for the direction of its affairs? If we are to-day faced with the necessity of this measure, a measure terrible in its character and in its consequences, my hon. friend and his colleagues would do well to take a few minutes of the time of the House and of the country to explain why that measure is necessary, because under their administration voluntary enlistment has broken down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: My right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) spoke in eloquent terms, in moving terms, of the responsibilities resting on the people of this country, responsibilities to the men who have gone to carry our name with honour at the battlefront. He said, we were to support them, to see that the sacrifices they made were not in vain; their sacrifice was to be recognized by others and still others and still others of our citizens, so that the honour of Canada would still and always be maintained, not by conscription, but by voluntary service, a service that would do honour to Canada and do credit to the Empire. I say the question is up to the members of the Government to-day to tell this country why it is now, at this stage, necessary to resort to this measure of conscription. The country that has sent 350,000 men to the battle front in voluntary service, is that country lacking in enthusiasm for the cause of the Allies? Surely the country that sends 350,000 can send a few more, could send a few more, would send a few more, if the enthusiasm that has been exhibited in the past had received proper direction and encouragement at the hands of this Government, of which my hon. friend is such an eloquent member. Is there no responsibility resting upon him and upon them? If that river of men has ceased to flow, what strange thing has occurred in Canada that, at the end of April, 1917, this river was still flowing, there was no question that it would continue to flow, and in June, 1917, there is no further flow of voluntary enlistment to be expected, if the honour of Canada is to be maintained it must be maintained by compulsory and not by voluntary service? The honour of the people of Canada in their support of the Allies in this war is discredited by my hon. friend in his remarks to-day, as by the measure that is before the House in whose support those remarks were made. There is some responsibility somewhere in this country of Canada, and it rests upon the Government of Canada, in regard to the direction of our affairs. Has there been honest endeavour,

has there been persistent and honest endeavour, to maintain the honour of Canada by voluntary enlistment during the three years that have passed? I do not wish to delay the House seriously, but that is a point that should be settled, and I am fortunate in being able to produce the reports of Hansard to show what direction the efforts of the Government took. Sir Sam Hughes, speaking on January 30, 1917, said:

But here another hindrance stepped in. I do not know whether it was in the interest of munition workers or not.

I think he meant munition "makers". He continued:

But I stand here to say that I look on all this talk of munition workers as piffle, compared with the need of men at the front, piffle of the worst kind—this kind of piffle of considering men getting $7 a day in munition works as compared with a man in the trenches, running the risk of being blown to pieces. It is piffle, and the commonest sort of piffle.

An order in council was passed forbidding the Department of Militia from authorizing a battalion here, there or elsewhere, and it is said that the reason was that too many battalions were being raised in Toronto, Winnipeg, Montreal and other large cities.

Continuing, he said:

The point is that they said: Here, you must not have so many regiments recruiting in Toronto or so many recruiting in Montreal.

Sir Robert Borden: I think what my hon. friend says might be misunderstood. There was not an order in council passed saying that no further battalions should be recruited, but that no further battalions should be recruited without an order in council.

Sir Sam Hughes: The object being to prevent two or three being raised in Toronto or Montreal, for instance.

Sir Robert Borden: Too many being raised in one place.

On the same date, Sir Sam Hughes said:

In other words, three months were lost, not in organizing the battalions, but in getting the power to organize them. I am not criticising, only there seems to be a desire to play to the gallery in connection with these munition workers. There was a drop in recruiting at all events. I have heard all sorts of stories, but I have never asked my officers. When I came back my officers made certain statements; they had been directed to go slow in recruiting, but I never asked; I do not know whether it is true or not.

However, seeing the falling off, seeing the need of straining every nerve we could strain at the front, when I came back I set to work to try and get the pulse of the boys. I have always been in favour of universal service, training the boys. I did not deem conscription necessary, and it was not. I could have raised 500,000 men by voluntary enlistment. I could have raised 600,000 by voluntary enlistment without any trouble, I believe. That is only a statement; but I believe I could have done it. However, this order in council stopping the authorization of regiments was passed, and the talk came on from every hand I presume paid for by German agents—against taking men from munition works.

Speaking on February 1, Sir Robert Borden said:

The fact that we succeeded in the first three and a half months of the past year in recruiting a hundred thousand men or more is an indication that the work was carried on with a good deal of vigour and with a great deal of success. The criticism has been made that proper regard to selection was not made. I discussed that question with the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence more than a year ago—I think in the autumn of 1915 for the first time. The course which my colleague took in that regard was that he did not think at that time that any more systematic method was necessary, and he said that it would be possible, through instructions given to his recruiting officers, to prevent unwise selection, selection which might result in the closing up of industries essential for the prosecution of the war, when recruits might have been obtained from other classes whose work and service were not so essential. I was informed by General Hughes that instructions had been given in various instances to adopt methods which would give some system to that purpose.

Mr. Oliver: About what time was that?

Sir Robert Borden: I think it was in the autumn of 1915 or early in 1916.

Sir Sam Hughes: Early in 1916.

Sir Robert Borden: Early in 1916, I think, and afterwards it was thought better that the purpose could be carried out in connection with other objects in a more comprehensive way by the proposals for National Service, and that is the explanation of the course which was taken.

So that we have it on the authority of the ex-Minister of Militia that so early as the fall of 1915 or early in 1916 a deliberate policy of retarding of recruiting was entered upon as between the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia. At whose instigation? At the demand of the fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters or children of the men who were volunteering to go to the front to carry the flag of Britain and uphold the honour of Canada? No; at the instigation of the munition makers, the munition profiteers who are fattening upon the blood of their country and who, through the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, denied to their employees the privilege of going to the front to fight the battles of the Empire and uphold the honour of Canada.

On February 1, Sir Sam Hughes said, as reported on page 373 of Hansard:

Take one special instance in which I was asked to take definite steps along this line was when the Prime Minister brought up the matter of the Sydney mines. The Prime Minister will remember that I rubbed the delegation up a little about their treatment of these fellows in days gone by. However, I did ask some of the recruiting officers not to take spe-

cialists or men expert in certain lines if they could possibly get along without them, or, at any rate, not to bring much pressure to bear upon them.

I heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce say in this House that he himself refused to allow his private secretary to volunteer because he considered that he would be of more advantage to the country acting as his private secretary than he would be as a soldier in the trenches. I heard the Minister of Customs make practically the same statement.

Mr. REID: What statement—that I would not let my private secretary go?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. REID: No statement of that kind was made by me.

Mr. OLIVER: Then it will have to remain as a question between my hon. friend and myself. I will take the opportunity of looking up Hansard.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: Take it back.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg the hon. minister's pardon. I certainly withdraw, in deference to his statement. But it is very clear in my mind that such a statement was made by the minister in regard to some official in his department.

Mr. REID: I would like the hon. member to show me any such statement as he refers to. I have no recollection of ever making such a statement.

Mr. OLIVER: I will take the opportunity of doing so; I have not Hansard under my hand at the moment. If I am not able to produce the statement, I certainly will tender the hon. gentleman every apology.

As to the position taken by a member of the Government on the floor of this House —and the idea was carried through the whole of the Government service, as far as the Government could reach—that there was not as great necessity for the services of able-bodied men at the front as there was in other places, I ask that member of the Government why my son or another man's son should go in the place of his secretary? Our sons are just as good to us as my hon. friend's private secretary was to him.

Having reached the point where the munitions makers of Canada have the sanction of the Premier and of the Minister of Militia in preventing the recruiting of their employees or near-employees, it does not come with good grace from the Minister of Trade and Commerce, eloquent though he may be, to declare on the floor of Parliament that Canada is not able to make good any promise she has made in the matter of voluntary enlistment. Let those who first made the promise and who later stood in the way of its fulfilment take the responsibility.

My hon. friend suggested that the leader of the Opposition by his proposal of a referendum was standing in the way of efficient and timely prosecution of the war on the part of Canada; I think that was the impression he desired to convey. The leader of the Opposition is the leader of the Opposition. It is his business to bring to the attention of the country such direction of its affairs as appears to be best in his judgment. It is the business of the Government to direct those affairs, and if it is true, and it is true, that voluntary enlistment has shown a decrease since the middle of last year, I ask my hon. friend what he and his colleagues have been doing between then and now to protect the interests of this country should there be a German invasion? It was known in June of last year that there was no prospect under the conditions then prevailing of the promise of the Prime Minister being fulfilled, that the rate of enlistment was such that there was no likelihood of the complement of the 500,000 men being raised within any reasonable time. What was the course of the Government under those circumstances? There was plenty of time between then and now to have taken a referendum, plenty of time for the Germans to have invaded and over-run Canada. They appointed my good friend from Calgary as Director of National Service, and sent postal cards presumably to everybody in the Dominion. That was their idea of how to deal with the question when the Hun was at the gates. They got some of those postal cards back, and the Director of National Service is still the Director of National Service. But there is no Service, individual or national, so far as any one can judge. This Government spent its time month after month, and month after month practically walking around in a circle, deluding its friends who were in favour of more drastic action into the belief that National Service meant conscription and at the same time giving Dorchester and other places in that neighbourhood clearly to understand that National Service did not mean conscription.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What member of this Government ever said that National Service did mean conscription?

Mr. OLIVER: I won't bother answering my hon. friend's interruption just now, but if National Service did not mean conscription, if there was no intention to make it the foundation of conscription measures, will the hon. gentleman tell me what on earth it was introduced for?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read the Order in Council.

Mr. OLIVER: I have answered my hon. friend's question. Will he answer mine?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman told me he would not answer my question. I, however, will answer his. The terms of the Order in Council speak for themselves.

Mr. OLIVER: Then the terms of the Order in Council are no more than sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. There have been no results either from the Order in Council or from the efforts of my hon. friend the Director of National Service.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: The Calgary trumpet.

Mr. OLIVER: If the conditions are in any degree as my hon. friend declared them to be, what answer has this Government to make to the fact that for one whole year they knew of those conditions and did nothing to remedy them? They did worse than nothing. When the announcement of National Service was made the effect was necessarily to injure still further voluntary enlistment. When it was announced that the Government was going to take upon itself the responsibility of deciding whether this or that man should go to the front and this or that man into a munitions factory, the responsibility of choosing between the man who was to get $1.10 a day with the privilege of getting shot, and the man who would earn $5 a day in a munitions factory and live in comfort, what young man, unless he was inspired by enthusiasm in more than the ordinary degree, would not naturally say, "The Government is taking the responsibility off my shoulders. It is no longer for me but for the Government to decide whether I shall go to the front or into a munitions factory." I ask you, Sir, whether that was a stimulus to recruiting? When that announcement had gone abroad and recruiting still further fell off, the Government did nothing more. They simply sent out their cards, got some of them back, talked one way in one end of the country and another way in the other end; but they did nothing.

The climax of it all was the proposal to enlist 50,000 men for home defence. Fifty thousand men to be taken out of productive industry at a time when it was believed that productive industry required all the help that it could get; taken out of productive industry, but not sent to the firing line. How many months did the Government spend on that project, and what was its result? Does the Minister of Trade and Commerce think that the Government is justified before this country in spending the time between June of last year and June of this year in talking one thing and doing a different thing; in talking action, but pursuing inaction? Is that his way of winning the war? And to-day, when there is placed before this House a suggestion that the power of Parliament is exhausted, that we hold no authority from the people of Canada, and that when we are imposing upon the people of Canada a measure, which, however necessary, however patriotic it may be, is still a most burdensome measure, we should ask the authority of the people to impose that measure; we are told that this suggestion is most unpatriotic because it would mean delay. It is right for the Government to delay, to walk up and down, to go round and round, for twelve long months; but it is absolutely unpatriotic for the leader of an Opposition to suggest that the people of Canada shall rule—because it might mean a delay of three months.

Now let me touch on the references made by the hon. gentleman to the province of Quebec. The province of Quebec has not sent as many men to the front, in proportion to population, as other provinces have. That is to be regretted. My right hon. friend thinks that the blame for the inaction of the province of Quebec—assuming that there has been inaction—rests upon whom? Upon the Government of the country? Oh, no; the blame rests upon the leader of the Opposition, the man from whom the majority of the people of Canada took the responsibility of office in 1911, the man who has held no responsibility of office since that time. He, we are told, is the man to blame, if blame there is, for the state of affairs in the province of Quebec, while the Government has no responsibility in the matter. In my humble judgment, a government constituted as this Government is, whose members from the province of Quebec were elected as being opposed, not to conscription merely, but to military or naval service on behalf of the Empire—a Government with these men in its councils, supported by their colleagues from Quebec, who represent within a fraction of half the people of that province and number within ten of half its representation in

this House, must carry the responsibility for failure to recruit in the province of Quebec, and any lack of military enthusiasm in that province must fairly rest upon the shoulders of this Government, whose members are opposed, not only to conscription, but absolutely to military service.

The question before the House is serious; it is serious beyond measure. Surely, if there is danger of division in this country, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce said there was; although he brushed it aside lightly, it was a small thing—if there is a possibility that one of the provinces of this Dominion is likely to be opposed to the policy which is about to be undertaken; and if it is the fact—and the right hon. gentleman said it was the fact—that the leader of the Opposition is responsible for public opinion in the province of Quebec, would it not be reasonable, would it not be common sense for the Prime Minister and his colleagues to take the recommendation of the leader of the Opposition?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER: If the facts are as the Minister of Trade and Commerce says they are—I do not say these are the facts; he says it—that is a reason why the proposal of the leader of the Opposition should be accepted by this Government in the interest of the wellbeing of the country, in the interest of its unity and therefore of its strength.

In speaking on this question I have dealt with it from the standpoint of voluntary enlistment and of the failure of voluntary enlistment in this country, and of the necessity, if necessity there is, for the introduction of this conscription measure. I think it only right to place before the House certain facts in regard to the measure of voluntary enlistment that is going on in Canada to-day, voluntary enlistment that is going on not because of the efforts of our Government but in spite of the efforts of our Government. I have here the latest issue of of the sheet called The Canadian Patriotic Fund, and I find a statement showing that the total enlistments in Canada for the Canadian Expeditionary Force for the month of January, 1917, were 7,721; for February, 7,644; for March, 6,648; for April, 5,420, a total of 27,433; or for one year, if continued at the same rate, 72,299. I note that a despatch from Kingston says that "456 recruits signed up in the Third Military District during the last two weeks." I say, in spite of this Government, and not because of it.

I desire to draw the attention of the House to an item which appeared in the Ottawa Citizen of a day or two ago to the effect that the enlistments in the city of Ottawa had fallen to a certain figure and the reason was because the enlistment office for the artillery service had been closed up. They had refused, during two weeks of the period to accept any recruits for the artillery service. It appears to me that when we have the evidence of the number of recruits during the preceding period, and when we have the evidence that this Government refused to accept recruits for any branch of the service here in this capital city of Ottawa, the Government has no right to say that voluntary enlistment is a failure in Canada or that people of Canada are lacking in their enthusiasm in support of this war.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Did my hon. friend say that we had refused to accept artillery recruits?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: That is so, but it was at the instance of the British Government who say that they have more artillery recruits in England than they need at present.

Mr. OLIVER: I notice that the British Government comes in conveniently when my hon. friends desire to escape from a difficult situation, but it appears to me that if the casualties at the front are as they are reported to be, and there is no doubt they are, this Government would not be placing the British Government at any disadvantage if they accepted all the artillery recruits that offered and gave them the training that is necessary for efficiency in the artillery service. I am still compelled to believe that the closing up of the recruiting office in Ottawa, and the refusal of artillery recruits, was rather in the line of emphasizing the necessity of this Military Service Bill than of satisfying the demands of the British Government.

No one is more disappointed than I am that the Government should have felt it necessary at this stage of the proceedings to say to the country that their policy of voluntary enlistment had broken down. There is, after all, something of inspiration in the idea of a man who volunteers, of men who, of their own good-will have left house and home, farm and land, wife, children and friends and have taken upon themselves, for their own credit and for the honour of their country, the responsibility and sacrifice of the war. There is some-

thing insipiring in that, something to be proud of and Canada has reason to be proud that so many of her citizens have taken that position and have done her that measure of honour. It is a matter of the deepest regret to me as one citizen of this country, and as a member of this Parliament, that we are not going forward in the same line and to the same result.

While I say that, I also take the position, which I have taken in this House in times past—and I think I was the only member in the House to take it—that universal compulsory service was the only logical service under such conditions as prevail in the world at the present time. I believe that universal military service is the logical and efficient method of bringing to bear the full strength of our country under present circumstances and conditions. Given a proper measure of universal military service, and there is equality in the distribution of the burden, an equality that does not exist in the case of voluntary service. While voluntary service has tremendous advantages in many ways, it has the disadvantage that the willing horse carries the whole load. It is only fair that every horse should carry his share of the load. It is only on the principle of equality of service—of absolute equality of service—that the compulsory principle will be recognized or accepted. It is the only principle that is fair. If there is not equality of service under the compulsory principle, then, instead of it being a democratic method of meeting a great emergency, it becomes an instrumeent of tyranny and unfairness in every particular.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) used the words "selective conscription", and the Prime Minister explained that he was not able to adopt the Militia Act now on the statute-book because it did not contain the selective principle, and the selective principle must be provided for by special legislation. In the adoption of this selective principle there is vast room for anything but fairness in the administration of the Compulsory Service Bill. In that provision for selective conscription, it appears to me, there rests the greatest reason for objecting to the measure as it appears before the House. I have said in this House before, and I say again, that the great necessity to win this war is able-bodied men on the firing line, and any provision or measure before the House that takes the view that equal service can be rendered by an able-bodied man in any other capacity, takes a view that I for one cannot agree with. And when I see a measure brought before the House as this measure is and advocated as this is, I am compelled to say that I do not look upon it as such a conscription measure as I would be willing to support.

To deal with a certain provision of the Bill; It is provided, as the Prime Minister has told us, that there shall be a Board of selection, a Board of appeal, which amounts to a Board of selection, and this Board of appeal shall be absolutely independent—that is to say it will be absolutely irresponsible, absolutely irresponsible. In other words, that Board will express the sentiment of the men who compose it, who again will express the sentiment of the people amongst whom they live, And it is provided that this Board shall grant a certificate of exemption on the ground:

> That it is expedient in the national interest that the man should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he is habitually engaged.

That is to say, this irresponsible Board has all the authority of this Parliament to say: this man shall go and this man shall stay. There is neither let nor hindrance, there is neither direction nor suggestion, and this Parliament is asked to support that measure and call it a measure of conscription. It is a measure of conscription, but not a measure of conscription as I would feel able to support.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member is objecting to this method. Does he prefer the method established in the Militia Act, of selection by ballot, or how does he suggest the selection should be made?

Mr. OLIVER: I would suggest that this Bill that is brought before the House should tell us how the selection is going to be made.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Well, it does.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg pardon, it does not. It says that two irresponsible appointees—

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Irresponsible!

Mr. OLIVER: Irresponsible, not responsible to any one—shall say that Smith shall go and Jones shall stay, without any reason whatever, except their own sweet will.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To whom should they be responsible?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not drafting the Bill. I am saying that this Bill says this

and that, this is the provision of the Bill that this Government has brought down, and asks this House to vote for. Now, I am a conscriptionist; I believe in universal military service; but I believe in universal military service on a fair basis, and I do not believe in a Bill that makes provision that Brown shall go and Smith shall stay and does not suggest, even in the remotest degree, why Brown should go and Smith should stay.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really did say, in introducing the Bill and again to-day, that we would be very glad to have suggestions which would improve the Bill. If my hon. friend is so strongly opposed to the provision which we have suggested, would he be good enough to give us the benefit of his suggestion as to what the provision should be?

Mr. OLIVER: Really I do not appreciate that as being my function.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER: That is the business of the Government of this country. They have brought down a Bill, they are challenging public opinion upon it; they have a right to do so. My business in this House is to show how and where this measure falls short of being in the best interests of the country, if in my judgment it does so fall short. Having done that, I have discharged my responsibility.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh.

Mr. OLIVER: And I again point out that this Government has brought forward a measure here, under the pretense that it is a measure that shall be a fair measure of conscription, and it is a measure that does not contain within its four corners the first element of fairness in the matter of conscription.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What would be fair?

Mr. OLIVER: I am saying to the Prime Minister that that is his business.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh,

9 p.m. oh.

Mr. OLIVER: It is the business of the Prime Minister to bring in a measure that will be fair, and let me suggest to the Prime Minister and his friends that this is a responsibility resting upon their shoulders just as the administration of Canada's affairs in this war have rested on their shoulders, and I think they are under a great mistake if they think that that responsibility is one that can be treated with levity.

Mr. BURNHAM: If the hon. gentleman does not feel that he owes any duty to this Government, does he not owe a duty to the country to make suggestions?

Mr. OLIVER: I do.

Mr. BURNHAM: Why not make them?

Mr. OLIVER: I am discharging my duty to the country according to my best judgment. Let me show how this provision will work out. In the part of the country where I live, where we have sent more men to the war in proportion to population than have been sent from any other part of the Dominion of Canada, where the men on homesteads, on the side lines, on the back streets, have gone in their thousands, and every day brings out its toll of casualties, carrying death and wounds into every side line and into almost every house and cottage—we know something of war in that part of the country, and when you talk of conscription we want to know what it means. We have been led to believe that a conscription measure would be fair to the country, and as we have done our duty, in a measure, so it would compel the people in other parts of the country to do their duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: Now, that is the kind of conscription measure I want to see, but that is not the kind of conscription measure my hon. friend has brought down, because when a board is appointed in the city of Edmonton, where the people have gone to the war and where the sentiment is in favour of maintaining our position in the firing line, and a man is called up and he appeals, the board will naturally say: Well, your neighbours have gone and you must go. That is what we would expect of a conscription measure in that part of the country. That is to say, in our part of the country those who have not gone would be compelled to go. But shift that position down into the good province of Ontario, in some of its localities, or into the neighbouring province of Quebec, or possibly into the Maritime Provinces; you will find localities in all of those provinces where the people have not very enthusiastically volunteered for active service overseas, where the sentiment of the people is not favourable to such military service, and you have your tribunal there, just as you

have it in Alberta, and a young man appeals from the call and goes before this its authority under this provision to permit the man to remain they would be chased out of the country. The result would be that, we at Edmonton, who have sent of our best, and who have sent so many of them, will have to send still more, and those who have sent none will still send none, under this provision as it stands. This provision bears the closest possible relationship, in sentiment and idea, to those National Service cards, which were drawn up for an express purpose, and worded so that the man who believed in conscription was told "This is the beginning of conscription" and the man who did not believe in conscription was told that it certainly did not mean conscription, and we have the evidence of the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny) on that point. We have a Bill that, to the people of Alberta, means conscription, but to the people of other parts of the country means just as much conscription as they want, and just the way they want it. That is not the kind of measure I would call a conscription Bill, and is not the kind of provision that I think is required to meet the Hun at the gate. It is not the way to do honour to this country and credit to the Government which brought it forward. I do not know, but it may be that this Bill has some resemblance to some Bill in England, or some measure passed in the United States. I can only say that we are legislating for Canada according to the conditions of Canada, and legislation that may be absolutely adapted to the conditions in England is not necessarily adapted to the conditions in Canada. Legislation which is adapted to the United States may not be adapted to our country. In case this legislation should be modelled on the English Bill, let me give the House some information as to how the English Bill is administered, and ask their opinions as to how they would be pleased to have similar administration in Canada. I read in the Toronto Saturday Night of June 16th, an article from England written by an English correspondent, Lacey Amy: He speaks of the conditions in England, and particularly of the conditions surrounding the enforcement of the conscription measure there. He says:

> Tribunals all through the country continue to hand out exemptions to huntsmen, variety artists, store managers, clerks, luxury manufacturers, frankly declaring that their mission is "to protect local industry". One district alone granted 30,000 exemptions during the past fourteen weeks.
>
> Even the Government joined the Freedom League. Only a few departments are not still to a large extent manned by eligibles with influence. In this 34th month of the war it is still the custom to hand a list of names to a branch of a department with orders to find places for them. A regiment is permitted to retain at home its football players and runners and boxers. The great markets of London—Smithfield, Covent Garden, Billingsgate and the rest—have scarcely been touched, because their combing out was left to committees of themselves and they have been unable to agree.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, if that is the way they like to have it in England, it is not the way we like to have it here, and if this measure is modelled on the terms of the British measure, and if these are the results of the British measure, I say this is not a conscription Bill, according to my judgment, and is not entitled to my support.

There is this further feature of the volunteer system: that if a man volunteers, he does so for reasons of his own. He takes his chance. He accepts what he gets in the way of treatment, or casualties, or whatever it may be, and we who stand here, legislating for Canada in some measure, can carry the responsability lightly. But if we, by legislation, reach out our hand, take that man forcibly from his business and his family, bring him under military control, and send him into the firing line, it is for us to see in every step taken that every safeguard is afforded, and every justice meted out to him. In looking back over the part taken by Canada in this war since August, 1914, I regret to say that I cannot see in the administration of our affairs, that spirit of fair play and of consideration for what is right and just that I would require to see in a government in whose hands I would entrust a measure of conscription of men.

I will not delay the House on the point, but I have here a clipping from the Montreal Star, a special cable from London, England, May 29th, by their correspondent, F. A. Mackenzie. Mr. Mackenzie has been at the front, and he states as follows:—

> My visit to the base more than ever convinced me that we are suffering both at the London and French bases from over-systematization, which maintains thousands of unnecessary clerks, docking, indexing, the precise writing systems. The fault is not with the officers who are administering. I strongly urge the Dominion Government to have the system rigorously simplified in order to prevent the present staffs being overwhelmed by red tape and routine.
>
> The dissolution of certain old battalions doing excellent service has been necessary.
>
> The divisional staffs asked me to try and remove the impression prevailing in some parts

of Canada that the battalions were broken up because inefficient and unsatisfactory. Among them are several considered among the pick of the army. The necessity which compels the disintegrating of the veteran battalions with brilliant records and splendid esprit is considered deplorable. One dissolved battalion held a funeral service and the men erected a tombstone "To commemorate the last resting place of the 48th Battalion, raised by patriotism February, 1915, destroyed by politics May, 1917."

Further on he concludes:

The armies are heartily sick of politics, believing the politicians a curse to the service in their intrigues, forcing a number of unsuitable men into posts.

Such a record does not seem to me to warrant us in placing in the hands of this Government the power of life and death, of honour or dishonour, over our people by the tens of thousands.

This Government that comes to us with this conscription measure, and assumes to itself that, because it proposes conscription, therefore it wants to win the war, when because of its course, of its action and of its inaction in carrying forward Canada's effort to win the war, conscription has to be resorted to. In this as in every other case I am in favour of prompt and effective action. If a Government holding a mandate from the people believed in its wisdom that it was necessary to introduce a measure of conscription, it would be its duty to introduce such a measure, and to enforce it, if it could enforce it. But that is not the position; this Parliament holds no authority from the people. It was elected in September, 1911, for a period of five years; to-day it sits here, self-elected, but confirmed in position by the authority of the Imperial Parliament. It is competent for the Government to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the country, but in the Governor General's address at the opening of the House it was announced that such was not the intention of the Government; that a further extension of the life of Parliament was to be arranged. On the Order Paper to-day is a notice that the Government purposes introducing a resolution for the extension of the life of Parliament. We of the Opposition cannot command the Government. We know that we hold no mandate from the people; that our authority, so far as the people are concerned, was exhausted in October last. We see that the Government proposes still further to extend the life of Parliament; that it does not intend to go to the people for authority. Under those circumstances, the only way in which the authority of the people can be secured is by the adoption of the amendment offered by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman says that he is is favour of conscription, but that he would not entrust it to this Government. Will he say whether he would entrust conscription to the leader of the Opposition?

Mr. OLIVER: If the leader of the Opposition became leader of the Government, I certainly would.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman would entrust the enforcement of conscription to one who is altogether opposed to conscription.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know that he is altogether opposed to conscription.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER: I heard him say here to-day that if his amendment is adopted and it is agreed to by the country, he would be a party to assisting the enforcing of conscription.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But he is opposed to conscription. Would the hon. gentleman, then, entrust such a measure to him?

Mr. OLIVER: I certainly would entrust to the leader of the Opposition, if he were leader of the Government, the authority to enforce conscription, believing that he would enforce it if it were the law of the country and if the people had declared for it. But the leader of the Opposition and others on this side of the House are not prepared to take the responsibility of supporting a conscription measure when, having usurped the authority of the people, we sit here by our own authority, not by the authority of the people. That is the position that we want thoroughly defined. If the Liberal party stands for anything it stands for the rule of the majority of the people. We believe in responsible government, but when a Government that is absolutely not responsible to the people, and which holds office without regard to the people, brings forward a measure which lays a burden upon all the people, then all the people have a right to be heard with regard to that measure before it is put in force. That is what we say, and that is all we say.

The leader of the Opposition has said that if a majority of the people are for conscription he will do his part in seeing that the law is carried out. I noticed how lightly the Minister of Trade and Commerce considered the authority of the people; it struck me that that certainly was good Tory doc-

trine. The fact that this Parliament did not hold authority from the people was a matter of the smallest possible consideration. We were Parliament, and because we were Parliament we should exercise our authority according to our judgment. If the military enthusiasm of our people declined, and if, because of the mismanagement of the Prime Minister in his leadership, our men at the front were not being supported, then we must make the people go—because we were Parliament.

Mr. BURRELL: My hon. friend said just now that this Parliament had usurped the authority of the people. Does my hon. friend not believe that when the members of Parliament unanimously extended the life of Parliament for one year in order to avoid bitter contest during the war the people in vast majority cordially approved that action?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know whether they did or not. We were careful not to take any chances on their doing it; we simply elected ourselves. I am not arguing that there was not at that time good and sufficient reason for the action that we took. I am arguing that because we took that action at that time is not a reason why we should take the same action again. Having taken the law into our own hands; having set ourselves up in a position independent of the people, we should, before forcing this measure upon them, submit it to their judgment and obtain their opinion upon it.

The leader of the Opposition drew attention in some measure to the condition of the House itself, aside from the fact that its term had expired and that the authority of the people, so far as we were concerned, had been exhausted. Taking the House as of 221 members, 9 seats are vacant by death, 11 by resignation, and 5 by reason of the members being unavoidably absent. There are two double seats: that is, two members each sit for two seats.

There are under military orders and pay 26 members of this House. These men under the military law are subject to service and entitled to pay therefor. I maintain that that is in effect an infraction of the independence of Parliament, whether it is inside the law or not. I am not criticising either the man or the military service, but it goes without saying that no matter who he is or how great the service he may render, the member of Parliament who is under military orders and receiving military pay is not in the position an independent member of Parliament should be in. He is not, as a matter of fact, an independent member of this House.

There are in this House, if I am correct in my count, 20 seats which are represented by men who were elected absolutely on the principle of opposition to Imperial Military service. It is this House, with this composition, that is to enforce conscription. Is it any wonder that the Conscription Bill is of the character that it is? We have had an administration of our military affairs since the war began that has not been to the credit of Canada, and I am one of those who believe that the influence of those men in the Cabinet and outside who were absolutely opposed to Canada's participation in Great Britain's wars is one of the great reasons why we have not had a more effective administration of our affairs in this war.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister in his speech a few days ago suggested what might happen to members of this House if the Conscription Bill were not passed. What does he think will happen to members of this House and of this Government who armed the men in the trenches at Ypres with rifles that would not shoot under stress of circumstances, and who kept them armed with those rifles and sent other men into the trenches armed with the same rifles for one long year after they had it on the authority of the British general that the rifle was inefficient? Perhaps it was not the influence of those who were opposed to Canada's participation in the wars of the Empire that was responsible for that condition, but undoubtedly that was the condition that did exist, and for that condition this Government is responsible, and it will be well for other members of the Government and other members of Parliament if they can show that it was those who were opposed to Canada's participation in the war who were responsible for the blood of the men who died at Langemarck and Zillebeck because the Government armed them with a rifle that they knew to be inefficient.

In a House of 221 members we have 9 seats vacant by death, 11 by resignation, 2 double seats, 5 unavoidably absent, 26 under military orders and pay, 20 elected to oppose military service for the Empire, 2 are under-secretaries, and 2 occupy special positions without pay, but with allowances, I suppose; I speak of the Director of National Service and the hon. member for East Kootenay (Mr. Green), who is now acting for the Government in the coal strikes. There is 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. In a House of Commons of 235 seats, as it would be after a general election, there would be 79 as above, 22 unrepresented, and 8 over represented, a total of 109 seats, or nearly one-half not represented as they ought to be. It is this Parliament, which has outlived the term for which it was elected, with nearly one-half of the seats unrepresented or represented by members who are not in the position they should be in, that proposes to put through a Conscription Bill compelling 100,000 of our men to give military service at the front, under the plea and pretense that the loyalty and military enthusiasm of our people have failed us in this time of stress. This conscription measure is brought forward as an excuse and apology for the Government's failure to discharge their duties and responsibilities for the honour of Canada and the safety of the Empire.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House was very much surprised this afternoon when the right hon. leader of the Opposition moved an amendment to the second reading of this Bill, seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton. We have listened to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) for an hour and three quarters endeavouring to show in the first place that the Bill does not go far enough, and in his next breath telling the House and country that the Bill is an iniquitous measure because it will tear the son from his mother and the husband from his wife. He tried to show that the Bill was not a Compulsory Service Bill, that in its working out it would practically defeat its own ends, and yet his chief condemnation of the Government tonight was that the Bill would have the dire effect upon the manhood of the country to which I have alluded. He says he is in favour of compulsory service, and always has been, and then deliberately seconds an amendment which amounts to a hoist for the Bill which would bring in compulsory service.

And he refuses, even though invited by the Prime Minister, to make a single suggestion to improve the Bill. He would send the Bill as it stands to the people to be ratified by the people, and would hand over the administration of it to the leader of the Opposition who is absolutely opposed to it; and yet he refuses to give any suggestion for the improvement of the Bill. To my mind, such a position is illogical and untenable.

Another point that my hon. friend makes is that this Bill is weak because, forsooth, Alberta and some other provinces, my own province for instance, have already contributed very liberally under the voluntary system, and it will take from these provinces certain individuals while allowing individuals in other provinces to escape. And why? Because he says the Bill provides for administration by an independent board which he chooses to call "irresponsible." What would he have said had the Government brought down a Bill to be administered, for instance, by the Minister of Militia or by some special committee of this House? He would at once have declared that it was a Bill for a political end, that it should have been entrusted to the courts. But because the Government bring down a Bill to be administered by the courts of the land, he says, forsooth, that this is an "irresponsible" way to administer the Bill. He might as well say that the courts of the land, from the Supreme Court and the Exchequer Court down to the police court, are irresponsible and do not administer the ordinary laws properly day after day. The very same men, the judges of the county courts, the judges of the Supreme Court, are the men chosen by the Government to administer the exclusion clauses of the Bill; and I repeat, his reflection upon these men must carry with it the inference that they are incapable of administering the ordinary laws of the land. Otherwise, his criticism means absolutely nothing; it is merely a captious criticism.

Referring to the munitions work, he took the Government to task because, he alleges, early in the year 1916, the Government and the Minister of Militia of that time had prevented the men, skilled workers, engaged in the manufacture of munitions, from enlisting. I have not heard of a single case of a man who insisted upon enlisting being denied that privilege.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was not here when the hon. member for Edmonton spoke. Did he say that there was interference with the men employed in munitions enlisting?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is an absolute falsehood.

Mr. OLIVER: I only read from Hansard what the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) said.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) said something to the effect that there was a conspiracy between the Prime Minister and the Minister of

Militia of that time to prevent individuals from enlisting and to keep them in the munition factories. That is a most unfair criticism of the Government; for the hon. gentleman himself, from his place in the House in 1915, and also I think in this very session of 1916, attacked, condemned, and maligned the Government because it was not assisting the Mother country in getting out munitions and was not giving sufficient support to the men at the front who at that time were suffering because munitions were not supplied in sufficient quantities. He knows that the one thing needed in 1915, when our boys went in at the front, was munitions; the thing that caused the slaughter at various points in Flanders was that they had not heavy artillery and munitions. And what gives the British at the front the advantage to-day? The tremendous quantity of munitions. And how have they been brought up to that point? By Canada, the United States, and the Motherland bending their skill and energy to their manufacture. The hon. member knew very well, when he made his unfair criticism, that the British Government brought men back from the front—thousands of them—to put them at work on munitions rather than allow them to remain in the front line. He seeks—and I consider it a most unfair and unkind criticism—and makes it an object of petty, picayune political attack, to compare the heroism of the men in the factory with that of the men on the firing line. We know that the men at the front, willing to lay down their lives, and hundreds of them making that last great sacrifice, are rendering to the country a service that can never be too highly appreciated. At the same time, it must be admitted that the men in certain walks of life can do their country a great service for the time being by sending to the men at the front the support of munitions. Let me give an instance. A young McGill student from my own city, skilled in analysing steel, enlisted as a private and was on his way to the front. But the former Minister of Militia got hold of him, and that young man is now in the Ordnance Department filling a position as a skilled engineer testing steel in the manufacture of ordnance, a thing that very few men in Canada understand. Would the hon. member for Edmonton take that young man out of the Ordnance Department and send him to the front? We on this side who differ with the hon. gentleman in political matters have always regarded him as an honest, rugged fighter, whatever we may have thought of his opinions. But his criticism to-night did not do him credit, nor do I think his constituents will approve the stand he has taken.

The hon. gentleman also referred to the failure of the voluntary system, and he very glibly tells us that the responsibility lies at the door of the Government. If this Government is entirely responsible for the failure of the voluntary system, then it follows absolutely that this Government and its supporters alone were engaged in the promotion of volunteering. But that is not true; the hon. gentleman and I know that it is not true. We can speak with assurance when we say that throughout Ontario and the West, and throughout Eastern Canada we know, but not with the same personal knowledge, both Liberals and Conservatives in every walk of life have joined hands in the work of making the voluntary system a success. We on this side have never hesitated to give credit to our Liberal friends in the West, and I could name them by the score, who have done great service in that line. But when the hon. gentleman stands in his place and seriously, on this solemn occasion, tries to make the House and the country believe that this Government alone is responsible for the voluntary system, he acknowledges that he and his friends have failed to do anything for that system.

He complains that this Government took no action between last June and this June, and this, he said repeatedly, is the time when the volunteer system failed. He says the Government should have taken action last June, and yet says that the Government having delayed for twelve months, it should delay for three months more, and perhaps not pass the measure at all. In one breath he charges the Government with not proposing conscription a year ago and in the next, with all his power, eloquence and influence, he seeks to delay the matter for another three or four months. If the Government was at fault, as he says it was, it is his duty, and the duty of every citizen of the country, to see that the thing is done now. Delay is not going to improve it. As a matter of fact, he knows, and I think the country at large knows, that there was an earnest effort on the part of the Government to avoid conscription. Why? In the first place, I think we had a decided pride in the fact that Canada had done so well under the voluntary system. I want to pause a moment to pay a tribute to Canada, to my country, for the splendid manner in which it has responded to the

call in this great war under the voluntary system. I was hoping, as I am sure many others have been, that we would have been able to get the 500,000 men and stand out as the one country in the world that did not require compulsory service. But, unfortunately, for various reasons that has not been possible, and so the Government come down now, after exhausting every other effort to secure the men, with a compulsory measure. My hon. friend refuses to make any suggestions to improve this Bill. He chooses at this most critical time in the country's and the Empire's history, at this most critical time in the history of modern civilization, to enter on a course of destructive criticism and refuses to make a single constructive suggestion to help the Government, notwithstanding the fact that the sincerity of the Government in inviting such suggestions was conclusively shown by the fact that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister allowed this Bill to stand for several weeks after it was introduced in order to give the leader of the Opposition an opportunity of joining with him in a national, coalition Government. When my hon. friend seeks to cast a reflection upon the Prime Minister and his Government, he has to reckon with that fact, and I believe that the country will properly weigh criticisms of that kind.

We are faced with a single condition. This war is either justifiable or it is not, it is either right or wrong, it should be sustained or it should be abandoned. That is the situation with which we are faced to-day. We have no choice except between these two courses. There is no middle course. Either we must sustain the men at the front by sending reinforcements or we must abandon them. There is, I repeat, absolutely no middle course. It ill behooves us as members of this Parliament to stand in our places here, as the leader of the Opposition did this afternoon, go back to the Boer War, or to the Drummond and Athabasca election and rake up all the political squabbles that have arisen in this country during the last twenty years. Such a proceeding is unnecessary and ill-timed. The thing for us to do is to face the conditions now. The conditions are clear, and again I say there is no middle course. If we admit, as I think we must admit, that our cause is a just one, and that we are battling for right against despotism, tyranny and brutal might, we dare not abandon the fight, we must not fail at this time, and we must concentrate our efforts upon bringing into play to the utmost our national strength. This Bill presented by the Prime Minister is calculated to do that very thing, to bring into play the full strength of the manhood of the country.

My hon. friend from Edmonton, as did his leader this afternoon, raises the constitutional quibble—I have no other word to characterize it—that as a moribund Parliament we have no power, no mandate, and no right to go on with this measure until we have consulted the people. Let us look at the logic of that for one moment. Year after year the Finance Minister has been bringing before Parliament methods of financing which were equally as revolutionary as compulsory military service. Last year he brought in a new method of financing; this year he extends it. Certain hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House condemn these measures as too drastic and far reaching. Why did not the hon. member for Edmonton and his leader on those occasions demand that the Finance Minister submit these measures to the people; they were more revolutionary than this measure, because there is no question but what this Bill simply contains what has been on the statute book for the last fifty years. The hon. member for Edmonton smiles, but I will read the clause again, although it has been read two or three times. Clause 61 of the Militia Act of 1868 is as follows:

> Her Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for actual service—

Mark the words.

> —either within or without the Dominion, at any time whenever it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion, or insurrection, or danger of any of them.

My hon. friend from Edmonton and the leader of the opposition will no doubt say that it is perfectly true, but that there is no danger of invasion. I do not think that the member for Edmonton would urge that, because I frankly believe that he realizes the seriousness of this war, and that it really means invasion if it means anything at all. But if that argument is raised, I quote what the leader of the opposition said in this House on August 19, 1914. Here are his words:

> Our territory is liable to attack and to invasion. Our shipping to Great Britain has been interrupted. England to-day is not engaged in an ordinary contest.

Could anything be clearer? The right hon. gentleman this afternoon urged seriously, and emphasized from his place in

the House, that he never believed we were in danger of invasion. He said in 1914, in the first war session:

> Our territory is liable to attack and invasion, our commerce has been interrupted.

Again I call attention to the Act, in order that I may put this question for ever at rest:

> Her Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for actual service, either within or without the Dominion at any time, whenever it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion, or insurrection, or danger of any of them.

Surely that is clear enough. But there is another phase of the question that I would call the attention of the House to. Supposing it is admitted for the sake of argument that there was no danger of direct invasion, but supposing we found that our commerce was interrupted. What would be the result? The property of Canada is not all contained within Canada. Wherever there are ships carrying cargo from Canada, there lies the property of Canada, and wherever lies the property of Canada, in a ship or otherwise, there lies the duty of Canada to defend that property. If the Canadian Government and the Canadian people say: We will send our cargoes out in our ships, and the minute they pass the three-mile limit we will have no further interest in them, their sense of national responsibility is about as low as that of any nation that we call civilized. It is not the case. The case is this, that wherever there is Canadian property, wherever there are Canadian lives or citizens, there lies Canadian duty and the duty of the Canadian Government to protect and defend them.

I wish to ask now this question: Who are particularly opposing this Bill? And I find, after careful thought, that there are two, or perhaps three elements. First, there is a section of organized labour, and I use the word "section" advisedly, a section of organized labour, because the sentiment is not by any means unanimous among the organized labour of Canada, who oppose the Bill, I shall refer to that later. Then there is almost a unanimous Quebec. I say almost because there are quite a large number of citizens of Quebec who are certainly in favour of this Bill and of prosecuting this war to a successful issue, and to these we give all honour and credit. But there is unquestionably a strong sentiment in that province opposing it, which I shall review in a moment. Third, there is a miscellaneous group, the slacker, the individual who has a misguided opinion that it is a sin to defend one's own family and hearth and rights, that in some way or other we should lie down and allow ourselves to be abused to any extent without offering any violence in return. There is that element, but I do not think they amount to much or have much influence in the upbuilding of the country.

Let me refer briefly to the situation in Quebec, and I hope to deal with it in all moderation and in a spirit of sincerity and kindness. I must refer, in connection with this subject, to an epoch-making event when Edward the Peacemaker consummated the entente cordiale between the two greatest democracies in the world, when they joined hands in the inspiring duty of preserving to the world those noble principles for which both had separately contended for many centuries. Sir, that was, I say, an epoch-making event which was welcomed by the democracies of the world as an evidence of the triumph of democracy over autocracy in the future history of events, and I think we can say this, that genuine and mutual were the efforts of the statesmen of both countries to bring that great event to a practical issue. But, sir, it rested with this great war to bring it to its ultimate result and effect, and this war has sealed that agreement, has sealed that Treaty, has sealed that understanding, with the blood of the noblest sons of the two nations, on the common field of battle. So in Canada, when war broke out, while we realized that there would undoubtedly be serious results, that there would be suffering, we welcomed to a certain degree this war, because we hoped it would for ever strike out of the national life of Canada the differences between the two great races in this country. I remember perfectly well how it was welcomed as an evidence of the good will of the two races in Canada, and we had hoped that now we could have a common ground upon which we could travel along side by side, in pursuance of our country's welfare. But, unfortunately, things have occurred that have dissipated that hope. I wish to read to the House some words that fell from the lips of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at that time, inspiring and graceful, so far as language is concerned. I suggest that the House should listen to these words, because they have unquestionably the right ring to them, and while we are sometimes mystified to harmonize the actions of the right hon. gentleman with his words, we at least must admire the sentiment expressed in them:—

10 p.m.

It is our duty, more pressing upon us than all other duties, at once, on this first day of this extraordinary session of the Canadian Parliament, to let Great Britain know, that there is in Canada but one mind and one heart and that all Canadians stand behind the Mother Country, conscious and proud that she has engaged in this war, not from any selfish motive, not for any purpose of aggrandizement, but to maintain untarnished the honour of her name, to fulfil her obligations to her Allies, to maintain her Treaty obligations, and to save civilization from the unbridled lust of conquest and domination.

I submit that these are noble words and noble sentiments that fell from the lips of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. But, I ask, what has happened in the last three years to change all this? What is there that makes the situation any different to-day? Has anything occurred in the past two or three years to make it less necessary that we should give our whole service to the Empire? Is there any reason why we should delay now, whereas the right hon. gentleman then said "at once" we should do this or that in support of the Motherland? He went on to say:

Long have we enjoyed the benefits of British citizenship; to-day it is our duty to accept its responsibilities and its sacrifices.

In my estimation, in these words we have a complete answer to the right hon gentleman's opposition to this Bill. There are responsibilities that he must take, that every member of this House and every citizen of Canada must take. We have heard from his lips and also from those of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) the constitutional question of whether this Parliament has the power or right to proceed with the Bill. This country is ruled or governed by a responsible Parliament elected by the people. It is true that our term expired last October, but it was, by a unanimous vote of this House, in which both of these hon. gentlemen concurred, extended, and what for? Not to carry on the ordinary business of the country, but to carry on the business of this war. That was the underlying principle of the extension of Parliament, that the business of the war might be carried on. Will the right hon gentleman or my hon. friend from Edmonton say that this Bill is not calculated to advance the cause of the war? Will they say that it is not necessary? Will they say that we can delay for two or three months in securing reinforcements for the front? It is perfectly useless for them to say that we did not do our best in the past. The past is gone, we are dealing with the present and with the immediate future, our duty rests there and does not rest in the past, and no amount of criticism of the past will bring about the needed assistance at this time. There are certain arguments which have been advanced by those who are opposed to this measure, and I think they are pretty well summed up in a resolution passed in Montreal the other day. I will deal very briefly with a few of these utterances. In this resolution they say:

Prepared as we are to defend the territory of Canada against all foreign attacks, we are equally determined to defend the autonomy of Canada and the liberties of its citizens against every agression from within.

In other words, this is what is said: We are quite prepared to defend Canada from attack, but we are not prepared to do anything in the defending. In other words, supposing there was a band of outlaws loose in a neighbourhood, some of the people might congregate together for the common defence of the community; others would say: We will not take any part in the defence against these outlaws until they attack our premises, nor until they come to our farms, our stores or our houses, then we may take measure of defence, but so long as they do not attack us on our own soil we will make no defence.

It seems to me that is a parallel case. Here we are a nation among nations, a people among peoples, a democracy among democracies, and when the soul of democracy is attacked by the most villainous and brutal power the world ever developed, one of the greatest portions of that democracy, or nation among nations of democracies stands back and says, "No, we will go no further" until when, forsooth? "Until our own shores are attacked." That was the argument of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and it is the argument set forth in this resolution from Montreal, in the province of Quebec. I contend that such an argument is absolutely untenable.

It is claimed by those same people that conscription violates the constitution. I have already set that at rest. Conscription does not violate the constitution, because one of the first Acts passed by this Confederated Dominion contains a clause for compulsory service within or without Canada, and I think that argument should be abandoned by those who are opposing this Bill, because it absolutely fails from end to end. They say it violates the constitution, and what do they suggest? The hon. gentleman from Edmonton suggests a refer-

endum. Where will he find, in the whole constitution, authority for a referendum on a question of this kind? It is not there. Of course, we can create a system of referendum, and I have no particular objection to it, but we are living under a system of responsible Government by a representative Parliament, elected by the people. That responsibility is resting on us now, and this is not the time to discuss whether we are going to change our system, introduce referendums, and amend our constitution. This is not the time to squabble about new policies. It is the time to take advantage, as I have already suggested, of the powers we have and to put them into execution. This resolution goes on:

> We believe that all new efforts on the part of the nation should be directed to the sole object of re-organizing the economic forces of the country, and of supplying the allied nations, whose cause Canada has joined, England especially, with the foodstuffs which they so insistently ask for.

That is their idea of their full duty. In other words, it is suggested that Canada should devote all her attention to selling foodstuffs to the allied nations, to take the homely illustration I cited a moment ago, "We will not go out with the posse, but we will feed the posse at reasonable terms, we will not proceed to fight the Huns or stand in the way of their invasion and aggression, but we will gladly feed those who do the fighting — at profitable rates". That is the argument, without any question. Another objection or suggestion was made by Edouard Monpetit, a professor in Laval University, who said that "Canada had done more than her share in the war, and that her moral obligation had been fulfilled." Reference is also made to the question of devoting our attention to supplying foodstuffs. There is no question that it is important, but if Canada emerges from this war with her honour intact and unsullied, but bankrupt, I contend she will be infinitely better off and richer in her national life than if she came out with hundreds of millions of dollars, reaped from the war, but failed, at this time, to do her part in sustaining the Empire.

I will refer, briefly, to another phase of the argument advanced by labour advocates and draw attention to a few of their statements. I shall quote the official organ of the labour party in my own city. I have no objection to any responsible citizen advancing views adverse to my own, or to those which are held by the party to which I belong. It is perfectly right that they should do so, but I reserve the right to debate those views, and, if possible, to answer them. I wish to show that those among the trades unions of Canada who are opposing conscription are really not consistent in the action they are taking. At the outbreak of the war, the Dominion Trades and Labour Council inserted a clause in their report stating that organized labour was behind the Allies until they had gained a final and decisive victory. They admit the war is in the interests of democracy, and that the principles at stake are democratic. I will read an editorial in the British Columbia Federation, the official organ of the Labour Party of Canada, written June 1, 1917, and, while in this article is an argument against conscription, nevertheless I want to quote it, to show that they realize that this is a democratic war, in the interests of the best principles of democracy. The writer of the article says:

> The old idea that the war was a natural consequence of trade, and that the present one had its origin solely in conflicting trade rivalries, has long since become so thoroughly shot to pieces, that it is no longer entertained except by the most shallow and superficial thinkers. It is now very widely acknowledged that the terrible spectacle now being staged by a veritable world at war, is but the inevitable and deadly struggle between the despotism and autocracy of the older slavery (chattel and feudal) and the democratic tendency and spirit of the latter (the capitalist form). It is a struggle to the death between the political concept of the former, which was of necessity despotic and stationary, and the political concept of the latter, which is democratic and progressive.

In other words, this editorial writer properly contends that this war is one between autocracy represented by the German States, and democracy, represented by the Allies. Admitting that, they argue that conscription is an attempt to resurrect despotism. The whole case of labour organizations against conscription rests upon the one point, whether or not the measure of conscription before the country to-day is a despotic measure, reactionary and liable to introduce the old autocratic system. If that system can be proven, then it is wrong. If on the other hand, it can be demonstrated that it is rather a measure to support the cause of democracy, then I say the last excuse of the labour representatives is removed. Democracy gives privileges to all classes of the people. The democracy of France, of the United States, and of the British Empire, gives to the people of these countries the highest type of personal and national freedom that any country or any people ever enjoyed. None can gainsay that statement. If that be the

case, there goes with it the corresponding duty of defending those rights and privileges, and the democracy that gave them to us. The very basis of democracy is compulsory service.

If you accept the idealistic view of the socialist who is opposing conscription, you accept the view that every man should be placed by the State in the sphere in which he is to move from time to time. The extreme view of the democratic socialist is that the State must control the activities of every man in the State; that is the underlying and fundamental principle of their belief. Yet these very men deny that principle when it is applied to the defence of the democracy which they claim to uphold. The situation is clear and unanswerable: If you accept the principles of democracy as advanced by the extreme democratic socialist, you accept the principle of compulsory service in various walks of life. To adopt compulsory military service, therefore, is actually to carry out the principle for which they so strongly stand.

It is argued that the people were not consulted. I ask the member for Edmonton and others who advance that argument: Was Belgium consulted when Germany invaded her territory? Was Serbia consulted? Were the people on the Lusitania consulted? Was Edith Cavell consulted? Was Captain Fryatt consulted? Were the members of families in Belgium consulted—not three years ago, but only last year—when they were separated and taken away to the worst kind of slavery in Germany? Were the common laws of humanity consulted on these occasions? It is contended that we should stand back and submit this proposal to an academic discussion throughout Canada, spend three or four months in deciding whether or not we should go ahead with it, while Germany with all her brutal force is—doing what? Consulting the convenience and comfort of the people with whom she is dealing? No; ruthlessly defying every law of humanity. The member for Edmonton and his leader suggest that these are times when we should engage in academic discussions; when we should quibble over principles; when we should debate whether such action is constitutional or unconstitutional; when we can afford to incur delay. The solemn duty rests upon those of us who are in Canada to do our part just as nobly, in our own limited way, as the boys at the front are, day after day and month after month, performing their duty. All this discussion, all this quibbling, all this political side-stepping, is wholly out of place; I am tempted to characterize it as almost a disgrace to this Parliament.

We have heard a great deal about conscripting wealth. But those who advocate the conscription of wealth are unable to define what they mean by the conscripting of wealth. "The conscripting of wealth" is one of the most convenient political phrases that I have ever heard. It is almost a twin sister to the term "free food." It has no meaning; it has never been defined; no one seems to be willing to take responsibility for it. What has the Finance Minister been doing during the last two years but conscripting wealth? Hon. gentlemen who now say that we should conscript wealth, not more than three or four weeks ago told the Finance Minister that he would ruin the industries of Canada, if he took too much of their profits. As a matter of fact, what is being done towards the conscripting of wealth? Hon. gentlemen are familiar with what is being done; it is only necessary to reiterate what has already been said. Twenty-five per cent of excess profits of 7 to 15 per cent is taken by the Government. Of excess profits of 15 to 20 per cent, the Government takes 50 per cent, and of excess profits 20 to 100 per cent, the Government takes 75 per cent. Surely that is a fair step towards the conscription of wealth.

It may be said, with a certain degree of force, that we should have an income tax. The Minister of Finance told us that it would be necessary to bring down further taxation later, and that it was not wise to launch every type of taxation at once. The taxation which he has launched and which takes a portion of excess profits during war time is the fairest type of taxation ever brought down in this House—and it is sufficient for the time being. Next year—if necessary, perhaps this year— the Minister of Finance can bring forward further methods of taxation.

The argument of our friends in Quebec that Canada has done enough may be answered in this way. I wonder if those hon. gentlemen opposite who have declared very loudly that they are going to vote against this Bill—one or two of them have already stated on the floor of the House that we have done too much for the Motherland in this war—ever think of the gentleman who ought to be sitting alongside the member for Edmonton, our colleague, Dr. Béland? Do they remember that the doctor had been in France when war broke out, and that he cheerfully gave his services to the French and Belgian Governments

in order that he might aid the wounded and the dying? Do they remember that he and his wife were imprisoned, and that when his wife died the brutal Huns refused to give him an opportunity of seeing her on her death-bed? Not long ago a despatch stated that our colleague, after two or three years' imprisonment, lies at the point of death, and that he is not likely to survive much longer. If hon. gentlemen from Quebec who declare that they will oppose this Bill have forgotten the other atrocities and outrages that I have mentioned, have they forgotten their colleague, Dr. Béland? If they have, we have not.

Without any question, this is a war to defend the most cherished principles of democracy. If we fail in this struggle because of lack of attention to the duties that now present themselves, then, Sir, that democracy fails. To hear the arguments of some of the gentlemen who have spoken throughout the country—not on the floor of the House, I admit—one would almost think that it would be better to live under the Hun than to adopt compulsory service in Canada in defence of democracy. That was really the substance of his argument. It is inconceivable to me how anyone can consider such a thing for a moment. If we do not measure up at this time to the proper height, then democracy receives its death blow. There is only one course before us in my opinion, and that is to accept the Bill. If the Bill has weaknesses, let us point them out, as the Prime Minister says. In Committee of the Whole—we are here discussing the principle—I shall cheerfully join with other members in a careful consideration of each clause. If we can strengthen the Bill let us do it; if we can make it more rigid, let us do so. If we can define any points more clearly, let us do that also. No one knows better than the hon. member for Edmonton that it is absolutely impossible to get what he calls an equitable Bill. He says if this Bill was equitable and fair he would accept it. He knows very well that there is no law on the statute book that is absolutely impartial. We can only get as near to that ideal as the intelligence of this House will permit, and it behooves the hon. gentlemen and every other member of this House to make this Bill the best of its kind that can be produced.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal this evening about the Hun at the gate. My hon. friend who has just preceded me (Mr. Stevens) represents Vancouver, one of the gates of Canada. My constituency lies near the other gate, and the Eastern gate is nearer the Hun than the Western gate. Speaking on behalf of my people, I can assure you, Sir, that we near the Eastern gate of Canada do not fear the Hun.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Why?

Mr. MARCIL: Because we can meet him as we have met him before. I come from a province where something was done for the British flag, before British Columbia and other provinces in the west were in existence. There might have been no British flag in America at the present time but for Quebec; that question was settled over a century ago and there is official evidence testifying to it. I represent a constituency which is largely French-speaking, although it has a large proportion of English-speaking settlers too, descendants of the United Empire Loyalists, and I know I am speaking for them in the remarks I shall make tonight. I am, according to Parliamentary doctrine, as much a representative of Vancouver as a representative of Bonaventure. Once a member is elected to this house he represents the whole of Canada, and it is as a member representing the whole of Canada that I intend to speak this evening and not on behalf of one locality or one province.

I was born in the province of Quebec. My ancestors came here nearly three centuries ago, and I hope to die and be buried on Canadian soil. I belong to this country and am faithful and loyal to it, and since the outbreak of war I have done everything it was possible for me to do in company with ministers of the Crown and others to stimulate recruiting and bring about the effort which I think Canada should make in the great contest before us. A great deal of interest is being taken at the present time in the situation in the province of Quebec. The leader of the Opposition, in his magnificent speech this afternoon, pointed out some reasons why recruiting had not been very active in that province. Many other reasons could have been given, but the chief reason is that recruiting in the province of Quebec was badly handled from the start. Even now it is not too late to adopt proper methods. If this measure were withdrawn and recruiting was carried on in the province of Quebec as it should be, by General Lessard, Colonel Blondin and other compatriots of the people of the province, I am sure we should get satisfactory results. Suppose, for a moment, that French-Canadians had been sent into Alberta, or Ontario, or British Columbia, and had asked the English-speaking people

there to listen to French recruiting addresses, and to join French battalions, and practise French military manœuvres, what results do you think, Sir, would have been obtained in those English-speaking provinces? Men are men, and blood is thicker than water. The recruiting has not been properly handled in the province of Quebec. When Colonel Blondin undertook to raise a battalion he adopted the proper method. He was accompanied by General Lessard, who is one of the best men we have in Canada and should have been employed from the very start, but why he was not, we do not know. They went into those parts of the province where they were likely to get recruits, and the results they obtained were very satisfactory. Col. Blondin declared that he stopped recruiting because of the introduction of conscription, not because recruiting was a failure in the province of Quebec.

I was sent to this House to help administer the affairs of this country as best I could. I have sat now for 18 years in Parliament; I have seen 179 members come and go, and a score of Cabinet ministers; I have seen a half dozen men occupy the Speaker's chair; I have voted for all kinds of measures, for the buildings of railways, and for the opening up of Canada in every part. I have taken as deep an interest in the province of New Brunswick as in the province of Quebec, as deep an interest in Ontario as in the Maritime and Western Provinces. After 18 years faithful service I claim to stand before you to-night, Sir, as a Canadian who has done his duty well not only by his own people but by the people at large. I consider it my duty now to say that I have no mandate, and have not been authorized to vote in favour of this Military Service Bill which has been introduced by the Government. I want the Allies to win this war. Everybody in the province of Quebec and everybody in Canada wants the Allies to win. There is not a man, woman, or child in this country that does not want us to win the war. Our Red Cross associations, Patriotic, and Belgian Relief Funds are doing everything possible for the soldiers, and to all these our people are contributing with results that have done Canada so much honour. Canada has sent forward a volunteer army of nearly 400,000 men. In the early days of August, 1914, the Government began in fear and trembling by offering a division of 30,000. Was that the extent to which they wanted Canada to participate in this war? They were not prophets, but they felt that Canada could well send 30,000 men at that time. When Parliament met in the old building in August, 1914, members from the province of Quebec and every other province unanimously assented to all the measures brought down and cheerfully voted for every dollar that was asked for by the Government to win the war. We went into it as a band of brothers because we wanted Canada to figure prominently in this war for the great principles of humanity and freedom which we all have at heart. Why was this done? What did the leaders say? What did we all say in our recruiting speeches? What did the Minister of Finance say when he appeared with me in the Russell theatre in the city of Ottawa? He said that Canada's participation in the war was entirely voluntary, and every man had to settle with his own conscience the question of enlistment. That was the appeal that was made throughout the country; we appealed to the hearts of the people, and that was why we met with such success. Now the Government brings down a measure of conscription in a moribund and defunct parliament, in which 20 or more seats are vacant and several members away. We have overrun our term by several months.

If this Government wish to serve the Allies, if they wish to make more effective the participation of Canada in the war, if they are sincere in favouring participation, there is only one course for them to take, and that is to appeal to the people, to trust the people.

This Bill was announced when recruiting was going on at the rate of about six or seven thousand a month, and this notwithstanding that the Minister of the Interior found so great scarcity of labour for our prairie farms that he felt it necessary to send to the United States to bring help. Surely, this rate of recruiting was satisfactory. But it will all be wiped off if you have this conscription measure.

We are told that there is opposition to this measure in the province of Quebec. So there is. But in many other provinces also there is opposition to it. That opposition exists chiefly because this measure is introduced as a change of the rules after the game has begun. We went into this war voluntarily. The Prime Minister has just returned from the Imperial War Conference, and he has told us that nothing new in respect of the autonomy of the Overseas Dominions was touched upon or decided, because it was understood that that autonomy was to be preserved. If

ever there was a question coming before the House on which the autonomy of the people must be preserved, it is a question in which the liberty of the subject is affected. If you want Canadians throughout Canada to participate actively in this war, do not attempt coercion, but appeal to the big heart of the nation, appeal to their patriotism and their better spirit; do not come down with the big stick and have half the population chasing the other half.

How is this measure going to be enforced? Are you going to jail two or three hundred thousand people? These people consent to the active participation of Canada in the war, but they are not going to be drummed into it. Gladstone, when he had to deal with Ireland, always said that coercion was of no use. Why is Ireland being left aside in the conscription measure in Britain? Because Lloyd George declared that he would not lose time in trying to enforce conscription in Ireland until Ireland was free to accept it voluntarily. Let the Irish question be settled, and Ireland will accept conscription and will do what she has always done, and Scotland too—and England as well, but never more than Ireland or Scotland—she will send forth to uphold the Empire's cause the best soldiers that Britain has had to support that cause throughout the world.

We want this matter dealt with fairly. We want to take the people into our confidence. We want dissolution of this Parliament, that we may go back to the men who sent us here, the men who are to pay the money and who ultimately will have to shed their blood. We want England to be victorious in this war, and we want Canada to participate, but in order that Canada may participate most effectively, we must go back to the people and go back immediately; we must appeal to their best feeling, but not try coercion, because coercion will not bring results.

Those who favour this coercion measure say they do not want to go to the country. And why? Because, they say, if it were submitted to the people it would be rejected. If rejected, it would be because the people do not like to be tyrannized over, and this is nothing more or less than an act of tyranny. What the Prime Minister should have done—and he ought to know it better than I or any other member of this House, because he has inside information—was to seek a renewal of his mandate to strengthen his arm, that he might carry on this war more effectively.

What would be the result now if this coercion measure is persisted in? You will apply it, but how many recruits will you secure by it? Do you think you can impose a measure of this kind upon an unwilling people who will not submit to it? We have evidence already that in some large cities in Canada there is no intention of submitting to coercion unless voted by the people in a constitutional manner.

I want Canada to continue her noble effort in this war. I think Canada has done splendidly ever since the war commenced. I think we have given evidences of our good-will in this matter of which we may well be proud, not only sending 400,000 men across the sea—no small contribution for a country of 7,000,000 of people—but assuming financial burdens so enormous that our children's children will hardly be able to pay them off. These things are greatly to the credit of the Canadian people. But why should not we remain united? Why should not Canadians from all provinces continue the effort so well begun? Why resort to coercive measures? Why not say to the people: our mandate has expired; we come back to you, and if you have confidence in the Administration we will go back and continue Canada's participation in the war according to the means that our country can command.

The right hon. the Prime Minister said that as a New Year's gift he would authorize the raising of recruits to the number of 500,000 men. Hardly had the words fallen from his lips when one of the ablest men of Canada, Lord Shaughnessy, said that 500,000 men could not be sent to the other side without seriously crippling our industries all over Canada. And those industries have been greatly affected as it is. We are told that we must maintain four divisions at the front The laws of the Medes and Persians alone could not be changed. Why must we maintain four divisions? Why not three, or five? I am not a military expert, and I question whether there are men in this House who are sufficiently qualified as military experts to say what is the particular value of four, or three, or five divisions. Canada must continue to do what she can to help Britain and win the war. But we have been told over and over again that production in this country is necessary, that it cannot be dispensed with, that the man on the farm is as valuable in his way as the man in the trenches. Why not, before resorting to coercive methods, have a really competent tribunal, composed of men big enough to impress their views upon the country, tell us that Canada can raise so many men for military purposes, but must

retain so many men for production, and munition work? Are we to be told, on the mere say-so of the leader of one political party, that such and such a thing is to be done, and the whole country must submit?

The province of Quebec has objected to this Bill and will object to it because it has no faith in the present Government. For one thing half of the membership of the House from the province of Quebec has been elected to oppose the present Government and the other half from that province was elected in 1911 after the gospel had been preached that the citizens of Canada had no duty to fulfil to Britain outside of Canada in defence of her own territory. The result of that nefarious campaign in the province of Quebec was the bringing into power of the present Administration. The present Administration would never have occupied the treasury benches but for the men who were elected in Quebec under the resolutions adopted at the meeting at St. Eustache, and framed by Mr. Henri Bourassa and the late Mr. Monk. That was the platform upon which the colleagues, or allies, of the present Administration were elected in Quebec. We of the Liberal party, who stood loyally by the participation of Canada in British wars, who stood loyally in favour of the creation of a Canadian navy, because we thought it our duty to do what we could for the defence of the Empire of which we are part and parcel, were condemned on every hustings in Quebec although Quebec stood loyally by us to the extent of half of its membership in the House. To-day the views we preached are recognized by all parties in this province.

This afternoon I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). The minister went back to what happened in this House in the last three years and put to us the question: What we were going to do about it. Were we going to stop our efforts? Were we going to tell the men in the trenches that we were not going to send them any more assistance? My view of it is this: If you attempt coercion you will send less men to the trenches than if you appeal to the proper spirit of the people. Let us go now before the country. I am sure that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will consent to the adoption of the remaining Supply and we can have the verdict of the people in the next two months. If that verdict is in favour of coercive measures everybody will submit to it. But if the verdict is in favour of carrying on the war as we have carried it on up to the present time, by appealing to the better sense, the better sentiment, of the Canadian people generally, we shall have the policy instituted and we will see that it is carried through.

I shall not, at this late hour, undertake to answer many of the points which were brought out because the House is pretty well informed upon all these things now. We have heard a great many allusions made to the province of Quebec and I do not want to say anything more particularly about that province. But, I will say that the people there are quite capable of coming to a decision and doing their duty properly. I am prepared to go back to my constituency, composed as it is of English and French-speaking Canadians, to meet the strongest representatives of the present Government that can be sent in joint debate before a French and English speaking audience, not only in my constituency but in any part of Quebec, and I am prepared to submit to the verdict of the people loyally no matter what that verdict is because in British governed countries when the people have spoken we must submit to their verdict. If the people of Canada think that coercive measures, that Germanized and Prussianized methods should prevail in Canada, and that they can do more for the allies than the methods of conciliation and union that we are preaching to-day, we shall submit to the verdict. But, I am satisfied that the people shall want first of all that Canada shall give the Allies a great example. What would be said to-morrow throughout the world if one-half of this country should chasten the other half and, by coercion bring about a contribution to the war when Great Britain is participating in this war on account of liberty and freedom?

We want to continue to do our full duty but we want to do it generously, we want to do it freely, we want to do it of our own free will, we want the man from Ontario to feel that his fellow Canadian citizen in the province of Quebec is prepared to defend his country, we want the people in the West to realize that if the Hun ever came to Canada it would be up the Saint-Lawrence river and that the citizens of Quebec would be the first to meet him. The citizens of Quebec have been called upon to meet the invader before. They met the invader in 1776, they repelled him from before the fortress of Quebec and forever after the British flag was kept flying over the citadel. They met the

invader on the banks of the Chateauguay in 1812 and on that occasion de Salaberry and his 300 men were able to turn 7,000 Americans back to their own lines. In the present war the handful of French Canadians, 14,000 or 15,000 in number, who have enlisted in Quebec have shown at Langemarck, at Saint-Julien, at Ypres, and at Courcelette, that they are worthy descendants of the pioneers of Quebec. We want to do our share and that is why we do not want to be tabooed, we do not want to be ostracized, because after all the French race are the oldest Canadian settlers. This is our native soil and this is the flag that we accepted freely when the other was returned to the country from which it came. We of the province of Quebec are the oldest inhabitants of this territory. Quebec remains as it was at the time of Confederation, the keystone of the arch. Without the free consent of the province of Quebec there would not have been any Confederation and the Prime Minister in quoting the words of the Militia Act repeated several times the name of Sir George Etienne Cartier. You will find such names as George Etienne Cartier and Louis Hippolyte La Fontaine at every step in the constitutional history of Canada. The corner stone of free, constitutional government in Canada was laid by the broad manhood of the British stock of Ontario and the Frenchmen of the province of Quebec who accepted the new duties imposed upon them as subjects of the King were loyal to the country.

But three or four days ago the Governor General of Canada accepted an address in the city of Quebec from the Mayor and the Premier of the province and was given assurance that the province of Quebec remained still the old Loyalist province of the Dominion. Is it because you fall short of a few thousand men that you are going to ostracize these people? Is it because after 150 years of faithful service to the British flag you are going to tear asunder the bond of friendship that exist between the French and English in this country? I do not think that after mature deliberation it will be found to be the intention of the present Government to do so. We have the evidence of the Prime Minister who was willing, if the leader of the Opposition entered a coalition, to pass the measure and then submit it to the people. That was the intention of the Government. Why not do it now? If you have a majority and you pass the measure, it will be a slim majority. Suppose you have 25, 15 or 10 of a majority, is that a mandate to impose such a coercive measure as this which will deprive any citizen of Canada of his personal liberty? Do you consider that you have a mandate in the seventh session of the twelfth Parliament when the constitution of the country says that five years shall be the term of Parliament, when you have 20 seats or more vacant, when the western provinces are not represented as they should be and when we have been elected on a franchise framed on the census of 1901 which is 16 years old? We have here twenty seats that are not represented. I receive letters daily from Restigouche, in New Brunswick, which adjoins my own riding; people write me saying: Our member has been dead for four years, we are not represented at Ottawa, will you kindly attend to this and to that? I do so cheerfully. Is that the kind of Parliament that should undertake to impose such a measure as this upon the people? I say no, Mr. Speaker. The Premier of Canada comes from a province where British principles are better understood than this. He comes from the old province of Nova Scotia, which was the first North American province to adopt responsible government. He understands what the British principle is, that to give force and strength to a measure you must have public approval, and you must have the consent of the people, the consent of the governed. I say this, and these are my last words, we in this Chamber, no matter what our origin is, no matter what language we speak, whether we speak one or two or three languages, we are all citizens of Canada, we are all British subjects, we are friends, devotees of the Allies, admirers of the great principles for which they are contending; and I would be unworthy of my origin, and every member of this House would be unworthy of his, if he fell back at the present moment. But when there is such a serious difference of opinion on this point, I think that there is ample justification for sending this measure to the people. We should have another general election, we should explain to the people the position as it is now, we should make them understand exactly what has been done and what remains to be done, and I have faith in the verdict of the people; I have faith that there is still enough patriotism left, not only in my own province but in every province of Canada, to send back to this House a body of men who will be deter-

mined to uphold our institutions, because we know that the defeat of Britain and her Allies in this war would mean the wiping out of our free institutions in North America. We differ only as to method. I appeal to the majority of this House, I appeal to the majority who come from Ontario and from the western provinces as well, to delay this measure, not to go too fast with it, because they may do more harm than good. I am not in favour of the slacker, I am not in favour of protecting the man who should do his duty, but I want a mandate to do that; I want to go back to my people, and when I get that mandate I will come back and I will legislate in this House any measure that is called for by the circumstances. But at the present time I have no such mandate, and for those reasons I shall vote for the amendment offered by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and against the second reading of the Bill, regretting to do so, because I would have liked, for the name and for the honour of Canada, that we should have continued our participation in the war unanimously, both parties agreeing to all our war measures as in the past. But if necessity compels me to vote against the Bill I shall do so. I shall do so, not because I am opposed to conscription as an anti-democratic measure, but because I have no mandate from my people, and because I want to serve the cause of the Allies by clearing up the situation and coming back with a mandate before imposing such a measure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman appeals to the House for a dissolution and a general election, as he desires a mandate. He states that he is not opposed to conscription. In the event of such a dissolution, would he appeal for a mandate for conscription or against conscription?

Mr. MARCIL: I would go back to the people and explain the position exactly as I found it and knew it, and if the people favoured conscription I would come back here and support it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What would you yourself ask for?

Mr. MARCIL: If you would supply me with the information that the Prime Minister of this country has I could give you my answer, but until I get that information I am asked to vote in the dark, and, therefore, I cannot do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You do not know whether you are against it or for it?

Mr. MARCIL: I am not against conscription, per se, or because I think it an anti-democratic measure, but if it had any worth in it it should have been adopted in 1914, and the Liberal party should have been called in then to join hands with our friends so that we could have had a united effort. But we did not insist on that; we supported you just the same.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would not have been tyranny or coercion then?

On the motion of Mr. Morrison, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Edward Kemp, the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Tuesday, June 19, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual report of the Topographic Surveys Branch of the Department of the Interior, 1915-16.—Hon. Mr. Roche.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 91, to amend the St. John and Quebec Railway Act, 1916.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Hon. Mr. COCHRANE: This measure is to grant an extension of time to the company for the completion of the road.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FOOD CONTROLLER.

HON. W. J. HANNA APPOINTED FOOD CONTROLLER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg to lay upon the table of the House copies of Order in Council approved by His Excellency on the 16th instant, providing for the appointment of an officer to be known as Food Controller for Canada. I have further to inform the House that the Hon. W. J. Hanna, Toronto, has been asked to accept the position of Food Controller, and he states that he is free to do so upon the condition that no salary shall be attached to the office.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is something new.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: His Excellency, the Governor General, has been pleased to approve of Mr. Hanna's appointment.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING.

Consideration of the motion of the right hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, resumed from Monday, June 18.

Hon. Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, having occupied the position of Minister of Militia for a considerable time during the war, I am more or less familiar with matters concerning recruiting, how it is carried on, and why it fell off, and possibly I may be in a position to give some suggestions as to what in my opinion, at all events, would be the proper method to adopt for the future. I may point out that I gave notice on May 8, that I would move the following resolution.

On the first opportunity on going into Committee of Supply, I shall move:—That in the opinion of this House the best interests of Canada, of the Empire, and of humanity, will be served by the application of the Militia Act, or by other action, to raise troops for compulsory overseas service.

This was not intended as a "want of confidence" motion, although I wrote the Prime Minister on the 17th October last strongly recommending compulsory service. I spoke about it at meetings all over the country during October, and I have consistently advocated it ever since. If the Prime Minister has no objection, I shall read the letter which I sent him on the 17th October last.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no objection.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The letter reads as follow:

October 17, 1916.

Dear Sir Robert,—

Regarding Compulsory Service.

The following are my own personal views and I alone wish to be held responsible for them; that is, I do not wish to profess to express any one's views but my own; others, however, let me hope, may hold the same ideas.

As you are aware, I have always been in favour of universal training and service. If the Federal Government had control of the schools and educational institutions of the country generally, I would, as I have frequently stated, so far as I am personally concerned, favour compulsory training for the young lads and young men.

As I have, also, frequently pointed out, this training, even if war might never come, would

be a great benefit to them from the manhood viewpoint. They would be better physically, mentally and morally. A higher standard of manhood would be established for Peace, and in case War should ever come, the Nation would be ready to defend its loved ones and its honour.

Since the outbreak of the War, Canada has raised considerably more than four hundred thousand men for all military purposes. This is about one hundred thousand men for each million of British birth or descent. After deducting the number of enlisted soldiers of other than British birth or descent, this still shows a higher percentage of enlistment than has occurred in Great Britain, or, I believe, any other country. This has been under the voluntary system.

But the War has assumed gigantic proportions beyond what was anticipated. It is no longer a War of peoples or nations, it is a War of the sacred principles of human liberty against Prussian autocracy and tyranny. It is a question of men and munitions. At last the munition problem is being fairly well met. The men problem is not yet solved. Sir William Robertson, Chief of the General Staff; Mr. Lloyd George, Secretary of State for War; Mr. Bonar Law, Colonial Secretary; Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister, as well as His Majesty the King, have each and all pointed out that it is now a question of "men and still more men."

There are parts of Canada which have not yet been successfully reached by voluntary enlistment. Whether or not the influences against voluntary enlistment are backed up by Prussian gold, is a question as yet not fully determined.

There are, in Canada, of all British origins, vide the last census returns, less than 3,900,000; there are of French origin upwards of 2,000,000; German origin about 400,000; of Austro-Hungarian origin about 130,000, etc., etc.

Britain at the outset of the war, resorted to voluntary enlistment only; but after having exhausted every available means that could be used under the voluntary system, the Nation, in the end, has had to resort to Compulsory service. On every hand, able-bodied "slackers" were seen. Families would send one, two three, and sometimes more, sons to the Front, while the neighbours would remain at home, filling the positions vacated by those gallant boys.

The same principle has been carried out in Canada, only on a broader scale. There may be some excuses for those of German and Austro-Hungarian descent hesitating to enlist; there can be none for any other nationality. However, to their credit, a considerable number of gallant Canadians of these nationalities have enlisted and have done splendid service at the Front.

I have evidence in my possession, that there are distinct movements abroad, in parts of Canada, whereby persons are urged not to go to the Front; not to fight, but to let these of British descent go away and leave open their positions in order that those who remain as "slackers" should fill them.

Such condition is certainly unfair to the gallant fellows who have risked their lives in the service. In short, one might as well claim that the paying of taxes should be voluntary, as the defending the Empire, in such a crisis, should be voluntary.

Of course, proper exemption should be made for the maintenance of our great industrial, agricultural, commercial and other requirements at home; but this exemption can only be arrived at after complete inquiry and registration.

I, therefor, have the honour, in view of all the circumstances, to recommend that the gravity of the situation, the justice of the cause, the preservation of the Liberties of our Canadian people and the successful issue of the War require a system of compulsory service with careful observation of the above safeguards.

Will you kindly give this your best consideration and, should you agree with the principle involved, may I hope that effect will at an early date be given thereto.

Faithfully,

(Sgd) Sam Hughes.

The Right Honourable,
Sir Robert L. Borden, G.C.M.G.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Ottawa, Canada.

I received no answer to that proposition. It is also well known that prominent members of the Cabinet, up till a couple of weeks ago, declared that there would be no compulsory service. It is further asserted that shortly before the Prime Minister sailed for England, definite pledges were given to certain dignitaries against conscription. In the presence of the Prime Minister during last December, the Chairman of the National Service Commission several times declared that compulsory service was out of the question; that to introduce it would mean civil war. The Minister of Militia, Hon. Sir Edward Kemp, quite recently declared in the House that the question of compulsory service had never been considered by the Cabinet. I have always pursued the educative line, realizing that men who are not informed on the subject tend to cater to fads and fancies of the public mind. They forget that under responsible government ministers must have the courage of their convictions—as was pointed out by the Minister of Trade and Commerce yesterday, in theory—and be leaders of public opinion; that only under autocratic forms of Government should advisers of the Crown be influenced by agitations forced upon them, and that the duty of members of Parliament is to educate kindly. Therefore, have I pursued a moderate line.

Had my aim been personal advancement or influence, or my desire to injure or embarrass the Government, it would have been easy early in the session, when such a motion would not have been accepted, to force it on the House. But my ambition is solely to help the boys at the front to win the war; therefore I took no action until I felt that the Cabinet and the country were well educated up to the line. Again, therefore, knowing the trend of a government to await being encouraged to act, have I pursued the educative policy, my aim being the success of my plans.

The day after the Prime Minister's return to Canada, with this same end in view, I sent him a letter. As it is not personal, I assume that there is no objection on the part of the Prime Minister to my reading it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It was as follows:

May 16, 1917.

Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden,
Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir Robert:

I have waited until your return before taking action in relation to our efforts in the war, or rather our lack of effort in the war.

I have given notice of a motion on going into the Committee of Supply in favour of compulsory service. This is not intended to be a want of confidence motion, if you can give me any assurance that the Government will seriously take up the question itself, and that energetic and effective action along right lines will follow.

I shall be glad if you will arrange a date this week, or early next, when this matter might be discussed in Parliament.

Faithfully,
(Sgd.) Sam Hughes.

The Prime Minister responded in his speech on the following Friday, enunciating the principle of compulsory overseas service. I, therefore, heartily endorsed the proposition he then made, and have hoped that the details of the measure would be such as to receive general approval. I had one, and only one, aim in all this business: to win the war; let Canada and Canadians, each and all do our duty, our full duty; let us maintain our civilization; let us not weary in well-doing, but stand or fall by the boys in the trenches. To raise troops for compulsory overseas service was the watchword.

Let us put a few questions. First, has Canada the authority to put in force a measure of compulsory service? The right hon. leader of the Opposition says that Canada has not that authority, and on that point we must cross swords with him. Second, what does that mean? Third, what does it involve? Fourth, what are the advantages? Fifth, what are the disadvantages or objections? Sixth, can it be accomplished, and with what consequences? Seventh, should there be exemptions? If so, of what nature? Eighth, how soon can it be ac-

complished? Ninth, will such soldiers be suitable? Tenth, why is a compulsory service necessary? Why not continue the voluntary system?

Let me refer to the first question: has Canada the authority? Section 15 of the British North America Act says:

> The Commander in Chief of the Land and Naval Militia, and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

"The Queen" here means, of course, the Governor General in Council. Section 91 of the British North America Act says:

> It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Canada, in relation to all matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms of this section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say,—
> Sub-Sec. 7, Militia, Military and Naval Service and Defence.

That is all the British North America Act has bearing on the subject. The Militia Act goes further. The interpretation clause, section 2, says:

> (b) 'Emergency' means war, invasion, riot or insurrection, real or apprehended.
> (g) 'On active service,' as applied to a person subject to military service, means whenever he is enrolled, enlisted, drafted or warned for service or duty, during an emergency, or when he is on duty, or has been warned for duty in aid of the civil power.

Then section 4 deals with the command in chief.

Inasmuch, Mr. Speaker, as this legal aspect of the question was largely set forth in an address which I had the honour of delivering to the House in January, if it is permissible, I would like it to be taken as read.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps it would be better if the hon. gentleman proceeded in the usual way.

Sir SAM HUGHES: All right. Section 4 says:

> The command in chief of the militia is declared to continue and be vested in the King, and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty or by the Governor General as his representative.

"Governor-General" means, of course, the Governor-General in Council. Section 69, which deals with active service, provides:

> The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Section 72, which deals with command in time of war, is as follows:

> In time of war, when the militia is called out for active service conjointly with His Majesty's regular forces, His Majesty may place in command thereof a senior general officer of his regular army.

That has been the case at the front; we have had a senior general officer in command of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Section 74 of the Militia Act (Army Act and Regulations) is our charter for our service beyond the seas, just as the British North America Act covers the administration of Canada. Section 74 reads:

> The Army Act for the time being in force in the United Kingdom, the King's regulation, and all other laws applicable to His Majesty's troops in Canada and not inconsistent with this Act or the regulations made thereunder, shall have force and effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of Canada for the government of the militia.

I would like the right hon. leader of the Opposition to note this. Thus Canada has full authority at any time to enrol and train her militia. The Government, if they chose to do so, could, in time of peace or in time of war, call out 300,000 men and train them; they could do it to-morrow. Canada has authority to send them overseas, for the defence of Canada, in an emergency, and "war" is an emergency, according to the interpretation clause of the Act.

Canada has full authority to equip, officer, and manage her forces as she pleases while they are within her borders. Beyond her borders and within her own laws, Canadian authority for management and control is wanting, except by adopting the Army Act. Canada has no constitutional authority, as I interpret it—and, of course, I am giving my own interpretation—to administer or control our men once we send them beyond our border until we adopt, as the law provides, the Army Act and the clauses relating thereto. After we have adopted the section of the Army Act in this regard, that section is as much a part of our constitution and law as is the British North America Act, and this Government and Parliament have as much authority to carry on the management of the militia under that law as if it were part and parcel of the British North America Act. But the British military law, especially the Army Act, gives that authority to Canada. The

statesmen and war officers of Great Britain have foreseen such situations as now present themselves. Not only in cases where the colonial Governments raise the troops and pay the cost, but even where Britain enrols and pays colonials, the British Government has by law safeguarded, in every conceivable instance, the rights, privileges and liberties of the colonials. Therefore the Canadian forces are in no sense "British regulars." I come now to a consideration of the British military law, 1914. I refer first to the Army Act, section 190, subsection 23, page 557, which says:

The expression "colony" means any part of His Majesty's dominions exclusive of the British Islands and of British India, and includes Cyprus and any British protectorate, and where parts of such dominions are under both a central and a local legislature, all parts under the central legislature shall, for the purpose of this definition, be deemed to be one colony.

Chapter XI., page 194, military law, provides that the military forces of the Crown shall consist of three classes, British, Indian and Colonial. Colonial forces are defined by section 3 as follows:

The colonial forces are of two classes, namely, the forces raised by the government of a colony, and the forces raised in a colony by direct order of His Majesty to serve as auxiliary to, and in fact to form part for the time being of, the regular forces.

I should like the leader of the Opposition to take note of this, because later on I intend to point out a flaw in his argument. There are two classes of colonial forces. I have no record of the Canadian Government having sent a despatch to the British authorities asking that sections 175 and 176 of the Army Act be made applicable to Canada, but I presume they did so. There was no necessity, however, for doing that unless we desired to let the British authorities enrol troops in Canada and pay them. The Governor General in Council might pass a thousand Orders in Council in regard to those sections, but they would not be worth the paper they were written on, because sections 175 and 176 refer to other classes of colonial troops raised by the British Government with the consent of the colony and paid for by the British Government. They do not apply in any sense to the Canadian Expeditionary Force. I did not know that that action was taken until the leader of the Opposition so stated the other day, but that is why I have claimed from the outset that those troops were under the control of the Minister of Militia, that is, under the control of Canada, and should be controlled by Canada, because sections 175 and 176 deal with the class of colonial troops that are not referred to here. If the British authorities were to enlist men in Canada for aeroplane service or anything of that sort and pay them and control them, then they would come under sections 175 and 176, but not otherwise. Section 177 is the section which applies to us, and I will refer to it a little later on. Chapter 11 of the military law goes on to state:

The first class of colonial forces—those raised by the government of a colony—are only subject to the Army Act when so provided by the law of the colony and when serving with part of His Majesty's regular forces, and then only so far as the colonial law has not provided for their government and dicipline, and subject to the exceptions specified in the general orders of the general officer commanding the forces with which they are serving. The Army Act, however, section 177, provides that the colonial law may extend to the forces, although beyond the limits of the colony where they are raised.

The second class of colonial forces—of which the West India regiment, the Royal Malta Artillery, the West African Regiment, the non-Europeans of the Fortress Companies, Royal Engineers, at Hong Kong and Sierra Leone, and the Hong Kong Singapore Battalion, Royal Garrison Artillery, are examples—is referred to by sections 175, subsection 4, and 176, subsection 3, of the Army Act. Their pay and maintenance are voted annually by the Imperial Parliament, and they are in fact Imperial forces, although serving in a colony.

Section 177 is one which gives to Canada supreme control of her troops, not in Canada, as we have it here under the British North America Act, but in England and at the front. The Army Act, section 177, page 539, provides:

Where any force of volunteers, or of militia, or any other force, is raised in India or in a colony, any law of India or the colony may extend to the officers, non-commissioned officers and men belonging to such force, whether within or without the limits of India or the colony; and any such law may apply, in relation to such force and to any officers, non-commissioned officers and men thereof, all or any of the provisions of this Act, subject to such adaptations, modifications and exceptions as may be specified in such law, and where so applied this Act shall have effect in relation to such force, subject to such adaptations, modifications and exceptions as aforesaid; and where any such force is serving with part of His Majesty's regular forces, then so far as the law of India or the colony has not provided for the government and dicipline of such force, this Act and any other Act for the time being amending the same shall, subject to such exceptions and modifications as may be specified in the general orders of the general officer commanding His Majesty's forces with which such force is serving, apply to the officers, non-commissioned officers and men of such force, in like manner.

This section shall not apply to any officer belonging to any such force when attached to or doing duty with, or to any non-commissioned officer or man belonging to any such force when attached to or otherwise acting as part

of or with, any portion of the regular, reserve, or auxiliary forces in the United Kingdom.

That sub-section means this: Prior to 1914, we were in the habit of letting some of our forces go overseas for the purpose of taking part in tournaments, the Queen's Jubilee, etc. The leader of the Opposition will remember instances of that. Although our troops wore the British uniform, they were not under British military law, and they were not under the law of Canada, because until we adopted section 177, we had no control over them beyond the three-mile limit. The section was enacted so as to meet this difficulty, so that while those soldiers were in England, while no Canadian law would cover their case, they would be attached to the British command and would be subject to that command for the time being.

I hesitate to differ from the leader of the Opposition, but I respectfully take the ground that it is admitted that Canada has the right to call out the whole militia, or any part thereof, to-morrow, whether in times of peace or war, for training purposes. It is admitted that Canada has the right to train, officer and arm these troops for the defence of this country, whether within or without Canada; and if we send these troops one inch beyond the three-mile limit of Canada we might just as well send them 3,000 miles away to the German frontier, because Canada's defence is not restricted to one inch, or one mile, or one thousand miles distance from her coasts, but is wherever Canada is threatened. I take the ground that we have the authority to do all these things within Canada, and in view of section 177 of the British Army Act, we have legal authority to control these men ourselves beyond the three-mile limit of Canada.

Secondly: What does compulsory service mean? It does not prevent the citizen who prefers to be recorded as a volunteer from enlisting as such. If he does not volunteer the Government should select men on a basis fair to all. These men must be trained and some of them sent overseas, but Canada must control and pay them there as well as here.

Thirdly, it involves the responsibility to the Canadian people for every man and every dollar. We have the responsibility now, but responsibility without the power to control constitutes an intolerable condition. Canada has already lost much in this regard. Compulsory service gives us this power.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

The advantages of compulsory service are:

(a) Under the volunteer plan the basis is enthusiasm, love of liberty, intense patriotism, the setting aside all else for the cause—home, loved ones, position, wealth, aye, even life itself—and all for his personal love of a principle. The volunteer offers all, risks all, sacrifices all.

(b) Under compulsory service the State adjusts inequalities, and instead, for example, of taking all the boys in a family, leaving the neighbour's boys all at home, as frequently occurs under the voluntary system, the duty of service is fairly and evenly distributed. Tens of thousands of good Canadian fellows, willing to serve, are still in mufti because they do not think it fair for them to go and leave at home neighbours just as eligible, secure in comfort and drawing high pay in various industrial pursuits. After the war the one might be penniless, without a position, possibly shot to pieces and unfit to earn a livelihood, while the other would live in comparative luxury and health, enjoying the liberties so dearly earned by the former.

(c) Every citizen owes duty to the State; he must pay taxes, must be personally responsible for a share in the administration of justice, etc. So also, in every land, each is liable for service for the defence of homes and loved ones and against a common enemy to mankind.

(d) Compulsory service does not imply a vast standing army, as I regret to say a few labour leaders are endeavouring to make it appear, and I was going to add, a few labour leaders bearing all the earmarks of being in the pay of German agents in the United States. My system implies training from ten to sixteen years of age in schools; then occasional brushing up in after years. But Canada in this emergency has not the preliminary training done; so other conditions must be applied.

(e) Conscription as in Germany takes from his home and business in the best two or three years of his life, in peace times, every male citizen. The man becomes lost in the machine; under the brutal German system he becomes mentally and morally debased.

Under my proposal for compulsory overseas service, the men would be called out, and after preliminary training would cross the ocean. The drawbacks attending the German system would be avoided. No autocratic class would be created; each soldier would have before him, by merit and fitness, the possibility of rising to senior position. The training would benefit each for

peace after the war; and above all, Canada would do her duty to the gallant fellows in the trenches. I venture the assertion that after a few weeks' training, the proudest men in Canada would be these lads, and they would all regret not having joined three years ago. When the war is over each will return to his duty as citizen, proud to have helped to overthrow the greatest autocracy that ever blighted humanity

(f) There are only two free governments upwards of a century old, namely, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the United States. Why? Rulers become autocratic, selfish, corrupt, sycophantic, mere creatures of corporations and of so-called democratic organizations —because the greatest tyrant and autocrat is the so-called democrat, irresponsible to the whole people. It has been asserted that people's representatives in national assemblies too often become mere pawns on the checker-board. Even in Canada men are found who suggest—nay, who go farther and assert that two great corporations—one railway, and the other a financial group—control this Government and the business and administrative ends thereof. I am not endorsing this assertion, but merely giving vent to the rumour.

Mr. GRAHAM: Simply putting it on Hansard.

Sir SAM HUGHES: For ordinary wars the voluntary system would usually more than suffice. This war, however, staggers humanity. It is beyond all former comprehension; it is the bitter, tenacious, desperate struggle of dark-age autocracy against free democracy. For thirty years the autocratic German machine has been planning, getting ready, while the free democracies of France, of Britain, of Italy, and now of Russia and the United States, have been living in a fool's paradise, unprepared. Free democracies, properly trained and directed, will ever defeat autocracies. A good illustration of that is found in the old athletic days, when the amateur team always proved superior to the professional whether at lacrosse or football. The same is true in every land and under any circumstances, but the men must be trained. It is difficult, however, even in tree Canada to instil the idea that discipline is not repression; is not the breaking down of one's will; is not the restrictive limiting principles, but is the upbuilding, the educative, the strengthening, the controlling, the developing, the training to control and to command idea. Canadians at the front have been so trained; hence the free, self-reliant Canadian citizen soldier has come out triumphant, although more or less weighted down by the machine idea and incubus of regular service systems.

What are the disadvantages worthy of note in a proper compulsory service system? I look at this thing from one end to the other and frankly I must confess that I do not find any, except such as are created by agitators for a special purpose, and these agitators will soon disappear for the people will not tolerate them.

Can compulsory service be accomplished? The right hon. leader of the Opposition says that it cannot. I again show my faith in the Canadians and cross swords with him. I have every faith that it can be accomplished, and accomplished just as easily as rolling off a log, as the Yankee says. If taken up in the correct way the plan will be generally acceptable. It would be well of course that the public should be fully instructed in a kindly way as to their duty to serve in defence of homes, loved ones, free institutions and liberty. It might also be impressed upon some, a very limited few, that this is:

> No time for wile or long intrigue,
> Our country to her children cries,
> Those who're not for us are against;
> Better as foes than false allies.

According to Canada's census in 1911 there were in this country 1,700,000 males from 18 to 45 years. The immigration from 1911 to 1916 of persons from 18 to 45 years of age was 500,000. That is only an estimate but it is an estimate based on all the information at my disposal, because, out of the nearly 1,700,000 people who came to Canada during the years since the last census, of 1911, up to the present time, I estimate that 500,000 would be of the fighting age between 18 and 45. Then I accept about 100,000 less than the estimate of the statistician who prepared these figures as to the natural increase. I have put the amount of the average natural increase in population at 200,000 although, if I heard the figures correctly in the House yesterday, it was put at over 300,000. The result is that Canada to-day has 2,420,000 fighting men between 18 and 45 years of age within her borders and at the front.

We have enrolled 420,000 men, which leaves two millions of men between the ages of 18 and 45 free for service. Of these two million men, 1,200,000 are single. I do not know how these figures compare with

those which were furnished yesterday, but, at all events, such is my estimate.

Of course, there will be certain exemptions and exceptions, but Canada could send another 200,000 men to the front and yet not weaken to any perceptible extent her producing capacity.

Should there be exemptions? I do not propose to enter into the details of the Bill to-day. My desire is that the Bill should go through with as little delay as possible and without any more discussion than is consistent with the proper consideration of the measure. But the exemptions would need to be very carefully looked at, and if I might here interject an idea, it is that one of the great objections to the conscriptive Bill is the form of the tribunal that is to administer it, but that is a matter the Prime Minister said could be amended. There should be exemptions. The Militia Act provides for them and this Act also provides for them.

The next question is: How soon can the force be enrolled? I am not trying to bring in Valcartier at all, but I believe that an ordinary man capable of taking hold of this matter could have this force ready to go overseas within the next four months. Within the next four months Canada should raise, equip and train 150,000 men, and by October they should be in the trenches. I do not think it would be much of a trick at all.

Will such soldiers be suitable? We have heard a good deal about boys not being fit to fight and not fit to do this and that. I have always had great faith in the boy. I was a boy once myself—you may not believe it, but it is true—and I still like to keep the boyish confidence. The most notable examples of bravery in this war have been afforded by lads mostly under 18 years of age. Thousands and tens of thousands of British, Canadian and Australian boys have displayed marvellous heroism and bravery. They fear nothing; they are ready to do anything. Then, to the question: Will such soldiers be suitable?—I say most assuredly, providing they are trained as citizen soldiers, and not repressed and dwarfed by permanent corps or regular service training. Discipline must not be regarded as repression but as development, education, polish, fitness. Train the boy to be self-reliant and fearless rather than to be an abject sort of machine.

It is sometimes supposed that young men do not make good soldiers. Let me once more impress upon the House that it was the boys of the Welsh regiment who smashed the famous French cuirassiers at Quatre Bras. The average age of the battalion, old and young, was below 20. Upwards of thirty per cent of Wellington's heroes at Waterloo were under 20 years of age. Twenty-five per cent of the warriors who climbed the heights of Alma, and fought in that misty morn at Inkerman, were also under 20 years of age, many of them under 17, and they were dandies. They were trained to fight in those days with cudgels. In this present great war, many of the most heroic acts have been performed by mere lads of 18. There is no fear but such soldiers will be suitable in every respect.

Why is compulsory service necessary? Compulsory service is necessary because the voluntary system, after accomplishing almost marvels, is exhausted. I have no exact evidence of it, but there is the best of reasons for believing that German gold, cleverly applied, did the trick. I do not for one moment believe that Bryan was bought by German gold in the United States but he was influenced by men who were bought by German gold. Henry Ford was approached by gentlemen who have since admitted, and sworn to it, that they were in the pay of the German agents who were influencing these gentlemen to take the line they did. I presume that if the evidence could all be brought out here, we would have some very interesting stories. I repeat that German gold, cleverly applied, did the trick. The records of American courts show clearly that the labour agitations, the contraband demands, the food riot movements, the "peace at any price" agitations, have all been controlled and directed by German gold. We have instances where gentlemen occupying high journalistic positions in this country were in receipt of money from the United States of America and it is now known, and it has been proved in the United States courts, that peace organizations in that country were to a very large extent maintained by German gold for years before the war. Early in 1916, when Canadian recruiting was at its zenith, whispers were heard from all Canadian centres—the work was skilfully done—dreading that workmen could not be found for the various industries and services in Canada. This matter was up in the House once before. I must here say in justice to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that it had been intimated to me last night that he had stated that I had been a party to helping the munition workers to smuggle men out

for munition work instead of sending them to the front. I never did anything of the kind. The Prime Minister referred to this matter some time ago in the House and there is no harm in referring to it again.

Mr. OLIVER: I merely read extracts from Hansard and I had nothing whatever to say on the point myself.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I thought that the hon. gentleman made a comment coupling me with the Prime Minister in stating the claims of the munition workers.

Mr. OLIVER: I merely read what the minister said.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I will deal with that matter a little later. The dread was expressed that workmen could not be found for the various industries and services in Canada and it gradually took head. At the time I suspected German gold, and so informed the Prime Minister. The movement grew in force. and the Imperial Munitions Board, and the Finance Minister, each became anxious and restrictive. Finally the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway was influenced by the agitation, and while the Imperial Munitions Board and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance had limited themselves to impressive personal conversations with the Prime Minister and many others, Lord Shaughnessy went farther, and not only privately, as did the others, but openly, proclaimed himself in an address before the Board of Trade of Montreal. Lord Shaughnessy had been regarded in railway circles as a man of sound judgment; he had been trained under the greatest railway man of the age, Sir William van Horne; but he had not the breadth of judgment, had not the force of character, had not the fearlessness in face of trial of the great master, Van Horne.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: He was not affected by German gold?

Sir SAM HUGHES: One would imagine from the wishy-washy criticism of the financial critic of the Opposition that there was some influence at him.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Whether that was a pat on the back or not I do not know. At this juncture I should point out that these agitations manifested themselves all over the country. The Prime Minister was bombarded with them. He was an easier mark than I. I would throw them out of my office. I might recite this incident; the Prime Minister will not object. A very distinguished gentleman, head of one of the largest organizations in Canada, the manager of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company of Sydney, came to the office and, with tears in his voice and some in his eyes, begged us not to enlist and take the men away. I had chanced to visit that institution many years ago, and as I then went along the lines of furnaces and down through the coal mines, I saw as handsome a lot of fellows as ever stood inside jackets, Highland Scotchmen every man of them. I had gone through it in after years and found hundreds of men not one of whom could speak the English tongue, and almost every one of them an alien enemy, in time of war. I asked the manager, as the Prime Minister may remember, what had become of these gallant fellows that he was now asking us to restrain from enlisting, in order that they might shovel coal and handle furnaces in Sydney. I pointed out that his foresight should have been exercised years back in keeping gallant Canadians of British descent in our country, in place of driving them out to the four winds of Heaven and filling their places with aliens from the mines of Germany and Austria.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The ex-Minister directed in writing that a young man in the city of Halifax be not permitted to enlist for service.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The gentleman has wakened up; I am glad to see it; I was not aware that he had enough vitality. The young man to whom he refers, I understood, had been a soldier, and as long as I was Minister of Militia or acting in any military capacity and a soldier undertook to act as that gentleman did, he would not be allowed to remain in the service. But I learned afterwards that he was not a soldier at the time he had written the articles referred to, and accordingly I observed the law and I think I made him an officer. I know I gave him a chance anyway.

4 p.m.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You prevented him from enlisting.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not. He was dismissed from the forces, that was the order I gave.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You gave directions that he be not enlisted.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, I gave directions that he be not appointed an officer.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The ex-Minister directed the officer commanding at Halifax that a certain individual there be not permitted to enlist as a private.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not remember the details. I do remember that this man had gone to the Old Country and had there written some of the most slanderous falsehoods; and I gave an order that if he was a soldier or an officer at the time, he should not be permitted to enter the forces of Canada, at all events until we had reason to believe he had learned his proper functions.

This agitation went on, then, about the labour question, and would you believe it, this man, the man who was in here demanding, with tears in his eyes, that we do not take the soldiers from Sydney, inside of two months was after me to give him command of a battery himself, and to take these very fellows away. The whole thing has been piffle from one end of Canada to the other. The Prime Minister, however, yielding to these influences—and I admit they were very serious, I was pestered with them until I threw them out—suggested to me a letting up in the recruiting. It was in vain that I protested and met the fallacious arguments.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: On what occasion was it that I suggested letting up on recruiting?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The leader of the Government on more than one occasion—take the very day when Mr. McDougall was present, the leader of the Government asked me again if I could not let up on recruiting; and, moreover, the right hon. leader of the Government later on pointed out—if he wants the whole story I will be glad to give it—pointed out that there was a tremendous agitation in Toronto over the subject, that he had had various communications from Toronto, that the Finance Minister had told him there was a perfect storm brewing there, and that agitation was due to the fact that men could not be obtained as workers. Mark Irish, of the Imperial Munitions Board; Mr. Flavelle, of the Imperial Munitions Board, and others had been insistent in their demands that these men would not be taken. If the Prime Minister will permit me, I will read letters that will cover the thing, letters from himself.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would be very glad.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Sir SAM HUGHES: I would like the Prime Minister to see one of the letters before I read it.

Mr. CARROLL: As a matter of fact, was not recruiting called off at Sydney and Glace Bay over a year ago?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I did not call it off. I will show the Prime Minister a copy of the letter; I have not the original here.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman can go on with his speech; I will make my reply.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Before I sailed for England in March, 1916, knowing that the Prime Minister had communicated his fears re the labour situation and the Quebec question to others—I might mention to Mr. Godfrey, of Toronto, and a number of others—and it being the transition period between winter billeting and spring encampment, I yielded to his request and partially let up on recruiting. I told the Prime Minister that the only excuse I could make was that it was between winter billeting and spring encampments at the time, and the records will show that we did not draw a man out, we did not give any men to the munitions; our officers simply did not exert themselves as vigorously as formerly, owing to the fact that we had no place to put the men without going to great expense, and spring camps were being formed.

It may be noted, incidentally, that these same organizations and gentlemen with affiliated interests, while prominent in patriotic and philanthropic professions, have, nevertheless, not been unmindful of the profiteering aspect of the war, hence, probably, their intense interest in the labour question. Only this week the head of the Munitions Board has taken it on himself to write a letter to the manufacturers of this country practically demanding that recruiting shall not interfere with his munitions, when every day if I go to any big factory in Montreal or Toronto I can see hundreds of men clamouring for work. I have seen five hundred men around the entrance to a factory in Montreal in the morning looking for work, at the very time these gentlemen were saying that we were taking away their workmen. There are 10,000 women in Toronto to-day, and hundreds of men, anxious for work in munition factories, and yet these gentlemen tell the public and the Government that we are interfering with the work of the factories, when it is perfect nonsense to say so.

Other contributing causes in the falling off of recruiting are, the abusive tone and language of many speakers at public meetings, calling indiscriminately all those not enlisting "slackers," "cowards," "shirkers," and thus forcing honest men to get their backs against the wall and become negative instead of positive.

Mr. MACDONALD: Speaking at Lindsay, Ontario, on April 28, regarding the conditions of which he spoke and the agitation, the hon. gentleman said:

> This 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 has been dead in Canada for fighting purposes.

Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the statement made by him in Lindsay is quite correct?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am quite surprised at the hon. gentleman asking any such question. That speech is issued by myself, and I am not in the habit of issuing statements that I do not endorse. I will prove it before I have finished.

I had just referred to the abusive tone and language of many speakers at public meetings as one of the contributing causes in the falling off of recruiting. Many of these speakers were well-meaning gentlemen, fellows with their hair parted in the middle, coming out of the cities and towns, many of them not over the fighting age themselves, men who should have been in the trenches; and these men would lecture the fellows in the country. It is a pleasant task for city chaps to lecture country boys on their duty. I could mention fifty men from different places, all of fighting age, who had the hardihood to go out and lecture men who, from one cause or another, were not going to the front.

I may say that thus far—and I have had a good deal to do with it—whilst I have encouraged recruiting in every legitimate way by enthusiasm, along patriotic lines, I have never asked a man to go to the front. I have no right to do so. The actual action of certain prominent people in directing men not to go, but to stay at home, and secure the places of those going to the front, unfortunately has had its effect. Since the ex-Prime Minister, the hon. leader of the Opposition, is so wedded to his beloved province Quebec, I regret to say that that is a charge which he might well inquire into, relating to the common clergy of his own province.

The removal from Ontario, or rather the establishment of industries in Quebec province, because, as the excuse was, "labour is scarce in Ontario, so many having gone to the war; but plentiful in Quebec, whence few have enlisted"—this regard I took up the question, upon representation from Col. Thomas A. Duff, with Sir Joseph Flavelle, and Sir Robert Borden, with the result that these industries are now more fairly distributed, and the British provinces are not so much penalized because of their enlistment.

I thought it well to present to the House a memo on that subject. A very large industry is being erected at Maisonneuve, and the reason given by those who are establishing it was that they could not get labour in Toronto, so many men had gone to the front, but they could get plenty in Montreal because none had gone. This came to Colonel Duff's attention, and he sent me the correspondence, which I forwarded to Sir Robert, and I think action has been taken on it. The following is the letter which I sent to Mr. Flavelle:

October 30, 1916.

Dear Mr. Flavelle,—

From Colonel Thomas A. Duff of Toronto, one of the most worthy and reputable citizens of Ontario, the following letter has been received:

"3 Maynard Ave., Toronto.
October 26th, 1916.

"Dear Sir Sam,—

"In the belief that you are not aware of the action outlined herein, I desire to present to your notice, the following:

"Recently, it is understood, the Imperial Munitions Board, under the leadership of Mr. J. W. Flavelle, of Toronto, and Mr. Gordon, of Montreal, has let a contract with an American firm for munitions, involving the erection of a plant for the manufacture of fuses in Canada. These commodities are, of course, for the British Government, and the contract is let by that Government through the Imperial Munitions Board in Canada.

"I understand that the Board expressed the desire that the work should be done remote from the Atlantic seaboard—at Toronto or other suitable interior centre. It is further reported that this American firm declined to go to Toronto, or in Ontario, because it was said workmen could not be obtained, so many men having gone as soldiers to the war.

"Rumor has it that this great industry will, therefore, be located by the Imperial Munitions Board in, or adjoining, the city of Montreal, where labour is plentiful.

"Now, sir, how does this matter stand? Wise military precautions require such industries to be removed from the seaboard.

"The excuse is put forward that labour cannot be obtained in Toronto. Why, sir, this is absurd. Toronto has many returned soldiers who have manfully done their duty for King, country and liberty, and who are competent for such work. There are many

more over military age, as well as some under, and others incapacitated for the front, who could well perform this work. Besides, Ontario has tens of thousands of the noblest and best women who are only too anxious to help in this great cause. Ontario, therefore, can supply many times the help needed. Of course, in any event, the few specialists necessary will have to be imported, or others trained.

"Let me point out to you, sir, in all sincerity, but in all seriousness, that this is unfair to Ontario. And why? First, this province now loses directly the industry and all that pertains to it in the way of local benefits. During the war our boys are at the front fighting, and their families and friends are, therefore, deprived of the privilege of profiting by this factory in our midst.

"At the end of the war the population of the province of Quebec will, in all probability, be increased by several thousand souls, who will have, meantime, profited financially and will have established comfortable homes in the city of Montreal or thereabouts, which is practically on the seaboard.

"At the end of the war, also, the state of affairs will be, Quebec province increased in wealth and population, as well as in the unit of representation in Parliament, because men have failed to defend their King and country; while Ontario's sons will return, possibly broken in health; their families dependent on Patriotic Funds; themselves without industries wherein to get employment; many of them maimed and crippled for life, and many more resting, as you once said in your farewell address to the boys, 'beneath the poppies of Belgium or the golden lilies of France.'

"The locating of this plant in Quebec looks like bonusing that province for the failure of its people to do their duty towards the Empire, and penalizing Ontario for the noble manner in which the cream of her manhood have offered and given their lives, and those left at home their substance for the cause of liberty.

"It is well known that many men, in certain parts of Canada, have been advised by those to whom they look for guidance, 'Do not enlist; do not fight against Germany; let others go; you should remain and get their places.'

"I lay these facts before you in the hope that in justice to the soldiers and their families from the province of Ontario a handicap may not be placed on her industries and her people through the loyalty of her sons in fighting for, what you term, the 'grand cause of human liberty.'

"Trusting you will take this matter up, I am,

"Faithfully yours,

(Sgd.) "Thomas A. Duff."

I am not familiar with the circumstances and I would esteem it a great favour if you would kindly advise me as to the true statement in the premises.

You can readily understand aside from the question of locality, what great importance must be attached to the location of these industries, that is whether they are accessible for enemy ships or not. For example, should, by any misfortune, Britain lose control of the sea, it is evident such factories should be inland, as nothing could then prevent enemy ships coming to Montreal.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

There is no doubt either, that the locality issue is, as Colonel Duff points out, important. In short, this action places a discount, and a heavy discount on the loyalty of the splendid citizens of Toronto who have so magnificently done their duty in the trenches, in the other departments of the service and in the great philanthropic, patriotic and charitable aspects of this awful war.

Please let me hear at your earliest convenience, and oblige.

I am writing merely in my personal capacity as a citizen and not as a member of Parliament; as a Cabinet minister or as the honorary president of the Imperial Munitions Board.

Thanking you in advance.

Faithfully,

(Sgd.) Sam Hughes.

J. W. Flavelle, Esq.,
President Imperial Munitions Board,
Ottawa, Canada.

I sent it to Sir Robert, and I know that action of some kind was taken in the premises. With regard to the falling off: in many instances men enlisted—some civil servants—on the guarantee that their places would be filled by women till their return. In a few days they found other men in their places and no women. I protested to the Prime Minister and had, in so far as the Civil Service is concerned, the grievance partially removed. I was informed that the Prime Minister took prompt action in the matter. One of the difficulties in regard to recruiting was the growth of the mercenary idea "high pay at home, with easy work and no danger", as against "low pay at the front, with hard work, and extreme danger". Or as one tersely put it "$7 per day with feather bed at home; or $1.10 per day in mud to the waist, being shot at at the front".

There were many other local causes—growing up from time to time—all based on the primary conspiracy of the "labour" and "employment" cries.

It was noticeable throughout the length and breadth of the country that, as soon as the British conscription law was passed, the people of Canada seemed in favour of compulsory service. The passage of the law had a magic effect from one end of the country to the other, and the cry then was, "Give us compulsory service, the same as they have it in England, in order that the thing may be equal, and these men may not stay at home." Hundreds of people have told me—in fact thousands have made the statement openly—"Why should I go to the front when Jones' boys have not gone; give us a chance at the ballot, and make it even, and if we have to go we will all go willingly" and to-day I believe that if the Militia Act of 1868, or

the later amending Act, were enforced in Canada, the man who would fail to observe it would find himself in a very small corner in every part of the country.

After my return from England, and after the Meredith-Duff Commission had concluded, I found myself hampered by being limited in the organization of new battalions. The Prime Minister, upon the demand of certain persons, had, as early as May, an Order in Council passed limiting the formation of these.

Our good friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) who has always been active, except when he wanders from Edmonton, last January, in the House of Commons, gave a list of regiments that were being recruited in Edmonton at one time. His list from Hansard is as follows:

The 56th Battalion—

That battalion never was in Edmonton; it came from Calgary.

The 63rd, 66th, 138th, 151st, 194th, 202nd, 218th and 223rd.

The 223rd was from Winnipeg. As to the 63rd Battalion, Edmonton was merely a central point. We took advantage of certain buildings that were there wherein to quarter our troops, that being the only convenient place that we could find in the whole of the northern part of Alberta. It was upon the urgent request of the citizens of Edmonton, backed up by the hon. gentleman himself, that we organized those regiments. Thousands of men came in from the hunting and railway camps all along the line. They did not live in Edmonton; they did not belong to Edmonton. There ought to be on file in the department records showing that petition after petition and deputation after deputation were received, representing that the people of Edmonton did not know what to do with these men and asking for the establishment of battalions there. Four of these battalions were up to strength within three weeks after their organization. Men were coming in from all over the country to join the colours; they were there, all ready to join before the battalions were organized. On June 3, 1915, the 63rd Battalion was formed; it was up to strength inside of a month. This battalion was in charge of Colonel McLeod, a very fine officer. On June 22, the 66th Battalion was formed under Col. McKinnery, who raised four battalions, aggregating about 4,000 men, inside of three weeks. On the 19th of November one of these was turned over to Colonel Belcher's battalion and on November 26, another batch of men were transferred to Colonel Arnott's battalion. So that there was no recruiting going on at this time; these battalions were full.

On January 28, the 194th Battalion was formed, under Colonel Craig from Vermilion, a fine boy. On February 4, the 202nd was formed under Colonel Bowen. Later on February 23, Cornwall's Battalion, the 218th, was formed. The organization of these battalions runs from June 3, 1915, to February 25, 1916. There was no overlapping. Recruiting was not abnormal, considering the fact that in that section of the country there are many single men and that this point was the recruiting depot for the whole of that part of the Dominion.

Mr. DOUGLAS: The hon. gentleman has not mentioned the 49th and 51st Battalions.

Sir SAM HUGHES: These battalions, which were raised long before that, were not mentioned by the member for Edmonton. I am merely quoting the statement of the member for Edmonton and dealing with the battalions that he mentioned as having been recruited in Edmonton at the same time.

There has been a lot of guff, privately and publicly, along this line. I remember that the Minister of Finance on one occasion became excited over the raising of three battalions in Toronto. If the Prime Minister does not object, I purpose reading some letters dealing with these battalions. There is one here which is marked "confidential"; I will let the Prime Minister see it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not care to examine letters in the House. If my hon. friend desires to read confidential letters, one would suppose that the proper course would be to show them to one in advance. The hon. gentleman will have to take his own course in the matter.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Well, I am prepared to take my own course in the matter; I shall not read the letter. It has been referred to in the House, however. There is nothing in my letter that I am ashamed of, and it also is marked confidential. However, if the Prime Minister does not wish the letter to be read—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Was it a letter written to me?

Sir SAM HUGHES: It was written by the Prime Minister to me.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As to reading it, my hon. friend will have to take his own course.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Certainly I will take my own course; I will not read it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What is the date of it?

Sir SAM HUGHES: June 9, 1916. It refers to the raising of this corps. However, I will read one written by myself. It was marked confidential by my secretary, but I will remove the word "confidential," inasmuch as it is my own letter, I assume that is permissible. This letter is dated July 5, 1916, and is as follows:

Dear Sir Robert:

Re recruiting.

You may remember I recommended to you, that we could raise as high as four hundred thousand soldiers, for the front. Later on, you recommended five hundred thousand. We can easily live up to your offer, if right systems are pursued.

When I assured you, at the beginning of the war, that we could supply a Division and maintain it, many hesitated and thought it could not be done, among others, General Gwatkin, who has had altogether too much influence and too much to say—considering he knows little or nothing about Canada, and about the same of military matters.

Instead of a division from 17,000 to 20,000 men, we sent over 33,000, and kept in service in Canada about 2,000 or 3,000 more.

Three systems of recruiting have been pursued.

I deem it important that this should be placed before the country; there is nothing secret in it. The letter continues:

First system: In enrolling the First Contingent, I overrode all red tape; communicated directly with each officer, as well as through the regular channels, and the recruiting was accomplished very rapidly. The whole force was formed and shipped inside of six weeks from the date of its authorization. It was akin to the 'fiery cross' of old Scottish days.

The next system of recruiting was not mine. During my absence in England, the system of raising men by drafts, and the policy of sending over only subordinate officers was adopted. On learning of this I at once stopped it. No inspiration was given on this side of the water, and the evident aim was to inaugurate a system across the water that would throw all positions, above the rank of captain, in the hands of British officers, who had no more military training than our officers, and not as much practical experience of the world. I stopped that system which, so far as recruiting was concerned, was a failure, and for the first winter carried out the plan of battalion recruiting them in the various battalion headquarters. This constituted my second system.

The officers of the battalion became the active recruiting agents. From the outset, all recruiting officers were directed to work in harmony with every organization assisting in the cause—Daughters of the Empire; Red Cross; W. C. T. U's; Church Societies; clergymen of all creeds; business and local organizations of all kinds—in short, everything displaying the right spirit was given the welcome hand, but the Department retained control of our own people only; all else was voluntary.

Had we been paying these organizations the cost would have run into many millions.

From time to time individuals, professing to represent this or that organization, etc., would wish their particular plan to be exclusively adopted, but we quietly side-tracked them—patted them on the back and went on. The result has been simply startling. There has been no friction, and the world cannot produce so successful a record whether under compulsion or voluntary system. We have been in advance of equipment every time.

Third system: Last year, in preparation for the four divisions in the field, I extended the system of recruiting to every center where twenty-five men or upwards could be raised.

We took, as a basis, practically the Parliamentary ridings; in some cases two ridings; but in the larger centres, like Toronto, Montreal and Winnipeg where there are between the city and the county immediately adjoining, seven or eight ridings, we grouped them within the city boundary, although I believe it would have been better to have stuck to the Parliamentary ridings, even in such cases as that. Of course, the drill halls, being largely in one part of each city, caused us to follow the centralizing plan.

Yet we found gentlemen exercising their influence publicly and privately to bring the great city of Toronto, with a population of 500,000, down to the same level in the matter of recruiting as the county of Ontario, with a population of 40,000. Rather than have one battalion in Toronto, one in Peel county, one in Halton, one in Wentworth, one in Hamilton, we divided the country into areas each containing about 40,000 or 50,000 people, and established a battalion in each of those areas. With all due regard to those who have been speaking about Toronto, Winnipeg, Hamilton, Montreal, Edmonton, no more successful system was ever carried out or ever will be carried out than the recruiting system which was established on that basis.

The letter continues:

My own riding has turned out, up to date. about 4,800 men and yet we are represented by only one battalion. We furnished hundreds of men, indirectly, to the First Division, for which "Toronto", largely, got credit; other rural parts did the same. We supplied detachments to the artillery, to the 24th Battalion of Montreal; to the 39th Battalion; to the 59th Battalion; and to the 80th Battalion; before the county battalion system was inaugurated. Of course that was due to the hope that the war would soon end.

The county battalion system has worked marvellously. Now and then, of course, one gets some faddist who wants compulsion; who wants registration; who wants some committee under himself to run matters, but we did not quarrel with any of them—we simply side-tracked them

but we certainly did not let any of them excite us, and everything has gone splendidly.

The troops go over as battalions; the senior officers give their time, and a good deal of money over and above what they get, for the little petty reward of going overseas with their corps. Even though these senior officers may not be fit to go into the trenches we think they are entitled to that recognition. All the others, who are fit, get chances in the trenches.

I do not wish to lecture any one, but I do trust that a spirit of fair play will be shown towards a number of gentlemen who have given their time and money to organize battalions with which they have gone overseas:

The system has worked perfectly in spite of a lot of petty intrigue to kill it. In short, the officers in place of following in one fad have utilized every fad and every system. We have taken good men, from any source whence they came, and let me say, I challenge history to show where such work has been done with so little friction.

Regarding Quebec province. I honestly believe I could enthuse it. It seems to be wakening up now. They have had no officers distributed through their counties; they have not been a military people, especially, in recent years, but the spirit is latent there.

Laurier has played on their prejudices; he has kept them at home to form a solid phalanx should an election occur, and he has endeavoured to stir up prejudice among the French people in every other province of Canada. He has made two recruiting speeches; one at Napanee which nearly killed him.

I hope this does not stir up any unpleasant memories.

It was in the United Empire Loyalist centre of Canada—a great place for a man such as he to "spout". His other speech was in Montreal. He made one solitary reference to recruiting, and two to the bilingual issue.

Still, I think Quebec needs only proper education to come right.

Throughout Canada, although all sorts of complaints from interested sources have come in—

This letter is dated July 5, 1916:

—I have not found one acre of land untilled; one wheel in a factory unturned; one bank that failed to receive or pay out cash on proper security; one man; one woman; or one institution of any kind; that has been held up by our recruiting.

There has been more or less dread here and there from interested parties for fear something might turn up that would injuriously affect some particular business, but it is a good deal like the little girl found by her mother in front of the fire-place crying. On being asked the trouble the little girl said "I was just thinking that I might grow up and get married sometime and I might have a little girl who would be playing around the fire-place and fall into it and get burned."

Following this, on July 10, 1916, I completed my report on recruiting to the Prime Minister, as follows:

In a recent memo to you I have reviewed my plans for recruiting. Of course there are many little special or specific methods that we adopt in various localities. For the future, it is my purpose to continue my third plan as outlined to you with all proper specific and special methods advisable.

There still remain upwards of one hundred and twenty-five thousand men to complete your offer of five hundred thousand. That is an average, in general terms, of one battalion to every two ridings. Some will furnish more, some will furnish less. These as infantry, with the artillery, Army Service Corps, Army Medical Corps, Engineers, etc., will more than make up the half million.

At the time you offered the half million men, it was as well known as it is now that Quebec was not doing her duty, nor were some other parts of Canada, although it must be borne in mind that the Acadians have done magnificently and I firmly believe that it is possible to get Quebec to fall into line later.

From the time a battalion is authorized until its formation is, as a rule, several months. First, officers must be carefully selected, then non-commissioned officers, and all must be trained. Active recruiting cannot begin before this time. Incentives of various kinds, of course, can be devised, such as special brigades, one to each province.

Supposing the war were to last until the winter of 1917. Canada at all times, under your promise, must retain fifty thousand troops, during the war, within her borders; all the rest are for the front. We have committed the mistake, thinking the war would not last long, of storing a lot of men in England. My plans are that division after division should be sent over to the front as soon as formed.

Thus at present we have four divisions, or two army corps, practically in the field. These could, as recent events have shown, be greatly advantaged by having either a reserve division for each corps, or a reserve corps, at the front. It would work out well and cost little if anything more to have these troops at the front instead of in Britain. Men get exhausted overworking and a change is greatly welcomed. Then in case of a drive or an overwhelming attack they would be on the ground.

The plan, insidiously devised, of keeping at least as many troops in England as are at the front, is silly. At the present moment, our whole force at the front is disorganized, and we have nothing to put in its place, excepting rapidly formed units from reinforcements who have had no experience at the front. By next spring there should be scarcely a Canadian soldier fit for the firing line left in England. There can be no object in having large numbers of troops in Canada, and in England at the end of the war.

If the war were to be perpetual, or even for forty years or so, I could readily see the propriety of having reinforcements in England balancing those at the front, but within a year or two from now one or other of the two sides in this war will be exhausted. Canada should not have, at the close of the war, a full quota of men in the firing line, a similar quota in England, and a similar quota in Canada. In short, as I regard it, at the close of the war the practical result will be that all our troops in England and in Canada might just as well have been left unenlisted, or at their homes. In other words, it is no real strength to our boys at the front to have a number of men in England and in Canada.

This does not imply that we would string all our men out in one long firing line. We might hold no more of a front than we now do but we should have behind these trenches battalions, brigades, divisions and even corps, taking their turn in the trenches to get trained. Then, should exhaustion take place, it would be time enough to amalgamate a little at a time until elimination would occur, and until victory or defeat would be ours. We would then have our men practically experienced and the original intention in raising the soldiers would be carried out. So far as recruiting for the future in Canada is concerned, your promise of half a million men could easily be fulfilled. But it will not be fulfilled if you permit yourself to be hampered by raising little drafts here and little drafts there sent over in charge of junior lieutenants.

This work is carried on by inspiration, not by fatheads, muddleheads or woodenheads. There has been a clean-cut system from the beginning. Every possible effort has been made in certain quarters to interfere with the force and keep it down to serfdom, to mistrust it and to humiliate it. That sort of thing must cease.

Bonaparte, as well as every other soldier of genius, recognized that dividing the soldiers' maximum efficiency into four parts, only one part depended on the actual man. Pride in himself, faith and confidence in his cause, belief in his leaders, etc., constituted the other three. Bonaparte had no use for woodenheads. He always claimed that—give him French officers, with a mixture of British soldiers, not English alone, but British, and these included large forces of Scotch, Irish and Welsh, in his wars—he would trim the world.

The Prime Minister stated that he thought if I wanted to read a letter, I should have consulted him first. Last October I sent him a letter in regard to compulsory service, but he never took the trouble to reply. Early in May I had a notice of motion before the House, but the Prime Minister did not pay any attention to it. I think, therefore, that I need not go out of my way to consult him in regard to reading letters in the House. I am ready to say on the floor of the House anything that I have to say, and as soon as the Prime Minister treats me in a courteous manner, I will act in the same way towards him.

History records that free governments, that is, responsible governments, gradually yield to petty bickerings; these to uncontrolled dogmatism; that to autocracy, and to dissolution. Nations and peoples forget that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

It has frequently been asserted that a responsible government is unfit to manage a nation in time of war, and that it should then give place to a dictatorship, or an autocracy. I have never believed in any such doctrine, and I hesitate not to affirm

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

that no condition of affairs can arise which cannot be met efficiently under proper responsible government. The bases of popular government are intelligent, independent, interested, free men and women; Canada has these in millions. Secondly, the jealous guarding of the rights, first of ourselves, and then of others; this is not always properly observed in Canada, I regret to say. Thirdly, popular government demands equal rights and equal laws for all, and special privileges for none; this is not observed in Canada. Lastly it demands loyal, unselfish level-headed statesmen, who will not be misled by personal ambition or any other improper influence; Canada is not altogether deficient in this respect.

In either war or peace, the Cabinet should be properly controlled. No Government could possibly last under a system where each minister would be privileged to dabble and meddle in the details, not only of his own department, but of every other one. The Prime Minister should be familiar with all matters, except routine, being informed by the minister of the particular department; but only great questions of policy should concern the other departments. Non-observance of this principle, owing to the fact that following the Canadian Cabinet rule for generations, no minister has the right to manage his own department, but is subject to meddling, hindrance, and interferences from all other minsters' besides the Prime Minister, has primarily caused the failure of the volutary system of enlistment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is the same with every Government. There is not an hon. gentleman opposite who managed his own department when he was minister. We have the evidence of one man that they "fought like blazes." It is a Prime Minister's right, and his only, to be satisfied by the minister of a department on matters other than that of policy.

It may not be amiss here once more to review voluntary enlistment. For the First Division my action was unique in history. All red tape was thrown aside and paternalism, which is one of the many banes of regular service systems, was entirely removed. Canada's citizen soldiers, not only then, but since, manfully proved my faith in them. In my absence in England, the debilitating plan of draft was resorted to, but I cancelled it on my return.

For the Second Division, during the winter months and at leisure, battalions were organized in various centres.

During 1915, it became evident, the war was more serious than anticipated, and that more men were needed. I resorted for the fall and winter of 1915-16 to the Home Locality System of recruiting. Nothing in history ever surpassed its success. I had plans laid for four hundred thousand men. Meantime the Prime Minister pledged five hundred thousand men. Personally, I have never seen why any limit should be fixed. We are in the war to establish human liberty and overthrow Kaiserism; and if it takes a million men for Canada's share they certainly should be sent. To complete the balance, however, of the five hundred thousand, the country was informally divided off so as to give, in general terms, about twice the area assigned for a battalion in the Home-Locality System. In short, for the Home-Locality System, a district of about forty thousand population was allotted to a battalion. In the last plan the unit was increased to about one hundred thousand This would have given between 525,000 and 550,000 men. During the winter of 1915-16, however, petty interferences began to hinder the work. These continued on into 1916, till finally, no battalion could be organized without delays. For example, before I left for England last June, I ordered the formation of three battalions in Manitoba. On my return in October they had not yet run the gauntlet of the Treasury Board and Privy Council. The three battalions have never yet been properly completed. Under my system they would have been ready to sail for England by the time they were finally authorized. However, I raised upwards of four hundred thousand men directly and indirectly with very little friction, and with the most marvellous good conduct and efficiency on the part of the soldiers.

Then, however, came the action early in 1916 regarding the labour question, and that was the beginning of the end of voluntary recruiting.

More than a month has elapsed since the Prime Minister's return, and his announcement of "Selective Conscription". The Militia Act, which, according to the Prime Minister has all the powers of this Bill except "selection",—or, to use his own words, "Thus, the only new feature proposed is the method of selection" to my mind is far more easy of application, broader and better adapted to the situation than this Bill. I do not favour selection by tribunals under the Justice Department; I prefer the ballot under the Militia Department. Under either plan troops will be allotted to a score of different departments in the actual militia service. Under the Bill they cannot be allotted to other employment. The Prime Minister read a list the other day of forty different branches of employment to which men could be allotted under the Bill. Under the Militia Act, however, men could be allotted to any national service, such as farmers, mechanics, miners, business men, etc. All would receive military, uniform rates of pay. Under this Bill, however, the man at home nightly in a feather bed may receive from $7 to $10 as a mechanic, while his brother in the trenches receives $1.10 for hard work and being shot at. Under the Militia Act the men could be now undergoing training in Canada, for I have yet to learn of the man objecting to training our men to defend homes, principles and loved ones.

Meantime, therefore, while the next few months are being wasted in discussion of this Bill—in appointing the machinery to carry out its measures, in hearing the tedious judicial appeals, in organizing the training camps, and in conducting the elections —let Canada act as she can act under the existing Militia Act until this Bill becomes law. There need be no delay, no friction, no need of compulsion to go overseas. The only compulsion would be to train, and no one could object to that. The machinery is ready. If the Government are actuated by honest desire to help on the cause they deserve credit. But I pass by every objection; set aside every obstacle; blot out every adverse claim; refuse to heed any criticism against the principles of the Bill. I stand for the Bill, and will help to make it a success—if such is possible. I wish to give it every chance; improve it, without loss of time; get it into operation forthwith, so that our beloved boys at the front may be properly supported, and the great cause of human liberty may be triumphant.

Let me appeal to the veteran leader of the Opposition to join, after pointing out his objections to the Bill, in having it become effective; grant a year's extension of Parliament, and have action such that our land under this Act may be in the firing line by the end of September.

I turn for a moment to some of the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition yesterday. He suggested that the Gov-

ernment request that sections 175 and 176 should be made applicable to the Canadian militia. I have already shown that the granting of the request would not be worth the paper it was written on. It could not be done. I have already taken up the question of the defence of Canada, and I need not detain the House discussing that point further.

The leader of the Opposition speaks of harmony. He is great on harmony. From the way he talks about it one would almost think he had been a musician. He said:

If to-day this harmony no longer exists the fault is not with this side of the House.

Well then, I do not know on whose side it is. If ever a Government has yielded to the demands of the leader of the Opposition, it is this Government, and on lines that, while not unconstitutional perhaps, have nevertheless brought all sorts of humiliation on the people of the other provinces. I cannot see where he had the right to make any statement such as that.

Speaking of the Militia Act, the right hon. gentleman said:

They may summon everybody when the enemy is at the frontier in order to preserve intact the soil of this our land.

Where does he find that in the law? I have studied the law myself, and I know that it cannot be found in it. He was simply putting words on Hansard that he had no right to put there. The militia can be summoned when the enemy is at the frontier; they can be summoned in times of peace or in times of war. But the right hon. gentleman says that everybody may be summoned when the enemy is at the frontier, and his words are not without some effect, coming from such an astute gentleman as he is.

Again he says:

I say that he could not under the Act as it is, send anybody across the ocean to serve in the war.

I do not see why the Government could not. Under the Act the Prime Minister certainly has power to send troops across the ocean. Further on the leader of the Opposition says:

The fact that the men of Quebec have not enlisted in larger numbers does not mean that they have degenerated. . . .I followed the enlistment very closely as it proceeded.

I am afraid that he followed a very long way behind. I had no right to approach the right hon. gentleman, but I have kept watch on him. I did approach the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) on

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

two or three occasions and I am proud to say he took a very active part in recruiting and did his best to help us, but as far as I can learn the right hon. leader of the Opposition attended only two recruiting meetings.

I have found the record of only two meetings addressed by the leader of the Opposition in favour of recruiting, one at Napanee, where there are a lot of United Empire Loyalist people, and one in the city of Montreal. I have read his speeches at these meetings and I could only find in them one reference to recruiting and two to the bilingual issue. I was very much amazed. I thought that my right hon. friend lost the opportunity of a lifetime. What the right hon. gentleman says about the English, and French Canadian born population is all right but his reference to the disarming of the people of Quebec was a little out of place. In times of war the people are always disarmed by the troops that come in. I do not wish to charge the right hon. gentleman with making the suggestion that these people were disarmed improperly but I would point out to him that the disarming of the people is something that always takes place. Even during the war thousands of people were allowed to keep their arms but when the war was over those arms which had been taken away were restored.

He said that when the Naval Bill was introduced in 1910 some of those naughty men of the Nationalist organization opposed it. He says that whatsoever a man soweth so shall he reap. We remember that in 1896 Sir Charles Tupper brought in an estimate of $3,000,000 for the purpose of buying rifles for the militia force. We remember that men clad in semi-uniform, on the eve of the election went from door to door saying that they wanted young men for recruits, not canvassing them politically, but asking them: What is your age; have you done any drilling? This had a marvellous effect in sending voters to the polls against Sir Charles Tupper and this proposed expenditure of $3,000,000. My right hon. friend himself must admit that what he sowed in that election he had a right to reap later on. My right hon. friend and his friends placarded the country from one end to the other with accusations against the Tupper Administration because of their action with reference to the proposed expenditure of $3,000,000 and their action with regard to the Manitoba school question. The right hon. gentleman knows the line he took in his speeches in Quebec and the line that he took in Ontario. These

expressions were diametrically opposed to each other as will be shown by his speeches and I will quote the speeches if he has forgotten them, but I do not think it is necessary. The right hon. gentleman knows that all is fair in love and war and if these gentleman outflanked him in 1911 surely he is sport enough not to kick about it but to take the trimming he got like a man.

I referred to the General Lessard incident yesterday and I shall not pursue the matter further as General Lessard has not an opportunity of speaking in the House. But, I was amazed at my right hon. friend referring to General Smuts' magnificent address in the city of London. He said:

> 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.

Well, lions in London are cheap, but for all that there is no finer man than General Smuts. I want to say that the right hon. gentleman has not quoted from General Smuts. He did not quote anything from him, but I will quote something from General Smuts. General Smuts has on the statute book in South Africa a law which says that if the Government want to send troops to fight for the British flag they go. He has a compulsory service law on the statute books of South Africa making the men who were our enemies only a few years ago fight for the British flag when the Government of South Africa says so. I am a little sorry that the leader of the Opposition did not quote that.

I have taken a hurried glance at the speech of the leader of the Opposition and there is nothing else that I desire to refer to in it. I have already explained the misunderstanding with regard to the expression used by the hon. member for Edmonton. I might point out once more, as the hon. gentleman touched a little on the Ross rifle last night, that the Ross rifle has been, and is, the greatest and best rifle in the world. The Ross rifle has never failed to fire once with relatively one per cent of jams, as compared with fifty per cent of jams with the Lee-Enfield. The leader of the Opposition, I noticed, had something to say in the House yesterday with reference to this rifle, but if either he or the hon. member for Edmonton wishes the data it is available, and it shows that the cause of jamming was not the rifle, but bad ammunition. German agents undoubtedly blamed the rifle, but the fact is that the cause of the jamming was bad ammunition. I wish to point out that on the second day of the battle of St. Julien the Canadian troops were supplied with ammunition which had been withdrawn from British troops. I am not saying that it was done intentionally—I would be sorry to think that it was—but on the afternoon of the second day, when their ammunition had run out, they were supplied with ammunition that had been withdrawn from a British division. The same ammunition that had jammed the Canadian rifles also jammed the British rifles and the gallant Durhams and Yorks, who had been supplied with this same ammunition had to throw their rifles away and retire. It jammed. Therefore, in all fairness and honour, lay the blame to the proper cause and not play the game of the German agents and say that it was the Ross rifle when it was the ammunition that jammed in the Lee-Enfield rifle and the Ross rifle alike.

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps the ex-minister might tell us how many Ross rifles are now in use by the Canadian forces at the front?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not think there are any; I am not sure about that. All I know is that the Ross rifle is better than the Lee-Enfield, but when the Prime Minister spoke to me about withdrawing it I knew the agitation that had gone on and which had been promoted by men who did not know that it was the ammunition that was the cause of the jamming. Although I know this quite well, I did not want to send soldiers into the trenches, who, by reason of this agitation, might not have confidence in the rifle. Therefore, inasmuch as the agitation had caused a want of confidence on the part of some of the boys, and in the interest of all parties concerned, I thought it would be well not to have a fight during the progress of the war over the matter, but to withdraw the rifle and allow it to be used for training purposes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who started the agitation?

Mr. OLIVER: Would the ex-minister say what was the number of casualties amongst the Canadians in the battle of Zillebeke?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The number is available but surely the hon. gentleman knows that the battle of Zillebeke was a shell fight. Our fellows were pounded by shells and there was not a rifle shot fired at them. It was long range fire and shells by the hundred were rained on them, the trenches were flattened out—I was there and saw the

place—it was worse than any ploughed field, and the boys went down. Harry Baker's battalion was there, it was long range fire and high explosive shells were sent over.

Mr. OLIVER: The question of the efficiency of the Ross rifle is a serious question to the people of Canada. I have asked the minister how many Canadians lost their lives in the battle of Zillebeke. The Canadians were armed with Ross rifles on that occasion and General Sir Douglas Haig reports that in that battle the Ross rifle jammed in the hands of the Canadians.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Canadians were not armed with the Ross rifle at the battle of Zillebeke last June. The third division never were armed with the Ross rifle there. I do not know that there were any Ross rifles at the battle of Zillebeke. I have great respect for Sir Douglas Haig, but it would not matter one particle to me, knowing the facts, if all the reports in the universe said to the contrary. The hon. gentleman is altogether wide in his remarks. The first division that had been armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle for months found that the rifle jammed just the same as the other did but the cause was bad ammunition.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. gentleman spoke of an agitation against the Ross rifle. Who started the agitation against the Ross rifle?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. member looks for information. I refer him to the pages of Hansard long years ago to gratify his thirst for knowledge. He knows as well as I know, and I am not going to take up time or dig up "dead corpses" here to-day. Let the hon. gentleman rest patient. He looks innocent, but he is anything but innocent.

Mr. Speaker, we are at war. Our boys have done magnificent work at the front, second to no troops in the world—I will not say better, but second to no troops in the world. They are suffering heavy losses. The Prime Minister has been at the front. I waited for his return. I knew he would be impressed by what he saw there. What may have been his views in the past on compulsory service, I know not and care not, but to-day he has brought down his Bill and is going in for compulsory service. I do not like the term conscriptive selection; but a rose by any other name would smell as sweet, and that is a matter of detail. I do not like the form of the measure; I should have preferred the Militia Act, which, I think, would have worked more smoothly and been quicker in its operation. There is scarcely anything, if there is anything at all, in this Bill that could not have been carried out under the Militia Act. It must be remembered that we would not be called on to ballot for every soldier under the Militia Act. It would be possible to pass an Order in Council under the War Measures Act and so to call out any class. But, in any event, we can call the militia out for training under the Militia Act, even if we do not send them overseas, and, in the name of Heaven, while this discussion is going on in the House, and if there is to be fighting while we are making our explanations here, let the boys be called out in the meantime and be trained under the Militia Act. That can be done and no one can object to it, and then when the Bill passes in some proper form we can apply its provisions and send them overseas if they do not volunteer. But I have faith that the boys called out for training would nearly all volunteer for service overseas. I will not throw a single impediment, directly or indirectly, in the way of the passing of this Bill, but will help on in every proper manner its passage through the House, in order that the boys at the front may be fully and properly protected and supported in their great struggle.

5 p.m.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, coming to a conclusion in my own mind in regard to the Military Service Bill now under discussion in this House on motion for second reading, I regret to say that, in regard to the principle of the Bill, I find myself in rather serious conflict with the opinions of my leader, and I think also with the opinions of the large majority of my political friends sittting upon this side of the House. Under ordinary circumstances I would feel very deep regret, very sincere concern, if that were the case, and had it not been for the kindly, generous and patriotic words of counsel and advice which my honoured leader has addressed not only to me but to all his followers with regard to this measure, I might feel some embarrassment, and not a little unpleasantness. His words of advice to the whole of us were that in regard to this measure he himself would prefer that each member should be guided solely by the dictates of his own conscience, entirely without regard to the ordinary and well recognized ties of party. For this reason I feel the more free to express without any reservation my own views and conclusions in regard to the

measure, dictated alike by my conscience, my heart and my judgment. And, after having given to the Bill the best consideration it is in my power to bestow upon it, I find that I cannot agree in the conclusions so ably expressed, so forcibly uttered, by my honoured leader in the House yesterday.

One is, I think, bound to consider every sentence, every word uttered by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in regard to this matter. We know that his learning on the subject is most profound, we know that his parliamentary experience is not only the longest, but I think undoubtedly the most brilliant, in the annals of this Canadian Parliament. But, notwithstanding these things, acting upon my own judgment, judging the measure as well as I can, I have come to the conclusion that my support should go to this Bill and that it should be a whole-hearted support. In my opinion, the principle involved in the Military Service Bill at this very moment is one to the advantage of the people of Canada, to the advantage of Canada herself, to the advantage of the Empire and to the advantage of our Allies. For these reasons I intend to support it. While I make that general statement in regard to my support of the Bill, I still leave myself free in regard to criticise some of its details. I think that in many respects the Bill may yet be usefully amended, and if I correctly understood the Prime Minister when he introduced the Bill into this House, and also when he spoke on the second reading of the Bill yesterday, he expressed a sincere desire on behalf of himself and of his Government, that he should receive any serious and useful suggestions by way of amendment to the Bill—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —in order that the proposal, so far as possible, may in its operations be rendered absolutely free from partisanship, political prejudice, bias, or other baneful influence. And when the proper time comes I think I may be able to make some suggestions which will not operate as voiding the principle of the Bill, but will, I think, smooth its operations, and will perhaps place it in greater favour with the public at large.

There is just one observation I might make here, and that is that I have one other reservation to make, and to my mind it is a very important one; that is with reference to the question of conscription in general. I cannot bring myself to believe that this Bill is the full Government policy in regard to the question of conscription. I cannot bring myself to believe that this is the last word on conscription in the proper sense of the word that we are to have from the Government during the present session of the present Parliament. Conscription, to my mind, involves the taking of more than manhood, more than flesh and blood.

I would vote to withhold the operation of this Bill unless the Government is prepared to go further, and, during the present session, bring in concurrent legislation which would operate as a conscriptive measure upon the wealth and resources of Canada in general for the purposes of this war. This is a matter which, I think, touches my heart almost as much as any phase of the war. I do not like to feel that we, in this Parliament, think lightly of the flesh and blood of the people of Canada, and think highly of the accumulated wealth of the country, and that we will touch the one and dare not touch the other. May it never be said in Canada, or of Canada, in the words of the late Thomas Hood, the English poet:

" Oh God, that wealth should be so dear,
And flesh and blood so cheap."

I believe the people of Canada, when they speak of conscription in the meetings which have been held, where they have applauded the doctrine of conscription, meant something different from the conscription provided in this Bill. I believe, in the minds of the people, conscription of wealth, conscription of industry, and of resources, are included, and I trust that, during the present session, the Government will take steps to bring in concurrent legislation, more appropriately, no doubt, embodied in another Bill, which will let the people see that flesh and blood are not lightly held, and that wealth is not lightly exempt. I can place before myself the picture that any hon. member in this House can conjure up, if he so desires, of the man over military age, snugly settled in his own household, checking up his profit ledger, his stocks, bonds, debentures, mortgages and other investments, knowing that he has nothing very much at stake in the war at the present time, agreeing readily that the youth of Canada shall go to the front, and shall fight our battles, and that, so far, he has been practically exempt from any burdens of the war.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Some of those men live more cheaply than the ordinary middle class man. They are not taxed more than

the other man is under the tariff. They pay nothing directly into the treasury of the Government for the purposes of the war. This is a thing I would like to see remedied.

I believe the people of Canada would be willing to be placed—nay, desire to be placed—upon an equal footing with the people of Great Britain, with regard to this war, and I, for one, cannot understand why so able a man as the Minister of Finance of Canada has, from year to year, postponed this question of taxing wealth. He has taxed the industries. He has clipped the manufacturers' profits, rightly or wrongly. He has taxed munition profits, and I believe they can bear more taxation. Why he cannot adopt that system of righteousness and equality in regard to the income of the rich man, I cannot understand. The Minister of Finance is a strong man. He understands the situation in Canada, and knows the public feeling. If he were given a free hand, he might act, but there must be some withholding force on the action of the Minister of Finance in regard to this matter. What that force is, I do not know, but people will conjure up certain things in their minds, when they get no explanation, because, at the opening of the war session in August, 1914, the matter was mentioned; and in the sessions of 1915 and 1916, and again this year, the matter has been brought most pointedly to the attention of the Minister of Finance. Each time he has put it off. He has procrastinated, and given reasons, which satisfy him, apparently, why the wealth of the country should not be taxed, but the time is coming when the people will imagine certain influences are behind the minister, unless he takes action. I trust that he will do so this session. If the Government will combine the conscription of wealth and resources of the country with the conscription of men for the firing line, I believe they will be backed, almost from one end of the Dominion of Canada to the other.

Having wandered, perhaps, a little from the Bill immediately before us, I will make a very brief survey of the position of Canada in reference to the war, from its outbreak in August, 1914, to the present time. I desire to make a consecutive statement, in order that the voters, whom I have the honour to represent in Parliament, may know my reasons for supporting this Bill, which emanates from the Government side, as it has not been very much my custom to support Government measures in the past seven years.

Most happily, Canada's experiences of war have been of very modest proportion and at long intervals, until the fatal day in August, 1914. War in 1914 found Canada and all or many of the present allied countries in a comparative state of unpreparedness, or perhaps, I would be speaking more nearly the truth if I said in a complete state of unpreparedness. The best prepared of the allied countries never dreamt of the terrific onslaught which was launched against liberty, humanity and civilization in August, 1914. None realized at first the awful significance of that outbreak, least of all, perhaps, the people of the dominions beyond the seas. We were safely and snugly situated, many thousands of miles from the actual scene of conflict. Our first enrolment in Canada proceeded upon the principle of voluntary enlistment. In Great Britain, after the regular army had been utilized, volunteers were called for until that system had reached its limit, and I think the system we adopted in Canada was adopted also in every other of the self-governing British dominions. In Canada, the first call for volunteers met with what, in my opinion, was a magnificent response; 33,000 men responded within six weeks, an equal or larger number in the next four or five weeks, and well do I remember, in the short session of August, 1914, standing on the corner of McLeod and Elgin streets, Ottawa, when we saw the Princess Patricias march proudly past. Well do I remember, on the 25th August, standing in front of the old Parliament Buildings, when we all cheered for the men from British Columbia, who were in service ready to go to the front just about twenty days after the call had gone forth for volunteers—and splendid fellows they were, many of whom have fought their last fight. They certainly answered the call in the most speedy and noblest fashion. I know that it is charged by many that our system of voluntary enlistment was a great blunder from the beginning, and that at the very outset we should have taken a course such as that recently adopted in the United States. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are all inclined to be very wise after the fact. It may be quite true that the United States has gone about the question of enrolment in a better manner than that adopted by us.

But the United States has had the opportunity of profiting by our experience and the experience of many other countries. In August, 1914, I think we were all in accord with the voluntary system being

the proper system of enlistment in Canada. So far as my recollection goes, no one suggested any other system. If in our decision we blundered, the blunder was confined not to Canada alone; it took place in every other British Dominion. But I do not agree with any critic who says that the voluntary system in Canada has been in any degree a failure; I rather think that from beginning to end it has been a magnificent success. But conditions have changed since August 1914. Perhaps I might illustrate that change by relating an incident that occurred during the short session of 1914. I well remember a remark made by one of the two Conservative friends with whom I walked one day down the broad way leading from the Parliament Buildings. He said: If I were Prime Minister, my policy would be, $100,000,000 and 100,000 men—and I would dissolve Parliament and go to the country on that policy. But the other man said: No; what is the use of promising something that you cannot perform? It looked like a monstrous promise at that time; we did not know what was before us. Let me give you another instance. We thought we were doing mighty well in August, 1914, when we made a contribution to the Mother Country of a million sacks of flour. We thought that that was wonderful—and under ordinary circumstances it would have been wonderful. Little did we dream then of the conflict that was to come; little did we anticipate then the millions of dollars that we should contribute and the hundreds of thousands of men who should leave Canada. I mention these matters merely to show that we thought somewhat lightly of the war or of the prospects of a lengthy conflict when we first started upon a volunteering system.

The charge so often made that our system of volunteering has fallen down is, in my judgment, absolutely unfounded. The voluntary system is a good system, but like all other human systems, it has its limitations. I am inclined to think that we have now come almost to the limit of that system in Canada. I have been pretty much of that opinion since last November or December, about the time of the campaign on behalf of national service. The figures in respect of volunteering were falling off very rapidly. I myself held meetings in the campaign for national service, and I heard many expressions of opinion in regard to what the Government should do in the way of securing more recruits. In fact, when I came to Ottawa at the opening of this session I had a motion prepared on the very question of conscription. When I came back after the adjournment I learned that my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) had placed such a motion on the Order Paper. Knowing full well that the remarks of a man of his standing and knowledge on this subject would have far more force and effect than anything that I could say, I thought no more of the matter.

To my mind, this is not a new question. Last spring recruiting in Canada had fallen so low that we did not have sufficient recruits to make up the actual wastage in Canada. Any man who has the war at heart—and I believe we all have the war at heart—must acknowledge that Government or Parliament must take some definite step to get more men, and to get them as speedily as they can be procured.

The figures which we hear from day to day in the House are, I think, not well known throughout the part of Canada which I have the honour to represent. I desire, therefore, to place upon Hansard a statement of the present disposition of Canadian troops as given in a return made in this House on the 15th of this month. The following is a statement of the troops available at that date:

In France, 136,400; in the Near East and the West Indies, 877; in England and en route, excluding troops in hospitals and convalescent homes, 108,736; in Canada, 17,353. This makes a total of 263,366. If we add to that, casualties estimated at 100,000, and medically unfit and discharged, 43,053, we have a total enlistment from the outbreak of the war to the present time of 406,419 men. This is a splendid showing in a country of Canada's size.

The figure which I have given as the number of medically unfit and discharged soldiers, which was taken from a return brought down on March 31 last, is made up as follows: Discharged in Canada, 26,658; returned and discharged, 11,917; discharged overseas, 1,478; a total of 43,053.

I should like to make also a brief statement of the number of men of military age available in Canada, exclusive of the 406,000 who have already enlisted. According to the census of 1911 and to the figures presented to the House yesterday by the Prime Minister, we have in Canada between the ages of 20 and 45, 760,453 single men and 823,098 married men, a total of 1,583,549. The following is a statement of male population according to age classifications in the Military Service Bill:

Age.	Single.	Married.	Total.
20-24	319,610	66,247	
25-29	205,125	165,369	
30-34	112,011	198,838	
35-39	68,144	189,731	
Total	704,890	620,185	1,325,075

Mr. CARROLL: Has the hon. gentleman any figures to show the number of men on duty and in training in Canada who are not of the Canadian Expeditionary Force?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Except the statement furnished in the House on the 15th of June, I have not any figures, but that statement shows the number of men in Canada to be 17,353. What strikes me from these two statements is, that we have ample power in Canada if we can utilize it, and the purpose of this Bill, if I understand it aright, is to utilize that manpower, not only for military purposes, but for all the necessary purposes in connection with the war.

I am going for a moment or two to discuss one or two sections of the Militia Act which seem to have given rise to some controversy in this House. I was always under the impression that under the Militia Act the Government could, in the case of an emergency, call out and send abroad to any quarter of the world all the manhood of Canada from eighteen to sixty years of age, simply upon an Order in Council and upon another condition that, if Parliament was not then in session, Parliament should be convened within fifteen days thereafter. I believe I was correct in that impression and that I am correct now. At the time of Confederation, at least in 1868, the law was that all the male population from eighteen to sixty years of age could thus be called out. I remember when the amendment to that Act was before the House in 1904 and the discussion that took place on that occasion. If my memory serves me aright, because I have not looked up the debate, on that occasion we added a clause especially relating to service of Canadians abroad on the order of the Governor in Council, and we placed in the statute that condition that Parliament must be convened within fifteen days after any such order was issued. That section, which is section 71 of the Militia Act and which is still in force in Canada, reads:

> Whenever the Governor in Council places the militia, or any part thereof, on active service, if Parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of Parliament within fifteen days, and Parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit and act in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

The reference in the section is to 4 Ed. VII, chapter 23, section 71. That section was placed in the Militia Act of Canada when my right hon. leader was the head of the Government and I, one of his humble supporters. That law has remained in force ever since, and if my memory serves me aright, when the Naval Service Bill was before the House in 1910, a special section was inserted in that Bill and the defence of the section by those who approved it, when it was attacked by those who objected to it, was that they had inserted the precise language of the Militia Act in the Naval Service Bill. I am prepared to stand by that section at the present time. So far as the conscription of men is concerned, there is wider and more drastic power in the Militia Act of Canada passed in 1868 and amended in 1904 than there is in the Military Service Bill now before this House. The only objection I have to that power is that it is too drastic. The Governor General, on the advice of his Cabinet, could, under that Act, call out the whole male population of Canada between eighteen and sixty years of age and could send them overseas, but I doubt very much if he could call them out for any other purpose than military service. It might be possible that, under the guise of the term "Military Service," men might be employed in the mines, or railroads, or other industries of that description, but the meaning of the law is that those who are called out shall be utilized for military purposes. That power is on the statute book, and it is a power that the Government can utilize to-day. What is the objection to the old Militia Act? Simply that we want to avoid conscripting men for a single purpose. We want to provide that every purpose pertaining to the war shall be supplied, and, to my mind, that is the chief feature in this Military Service Bill. We have been told by parliamentarians, by the press of the country, from the pulpit and at almost any meeting one can go to in any city, town, or village, that one of the first duties of this country is to produce foodstuffs. The farmers have been told, through their farm newspapers and through the general press; it has been dinned into everybody's ears, and everyone in this House knows that one of the great demands in this country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to-day is for agricultural labour. The men from the townships of Ontario have not volunteered in

the same proportion as men from the cities, but I can speak best of the county of South Wellington, whence I come, and I know that not only in South Wellington, but in North Wellington every township is well represented in the infantry battalions and batteries at the front. They have contributed their full share, and what is the result? On every hand we hear the cry for hired help. Last week I returned home, and a man of thirty years of age, with 250 acres of land and 80 head of fine cattle, but with no hired help, said to me: "What has conscription to do for me? Is conscription going to take me?" I said: "No." He named in the county of Halton a farmer with two sons who owned 100 acres of land, and my suggestion would be: Might not conscription bring one of these sons from the small farm to the man who had 250 acres and no hired help?

Mr. NESBITT: Where does the Bill provide for that?

Mr. GUTHRIE: In the selective feature. At least I have so argued and so understood. If men who enroll for service under the Military Service law are better adapted for agricultural service than for military service, agricultural service is what they will be put to.

Mr. NESBITT: That is not provided for in the Bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then that is a detail that should be remedied, but I understand that is the real purport of the Bill, and I have told some of my agricultural friends that in so many words. I do not believe you can get another man to-day from the farms of western Ontario without injuring the production which we say is only second in regard to our necessities for the war—men at the front coming first and production second. That is one reason why I prefer the Military Service Bill to the present Militia Act.

I believe there is a large number of men available in the cities and towns and villages of Canada who cannot be reached except by this Bill. I have probably addressed more recruiting and Patriotic Fund meetings in the province of Ontario than any other member of the House, except perhaps the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and any one who has tried as hard as I have must have come to the conclusion that the men whom you want to reach are the very ones who do not attend recruiting meetings. At one town in western Ontario somewhat of a joke was perpetrated not long ago. A recruiting meeting at the market house was to be addressed by a sergeant from the lower provinces. He was an excellent speaker, but as there were hardly any men present the meeting was adjourned, and the recruiting sergeant received permission from the manager of the picture show at the other end of the town to make his speech there. Many of the men at the theatre felt quite insulted and complained to the manager that if such a thing ever occurred again they would no longer patronize his show. The fact is, the men you want to enroll do not attend the recruiting meetings. I am speaking only of the places I know best, and am not referring to other parts of Canada at all. I am sure that if this Bill is passed a great many men now in Guelph will go to the front and probably volunteer before conscription comes in. I look in the banks and see able-bodied male clerks doing women's work. I see them also in the dry goods and retail stores, in the counting houses and a dozen other places where female labour could easily do the work. These men cannot be aroused to enlist either by personal interview or by speeches at meetings. I think there is no way of getting them unless by some measure of force. The city of Guelph with a population of 18,000, has given almost 10 per cent of her population, or about 1,700 men. That is a pretty good showing for a town of that size, but there are still 300 or 400 more men in that city who could be reached by a measure of this kind, and who will not come forward unless compulsion is used. I suppose conditions are much the same in other cities throughout Canada

I much prefer this Bill to the Militia Act. I am in favour of it because, for one reason, it will enable every necessary branch of labour to be supplied. In this connection I wish to refer to a circular which I think has been sent to every member of the House from the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, dated June 11, 1917. This circular comes from a body of men for whom I have the highest respect and regard. During the seventeen years I have sat in the House there have been very few occasions upon which I have not been able to see eye to eye with the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. I believe that union labour in Canada represents an exceedingly valuable body of our population. Not only are they good workers, but clear

and level-headed men of good judgment and common sense. Sometimes they make mistakes as other people do, and I believe that in this circular they are labouring under some misapprehension. There is not a great deal of difference between the Trades and Labour Congress and myself in regard to this circular; in fact, we are very close together except on one point. One paragraph of the circular says, under the heading of Conscription:

> On December 27th, 1916, Premier Borden informed the executive of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, that if conscription should prove the only effective method to preserve the existence of the State and of the institutions and liberties which we enjoy, I should not hesitate to act accordingly.

The Trades and Labour Congress followed that up with this clause of their own:

> We are positively of the opinion that this situation has not arrived.

With that statement I certainly take issue. The next paragraph says:

> The necessities for the effective conduct of the war are food, munitions, shipping, and military man power, and Canada is geographically well situated to supply the first named three essentials, and can do much to assist in winning the war by developing her production in these essentials to her fullest extent.

The only exception I take to that is the order in which the necessities are put. They have put last what I would put first, namely, military man power. I would entirely agree with them if the order were reversed thus: military man power, food, munitions and shipping. I entirely disagree with them when they say that the time has not arrived, and I believe that when the Trades and Labour Congress thoroughly understand the situation they will see that I am right and they are wrong. If I were simply to endorse their statement—and that is their statement—they would have mighty little respect for me and I would have mighty little respect for myself. Union labour in this country has furnished our forces with a tremendous number of men. It is entitled to very great credit for what it has done to back up our men at the front and our war operations generally. But we have now evidently reached a line of cleavage, and upon this question I and my friends of the Trades and Labour Congress do not agree. I believe that the time has come for putting a Military Service Bill into force; the Trades and Labour Congress take the opposite view, that the time has not yet arrived.

There is another organization with which I have not so much sympathy, known as the British Columbia Federation of Labour, and another organization known as the Social-Democratic Party of Canada. The British Columbia Federation of Labour went on record as being opposed to conscription on the general proposition that:

> Military or industrial conscription is the imposition of a form of servitude which is obnoxious to a so called free people.

I do not think it is worth while taking up the time of the House discussing propositions of that kind. So far as the Social-Democratic party in this country is concerned I take no interest in it. I do not think it is helpful in any way. I desire to say a few words in regard to the amendment moved by my right hon. friend and leader that the opinion of the people should be taken with regard to this Bill upon a referendum.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 84, to incorporate The Canadian Divisions of the Aerial League of the British Empire.—Sir Herbert Ames.

Bill No. 86, respecting The Western Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Schaffner.

Bill No. 88, for the relief of George Maisey.—Mr. Wilcox.

Bill No. 89, for the relief of Herbert Featherstone Conover.—Mr. Henderson.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Sir Robert Borden for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, resumed.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (resuming): Mr. Speaker, just before six o'clock, I was endeavouring to discuss some of the selective features of the Militia Bill which is now before the House. My attention was called during the adjournment to some of the language which I used, and on further examination of the Bill, I concluded that perhaps my language in regard to agricultural labour was broader than the terms of the Bill would warrant. I notice that the Bill in its preamble mentions the question of agricultural labour and says:

And whereas, by reason of the large number of men who have already left agricultural and industrial pursuits in Canada to join such Expeditionary Force as volunteers, and of the necessity of sustaining under such conditions the productivity of the Dominion, it is expedient to secure the men still required, not by ballot as provided in the Militia Act, but by selective draft.

Then on referring to section 11 of the Bill I find it provides that:

An application may be made, by or in respect of any man in the class or subclass called out by such proclamation to a local tribunal established in the province in which such man ordinarily resides, for a certificate of exemption on any of the following grounds:—

(a) That it is expedient in the national interest that the man should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he is habitually engaged;

(b) That it is expedient in the national interest that the man should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he wishes to be engaged and for which he has special qualifications.

I must say that on reading this section again, the language I used before adjournment at six o'clock seems to be rather too broad. My understanding of the Bill at that time was that, under the selective system, a board would have power to supply agricultural labour just to the same extent as it would have power to tell a man to serve in the military forces. On reading the Act more carefully, I find that this exemption is to be granted only at the request of the man himself. I think that is a detail of the Bill which may well be looked into, and amended, if necessary, when we come to the committee stage. In every city, town and village in Ontario, farm labour has become scarce for two reasons: First, by reason of enlistment; and, secondly, by reason of the attractive wages paid by manufacturing companies during the present war, and particularly by munition factories. If a man, by making an application, can continue earning $4, $5 or $6 a day in a munition factory, he will not, as a matter of choice, return to the farm, although he is especially qualified to do farm work. I think the board having control of these matters should certainly be entitled to conscript that man's work, and have him engage in agricultural labour if he is not going forward for military purposes. That was my understanding of the Bill when I spoke, and if it is not the letter of the Bill, I think it should be made plain, because the farmers are suffering very gravely from the want of help from the two causes I have mentioned. I maintain that the farmer in the back concession of a back township who makes two blades of grass grow this year where but one grew last year, is doing a patriotic duty, and is serving his country to the utmost of his capacity. That man needs help and should be helped, and there should be something in this Bill to supply him with labour ordinarily called agricultural labour, which has flocked to the cities, towns and villages, where manufacturing industries pay much higher wages than are paid in the country. This is the sacrifice the individual will have to make.

There are other great lines of industry that may have to be helped also. I doubt very much if you will get very many men from the transportation companies or from shipping companies. I hear on every hand that men are becoming scarcer and scarcer upon the railways, and that great difficulty will be experienced this year in securing crews for both lake and ocean shipping. It may be that, for transportation purposes, men may have to be taken from other callings, and I think that the board dealing with these matters should be given power under this Act to arrange to furnish a supply of labour for transportation and shipping companies. There is, of course, a great deal of necessary and essential labour that must be performed in Canada. We are dependent for our food, our raiment, and our shelter, and need a tremendous number of men, whose services will be required for the production of articles required for consumption in Canada alone. Notwithstanding that, there are so many industries in Canada to-day that are producing what at any time we would call luxuries, in addition to the men whom I mentioned earlier in my address, that I have no doubt the classes enumerated in the first four section of this Bill will readily yield all the men that are necessary, and more, within the present year at all events, for military purposes, and that the different industries which are essential to the proper carrying on of the war may all likewise be supplied.

Now a word in regard to the amendment moved by my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon the question of a referendum. Upon this point I cannot agree with the view taken by my leader. I have never been favourable to the principle of referendum. I think it is antagonistic to our ideas of responsible Government. We are elected to this House by our electors to pass necessary legislation, to adopt necessary measures, according to the judgment and ability which we have, and if we make mistakes, if we blunder, if we do wrong, our responsibility is directly to our electors, who can

turn us out at the first ensuing general election.

If you adopt the principle of a referendum, you are going to find the Government of Canada in this position: that upon every difficult question the Government will adopt the referendum if, for no other purpose than to avoid any conflict of opinion in regard to itself. Our system is, and has always been, founded upon the doctrine of responsibility. The Government is responsible to Parliament and the people; and members of Parliament are responsible to the people, and if the people desire a change they have a right to make it. While it is said the system of referendum and of initiative and recall are more or less favoured, particularly in the Western States, and to some extent in the western provinces of Canada, I believe the constitutional method of dealing with the question is for Parliament to decide it, and the people then have the right to review our work at each general election. My right hon. leader took that course on more than one occasion, notably in 1911, on the reciprocity issue. He might have had a referendum on that question and continued to hold power, but I submit that would not have been constitutional and not good British parliamentary practice in that case, nor would it be good practice at the present time. I remember also, when the Navy debate took place in the House, in 1910, the question of referendum was brought up once more. My right hon. leader might have sheltered himself under the referendum, instead of allowing himself to be involved upon this question in the election of 1911. But he took the course a statesman would take, and said, "No, when the time comes we will appeal to the people," and he did appeal to the people, and on that and other issues was defeated. The Government takes its own course in these matters, and if blunders or mistakes are made the Government is responsible to the people. For that broad reason, I do not favour a referendum.

Then, again, I think, upon this question a referendum is entirely unnecessary. In my view of the matter, the first duty of the people, and the first duty of Parliament, is to defend their country. That is a natural duty, a natural right, one that we are bound to assume and perform. If we take our oath of loyalty, we assume that obligation. We require no mandate for the performance of a paramount duty.

Another objection is that, instead of threshing the question out in this House—

[Mr. Guthrie.]

and it is a difficult question—we would transfer the contest to the platforms of this country, where it would be a more difficult question and might cause very serious disturbance. There is no reason for referring it for decision to the electors. Why not, in a manly way, settle it ourselves? I believe also that it is not possible at the present time to have a fair referendum. I would never consent under any conditions to have a referendum which did not include the men who have volunteered and gone abroad in the service of the country. If my memory serves me, the total vote in the election of 1911 was about 1,200,000. When you consider that something over 400,000 have enlisted, that means that 33 per cent of your electorate is out of Canada. How are you going to take the vote of these men? It cannot be taken. When the Soldiers' Bill was introduced by the present Government I was suffering from illness and was not in the House, but I thought if ever a Government went the extreme length in trying to poll the soldier vote, it was the present Government. I did not believe at the time that the Government was serious, nor that they would poll that vote if they could. But apart from that, is it possible to take the soldiers vote, are you going to poll the vote of the men in France? Are you going to cease firing and pass the ballot boxes around? You must remember there are 136,000 loyal Canadians at the firing line. How are you going to take the soldiers' vote in England, where we have 28,000 troops at present, probably on their way to the front, and 80,000 in training, the balance being in hospitals and convalescent homes. Do you think that vote could be polled? What have you on this side of the water? You have a population which says, "We will not enlist." Do hon. gentlemen think that men who will not enlist will support a compulsion on referendum? The proposition would be defeated. The men who did not want to go to defend their country would vote against it. I do not think that would be a fair vote. I believe, if any one is entitled to vote on this question, it is the men who are overseas, and I see no way of fairly taking their votes without a tremendous expenditure of time, if it be possible to take it at all, I believe that is one fundamental reason for opposing a referendum upon this question. Never would I consent to have a slacker at home vote, and a man at the front be deprived of his vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: However, the difficulty can be overcome in another way. If you allow this Bill to pass without a referendum, you may consult the people afterwards, when the boys come home. You may then get some fair expression of opinion on the question, which I do not believe you can ever obtain until the war is over, and the boys return. A referendum to my mind would leave the decision of one of the most vital questions which has arisen in Canada to the very people who have neglected to volunteer, and to the parents of those who are so timid as not to permit their sons, who would otherwise volunteer, to enlist for service. I will never consent to have the question submitted to such an electorate.

These are, substantially, my reasons for opposing the amendment moved by my right hon. friend, and leader. He has referred to another question, which I will discuss very, very briefly; that is that this Parliament is in the nature of a moribund Parliament, or, as he described it, a rump Parliament, his contention being that, on that ground, this House should not deal with it.

I do not take that view of the matter. My view is that this Parliament is in every respect legally constituted. I do not think that I am telling any secrets or betraying any confidences when I say that in February, 1916, I was about the only man on this side of the House, except some members from the province of Quebec, who were opposed to the first extension of the term of Parliament. I thought that there should be no extension. I pointed out then to my friends: if you grant extension this year, what are you going to do next year, when the war may be more serious than ever? Last year we on this side of the House committed ourselves unanimously to the granting of an extension. Both Houses of Parliament agreed to the extension and the British Government, as our supreme authority, amended the British North America Act so as to extend the life of Parliament for one year. That extension was strictly constitutional; it did not limit our authority in any way. If anything, it was an enabling Act, to enable us to carry on our national affairs. It could not and did not restrict our rights; every Act that we could legally pass a year ago we can just as legally pass to-day. The Parliament of Canada sitting here to-day is legally constituted for all purposes and can deal with full power and authority with the Military Service Bill or with any other Bill which may be brought before it. The question is as to the wisdom or the propriety of any course that is proposed and not as to our constitutional right to pass this, that, or the other Bill.

I have noticed in the newspapers during this month the reports of many of the church congresses of Canada which usually meet in the month of June. I have read the report of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in Canada, representative of that church from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I have read the reports of the Methodist Conferences held in various parts of the Dominion; of the annual meetings of the Baptist church, and of various meetings of the Anglican Synods. Speaking generally, each of those church courts has passed almost unanimously motions in support of the present Military Service Bill. In some cases they have added that which I believe to be exceedingly important, namely, that wealth and other resources should likewise be conscripted; but in no case have I seen anything like a proposal for a referendum or a general election. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Robert Rogers) in the month of June, 1915, put his ear to the ground and heard murmurings and rumblings, which gradually increased to tones of thunder, and he told us that the people demanded an immediate election. I may tell the hon. gentleman that if he puts his ear to the ground now he will still hear murmurings and rumblings, growing louder and louder until they become like tones of thunder. They ask, however, not for a general election, but that we have no general election at the present time. A referendum on this question would be the equivalent to a general election, and to that I am opposed.

It is asked, is there any demand for a Conscription Bill of this kind? Apart from the church courts, the municipal bodies, and the boards of trade that have passed on the question, I do not know that there is any general demand among the people on the subject. We have read reports of meetings at Toronto and elsewhere, at which resolutions endorsing the principle of this Bill have been adopted, but I do not know that among the people themselves there has been any general demand for such legislation; in fact, I am inclined to believe that the demand has been the other way. I have received only a few letters on the subject, and none of them have been decided in

their expressions of opinion, and none of them have been signed. I think that there are a good many people who do not want to show their hands in regard to conscription. My suggestion would be that if we are to have a referendum on it, the people should vote as we vote in this Parliament, by standing up, or showing their hands. I would favour the old open vote, in order that we may know just where the people stand with regard to the referendum. I have not received any petitions against the proposal except the one directed to me by the Trades and Labour Council. But there certainly is an urgent call for men. Every man on this side of the House knows it; every man on the other side knows it. The question is, how are we going to get them? So far, nobody has told us; nobody has suggested how we shall get the necessary men—that is, aside from the adoption of this Bill or the enforcement of the Militia Act. I thought, perhaps, my right hon. friend and leader might make some suggestion, but he did not. Perhaps as the debate goes on some suggestion may come from somebody, but personally I see no way of getting more men unless we adopt some compulsory system.

There is a clause in the proposed measure which provides that the legislation shall come into force upon the proclamation of the Governor General in Council. Whether that is a wise proposal I do not know. I would prefer that a definite date be fixed, say two or three months hence, rather than that the coming into force of the Act should be left altogether to the whim of the Government. If a date two or three months hence were fixed and the Bill were passed the result might have a good effect upon recruiting. There is no doubt that after the Prime Minister made his first statement in the House with regard to conscription, a larger number of recruits presented themselves at the various recruiting offices than had been the case for some time previously. I am sorry to say that the results of the presentation of recruits was not in all cases very satisfactory. In one case where 29 men presented themselves two days after the speech delivered by the Prime Minister the local board who examined them rejected 23 as medically unfit and accepted 6. Another board in another city passed upon the same 29 men on the following day and reversed the figures, accepting 23 and rejecting 6. The Prime Minister must safeguard this Bill in that respect. Local influences may and will be used; I am strongly opposed to the appointment of anything like local boards. It will not cost much to establish boards here and there in different places throughout the Dominion and move them from time to time so there may be no chance of partiality in their decisions. That is my only reason for mentioning this matter.

But, as I have said, the call throughout Canada and the world is for men. The call comes from every quarter; it comes from the men in the trenches and in the hospitals, from the returned soldiers and perhaps also from the dead. There is no doubt that the people of Canada are under the most solemn pledge that men or women could give to support the men who have gone into the trenches; we cannot avoid that responsibility whatever else we may avoid. I shall place on the records of this House a poem of noble thought and sublime inspiration which tells of that call from the dead. A young man, a school friend of mine, Jack McCrea, of Guelph, now as Captain John McCrea, serving at the front with a detachment from McGill University, is the author of this now celebrated poem. It was first published in Punch in London and was afterwards copied in many British, American and Canadian newspapers. One paper said it was perhaps as pure a bit of poetry as had ever been written in the English language. Another paper said that there was more direct appeal in the few lines than there would be in a volume of large dimensions. These lines, I believe, should be in every school-book in this country, and I read them that they may be printed in Hansard:

In Flanders' Fields.

In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place, and in the sky
The larks still bravely singing, fly,
Scarce heard amidst the guns below.
We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders' fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe,
To you from falling hands we throw
The torch,—be yours to hold it high;
If ye break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep though poppies grow
In Flanders' fields.

Surely, in those beautiful words, there is an appeal from the dead. There is a condition which we must meet soon, or it will not be very long before Canada is unrepresented at the front. I have my own ideas on this matter, and I am going to conclude by stating them.

Perhaps I stand by myself on this question, but for a long time I have been and

still am in favour of co-operation between the parties in this House, not only at the present moment, but as long as the war lasts. I favour coalition; I favour an extension of the term of Parliament, and I favour this Bill. I do not believe this Bill will be successfully put in force by a single political party; I fear it will not. We are all agreed that we must have men. I have read very carefully the correspondence which has passed between the Prime Minister and my right hon. friend and leader on the question of a coalition Government. To the ordinary mind, no insurmountable objection was presented in the correspondence, nothing that a little compromise could not overcome. We have certain facts before us, and we are all agreed on them. On the one hand we have on the statute book now a Militia Act which can be enforced at any time and which is more stringent in its terms than the present Military Service Bill. On the other hand, we have the Military Service Bill providing for conscription on the principle of selection. If I read the correspondence aright, the leaders of the parties in this House could not come together on the single question of conscription. As I have said, I do not consider that an insurmountable objection; I believe if the two leaders really intended to agree, they could agree upon this question. There must be some give and take, some compromise in such a matter. Why not have a consolidation of the two Bills, leaving the Canada Militia Act practically as it stands, but adding to it the selective clauses of the present measure? Conscriptive legislation is on the statute book now; we are neither introducing nor passing it. It is there and has been since 1868. The selective clauses are new. I am quite satisfied that the Prime Minister has no thirst to hold on to power, and I am just as confident that on the part of my right hon. friend and leader that he has no keen desire to attain power. I believe both leaders are both absolutely sincere, but something which I think could be and should be overcome, stands between them. What an example it would be to the whole of this country if the two great political parties came together and settled their differences. I do not mean past disputes; I do not mean questions of the management or mismanagement of the war in the past three years; I mean that only from this time forward. If an agreement could be reached on the main question and nothing taken up save measures which pertain to the war, it would be a happy day for Canada. Then after the war, we can fight out our differences.

I cannot approve the suggestion of the Prime Minister, as set out in the correspondence, that a coalition should be formed; that this Bill should be passed, and then that an appeal be made to the people for a mandate. What we want to avoid is a general election, not to bring one on, what we should do is to come together and have the term of Parliament extended and carry this war to a successful conclusion, and then if the people condemn us, let them condemn us and turn us out. So long as we have done our duty, we need not fear. The time is not too late for the leaders to come together. This matter is so serious that I can scarcely put my thoughts into language. I know that in every corner of Canada the people would approve it if our leaders came together. This Bill, if it is passed, is going to get us nowhere; no one party will be able to enforce it successfully; it will cause strife and discord in many parts of Canada. Perhaps if some of those less prominent members on either side of the House were to take up the matter of coalition it might not be a bad thing. I believe that all the brains of this House of Commons are not to be found on the front benches of either party. Perhaps if a few of us back-benchers could sit down for half an hour or an hour, we might work out something feasible which our leaders might accept, but I most sincerely ask that negotiations be not concluded at the present time and that another effort may be made to secure coalition. I know there has in the past been a great deal said, particularly in the newspapers, which is hard to overlook; that insult has been heaped upon insult by the press of both parties. These things sting and smart; but when we are face to face with a fight to a finish, with a world conflict, when my leader's sentiments are that Canada is in this war "to the last ditch" and, some years ago "to the last man and the last dollar," and when these are also the sentiments of the Prime Minister, surely these worthy gentlemen can come together on this question, upon some ground acceptable to all Canadians.

If not, could not a committee be got together which might perform some useful services? There need be no quarrel over names in any coalition government; put it on the basis of the members of His Majesty's Privy Council in Canada. There are plenty

of able men of the Privy Council in this House well qualified for office. Let them get together and set about to win the war. When the war is won let us have a general election, and if the people do not approve the arrangement they can turn it out of power. That is my suggestion, and I make it as seriously as ever I spoke in my life.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): Mr. Speaker, first of all may I be allowed to congratulate my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) upon the very eloquent address which he has just delivered. It is the glorious privilege of Liberalism not merely to differ from Conservatism, but to be at times individualistic to the point of differing with its own friends. Although I admire the general form and tenor of my hon. friend's remarks, with many of his statements I am bound to take issue.

In discussing this question I intend to be moderate as usual, but to be firm also, because I believe this is the most complex problem that has ever been approached by the Canadian House of Commons since Confederation. Although it is distasteful in debates where there is such a sharp cleavage of opinion to have to produce a loyalty passport, I wish to say once for all that in taking the stand I intend to take on this Bill, I yield to no one in my loyalty to His Majesty the King. The hon. member for South Wellington spoke a moment ago of the oath of allegiance which the members of this House have taken, and of the danger to unity if this measure were brought direct before the people in the shape of a referendum. Let me remind my hon. friend that there is at the antipodes another British dominion called Australia, which is just as loyal and law-abiding as is Canada. In Australia a referendum was taken on this very question, and I think a greater service was rendered to the Empire in that way than if Mr. Hughes, Prime Minister of Australia, had forced his conscription measure on an unwilling electorate. Need I say that all of us, whether we are of the Conservative or of the Liberal party, whether we belong to the great province of Ontario or to the old province of Quebec, whether we are from the East or from the West, are united on the question of winning the war. We all are anxious to win the war, and win it as speedily as possible. In the year 1914 a pledge was given on behalf of Great Britain, by that great British statesman, the Hon. Herbert Asquith, then Prime Minister, in which, defining the issues before the British people, he used the following language:

If I am asked what we are fighting for I can reply in two sentences. In the first place to fulfill a solemn international obligation,—an obligation which if it had been entered into between private persons in the ordinary concerns of life would have been regarded as an obligation not only of law but of honour which no self-respecting man could possibly have repudiated. I say secondly, we are fighting to vindicate the principle which in these days when material force sometimes seems to be the dominating influence and factor in the development of mankind, that small nationalities are not to be crushed in defiance of international good-faith by the arbitrary will of a strong and overmastering power.

The reasons Mr. Asquith gave at the beginning of the war why Great Britain came into this stupendous struggle hold good to-day, and the Canadian people, whether they belong to the French-speaking or English-speaking nationalities, stand and abide by those lofty principles. Canada sided cheerfully with Great Britain and the Allies, and I maintain that all the war measures that have been presented by the Government since August, 1914, have received practically the unanimous consent of the House. It was furthermore stated over and over again that in all these matters we would act constitutionally, that our aid to Great Britain and the Empire would and should be voluntary; and our aid has been voluntary.

Let me tell my hon. friend from South Wellington that I personally have as much at stake in this war as he has. I am one of those who have given up an only son to fight the battle of liberty. At the age of 18 he left the University classroom to fight for his King and country, but he went with unfaltering steps to fight as a volunteer, not as conscript; the two things are quite different. Perhaps it is because I have French blood in my veins, but I make quite a distinction between voluntarily offering to fight and fighting under compulsion. That is the essential difference between my hon. friend and myself, and it is quite a difference, I am free to admit. If the cause is great and noble, let us concede at once like men and patriots that Canada has done wonderfully well since the beginning of the war. She has done as nobly as any country of her size and population could have done under similar circumstances. A few comparisons, actual and historical as well, may be useful. The effort of Canada in this war is not to be compared with that of Great Britain or France as regards numbers, because you cannot apply the law of averages as between a country with a population of 7,000,000 and countries with a population running from 35,000,000 to 50,-

000,000. We have heard about compulsory service being adopted by the United States of America, and of the armies which that country is going to levy in this war. Have you ever thought, Mr. Speaker, of applying the law of averages as between the effort of Canada and the effort which the United States of America are going to make? I do not think our population at the present time amounts to 8,000,000, but placing it at that figure, and the population of the United States at 112,000,000, which are the latest figures I have seen in the American press, I find that Canadian troops are equivalent to American troops in the following proportions, according to population:

Canadian troops.		American troops.
80,000	Equal to	1,120,000
160,000		2,240,000
320,000		4,480,000
400,000		5,600,000

Sir, I am not afraid to compare the potential effort of the United States and that of Canada. Let me give the evidence of a gentleman whom we know well, the ex-President of the United States, Mr. Taft, who spends his summers at Murray Bay, in the province of Quebec, and he is none the worse for that. Mr. Taft, speaking the other day at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections on the subject of "International Adjustment After the War," declared that:—

> The United States would have to put billions of money and millions of men into the struggle.

Mr. Taft paid a splendid tribute to the patriotism of the British colonies.

> Canada alone has sent about 400,000 to Europe out of a population of not more than 7,000,000. If we are to do our part in the same proportion we must send not less than 6,000,000 to the front.

That is the true test as between what has been done by Canada and what should be done by the United States of America.

But let me pass from actual to historical comparisons. If I had time I could, by quoting history, memoirs and statistics, establish that Napoleon Bonaparte, in France, during the First Republic, during the First Empire, and until after Waterloo, never used, under the power of conscription, more than four per cent of the available population of France, while we in Canada, with less than 8,000,000 people, have raised through the voluntary system more than five per cent of the total population. With reference to the conscription system under Napoleon, let me remind you that in 1800 the population of the French Republic was 33,111,000. During the Consulate 210,000 men only were raised in France from 1800 to 1803. During the most successful years of the First Empire, under Napoleon Bonaparte, from 1804 to 1809, there were 746,000 men raised by conscription out of a population of nearly 35,000,000. During that period we know that, unfortunately, the most sanguinary battles were fought—Montebello, Marengo, Hohenlinden, Elchingen, Austerlitz, Saalfeld, Jena, Auerstadt, Eylau, Friedland, Abensberg, Eckmuhl, Essling, and Wagram. And these campaigns: Marengo, Ulm, Jena, Peninsula, and Wagram.

From 1808 to 1812, during the decline of the Empire, through conscription, 517,000 soldiers were levied in France. In 1812 the population of France was 45,700,000, making the percentage of the population serving under conscription one and one-quarter per cent during the three-year period. Under those circumstances, and in view of the comparisons I have given, may I not say that the effort of Canada has been noble, generous, ample, and that before adding through conscription to the numbers she has already sent to the front, it is only just and fair that we should at least pause and consult the people.

9 p.m.

I listened with great attention to the very eloquent speech delivered by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) yesterday and also to the speech of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) this afternoon on the interpretation to be given to these words contained in section 69 of the Militia Act "beyond Canada" and "for the defence thereof." Let me read the section, because I believe my hon. friend from South Wellington was in error when he argued that the principal change at the time of the revision of the Militia Act in 1904 was made in section 71. There were three chief modifications of the Militia Act as brought down by the late Sir Frederick Borden in 1904. The first was one concerning the commanding officer of the Canadian militia. Until the year 1904 the command of the militia had to be given to a British officer, whilst since 1904 the command can be given to a Canadian military officer. The other change has regard to the raising of the militia of Canada in times of emergency to be sent without the country. The change made in that clause consists in the addition of the words "for the defence thereof." Let me read that section:

The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof—

These words were added. They were not in the old statute. They were added for a reason which I shall explain in a moment.

—for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

The third modification was made by section 71, and it has reference to the calling of Parliament. It reads as follows:

Whenever the Governor in Council places the militia, or any part thereof, on active service, if Parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of Parliament within fifteen days, and Parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit and act in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

Nobody takes exception to that very wise clause having been inserted in the Militia Act. It is not in question, at all events. The only point at issue is whether or not we should give to section 69 of the Militia Act the interpretation which was given yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the hon. member for South Wellington. Before the enactment of section 69, there was nothing in the Canadian statute which indicated clearly whether Canada, or the Parliament of Canada, had the right to send troops abroad for the defence of Canada or for the defence of the Empire, if you please. The question was debated at considerable length during the session of 1904.

I am rather surprised that the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and my friend for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) should not have read over again the debate which took place on that occasion. They might have found enlightenment; they might have discovered that the words "for the defence thereof" were embalmed in that section in order to clear a situation which heretofore had been obscure. Let me refer to the father of the law itself, let me refer to the ipsissima verba of Sir Frederick Borden when explaining the clause which was numbered 77, I think, as the Bill was introduced. I quote from the debate:

Mr. W. A. Maclean: Am I to understand that clause 77, (now clause 69) limits the Canadian militia in their service outside of Canada to the defence of Canada?

Sir Frederick Borden: Yes.

Mr. Maclean: Not for the defence of the Empire?

Sir Frederick Borden: No.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. Maclean: Then the active militia of Canada under this proposed Act could not be sent outside this country by the Government to take part in the defence of the Empire except under a special contract as in the case of the troops sent to South Africa?

Sir Frederick Borden: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I could proceed and quote column after column of Hansard on the same subject.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: My hon. friend appears to have read that debate. Does he not know that Sir Frederick Borden said over and over again that the change he proposed to make made no difference in the law as it then stood?

Mr. LEMIEUX: On the contrary, he said that he had consulted the Imperial authorities, that he had scanned the legislation of all the various provinces before Confederation, but that he found that in none of the statute-books was there a constitutional obligation for those provinces to send their soldiers outside of their own territory.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: At the same time he also said that it made no change whatever in the law as it stood prior to that amendment.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: That is correct, he said that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And what he said was true, as there was nothing in the statute before this amendment providing for the sending of our troops outside of our territory except for the defence of that very territory.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Why does my hon. friend base any argument on the change made in 1904?

Mr. LEMIEUX: He made the statute clearer. There were many people, as the debate will show, for instance my hon. friend's leader, the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes), the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), and the late Mr. Gourley, who contended with very great vigour that of course we could send our troops to any part of the world the moment the Empire was at war. Sir Frederick Borden said: No, you cannot do that under our law, but because there is an impression that that may be done, I shall make the law clear. I have consulted the authorities in London and they have agreed to that modification.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The Minister of Justice said, yes, they could.

Mr. HAZEN: What did Sir Charles Fitzpatrick say on the subject?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have not his words here, but Sir Charles Fitzpatrick would not have said otherwise than did the statute, which is very clear. Besides, Sir Frederick Borden was very emphatic. Here are his words in answer to the late Mr. Barker who was playing the part of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), out-Heroding Herod:

> The hon. gentleman has asked with an affectation of much anxiety, what the world will think, and what the rest of the British Empire will think of Canada—though I have told him over and over again that upon the Statute-book of every colony of the British Empire is to be found precisely the same provision as he is now criticising. And, Sir, upon the Statute-book of the Mother Country herself, the hon. gentleman will find this section 12, part 3 (presumably of the Army Act) "any part of the militia shall be liable to serve in any part of the United Kingdom; but no part of the militia shall be carried or ordered to go out of the United Kingdom."

So that in every British colony, in every province before Confederation, even in the Mother Country, militia troops could not be dispatched outside of the territory except for the defence of the territory itself. That case is made abundantly clear. And, Mr. Speaker, why should we be discussing this point? Has not the Prime Minister himself, as was made so evident yesterday by the dispatch read by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, admitted the force of the view taken by Sir Frederick Borden as he introduced that legislation in 1904? He said through the Governor General to the home Government that Canada contemplated aiding the Mother Country in that great struggle, but that, unfortunately, they were handicapped as to their right to dispatch troops outside of our own territory. As a result, Sir, an Order in Council was passed at the request of this Government by the Imperial authorities incorporating our troops into the Imperial army. This fact is unchallenged, and I do not see the object of discussing whether or not constitutionally we have a right to send our men outside of Canada except for the defence of our own country. I do not say that Canada will not, I do not say that Canada may not, but that Canada must, makes in my opinion, all the difference in the world.

Sir, on this grave issue I stand upon the bedrock of our constitution, and I claim that England has accepted the Canadian contention that there is no constitutional obligation upon us to take part in wars outside of Canada, except for the defence of our territory. I am proud to say that we have taken part in this stupendous struggle for liberty, but it is on the principle of the voluntary system, and it is on that principle that I, as a Canadian, desire that Canada shall continue to the end to be with the Allies. I may say at once to the father confessor of the Tory party, my good friend, the Solicitor General, that I am opposed to compulsory service, and I do not understand his anxiety in asking every member on this side of the House to state whether he will support conscription or be against it, if a referendum be submitted. I say to him that conscription for Canada is the Milner system—the autocratic system.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Every man in this free British country has a right to his own opinions, and has as much right to be against the compulsory system as has the Quaker, the Mennonite, aye, as much right to his opinion as Sir John Simon, Mr. John Morley. No one either will question my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) the right to his opinion in favour of the compulsory system.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am opposed to compulsory service, and why? We have entered this war on the principle of voluntary service, and the pledge of the Government to that effect is positive, direct and binding. The honour of Canada, the honour of the Government are at stake. The Prime Minister and his colleagues, from the highest to the humblest, have repeated, from one end of the country to the other, the statement that there would be no conscription in Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They have repeated it in public meetings, on every platform; they have repeated it here time and again before the assembled Parliament. I need not quote the pledges of the Prime Minister, as he will not deny them. Shall I say, Sir, that when the National Service cards were issued, the Prime Minister authorized some of his colleagues to declare that the people might sign those cards as they did not mean compulsory service. I say to him that he has authorized some of his colleagues to make that declaration to the Archbishop of Montreal, who issued a letter, inviting the faithful of Montreal to sign the National Service cards, because, he had the assurance that they did not mean compulsory service. He distinctly accepted

the pledge and the word of honour of the Government that there would be no compulsory service. In what position to-day is that dignitary of the Church?

Mr. MURPHY: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) stated in the county of Dorchester, to his electors a few weeks ago, that there would be no conscription. The members of Parliament who took part in that contest heard his statement. He was elected on the strength of that pledge, and the paper which speaks for the Conservative party in Quebec, L'Evénement, the organ of my hon. friend (Mr. Sévigny) stated most positively that there would be no conscription. Let me translate one of the last articles published by that paper before polling day. I forget the date, but the words are as follows:

The heading of the article is:

"Un tiens vaut mieux que deux tu l'auras."

The only translation I can make of that old adage is: "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." The article proceeds:

The electors of Dorchester are now well notified. They know that they will never have conscription from the Conservative party. They do not know what they will have from a Liberal government, the party of conscription.

And, Sir, on the 26th January, 1917, whilst that election was raging, the following article appeared in that same paper:

If the Borden Government had been in favour of conscription, conscription would have been decreed, but the Government have declared that they will not have conscription. that they do not desire to have it, as they can organize up the defence of Canada without having recourse to conscription. If the electors of Dorchester were to elect a Liberal member, and that conscription would come afterwards, they then could not complain, they would have been notified. They know what they will have from a Conservative government. They do not know what they will have from a Liberal government. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. That is the wisdom of the nation which thus speaketh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: So that, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, his colleagues and the latest addition in the Cabinet, my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue and his organ in Quebec, all pledged the honour of the Government that there would be no conscription through the Tory party, but on the contrary they announced that conscription would come through the Liberal party. Mr. Speaker, that is not all. I could read many other speeches which have been delivered by members of that party. This is however too serious a question to revel in personalities. What I want to convey to the House is this: since the war has commenced I have addressed meeting after meeting in the province of Quebec, in the district of Montreal, and in the province of Ontario. I have addressed at least a dozen meetings with the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, appealing to our fellow countrymen in the great cause for which we are fighting at the present time, and I am surprised to hear the very ungenerous reflection which has been cast on the attitude of the right hon. gentleman since the beginning of the war.

Mr. MURPHY: Surprised?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, because at least I should expect justice from him. Is it not a fact that the right hon. gentleman has, from the very inception of the war, on many, many occasions addressed his fellow countrymen in the province of Quebec, in order to stimulate their zeal in the great cause that we are fighting for to-day? I know that my hon. friend cannot deny this assertion. I, personally, addressed meeting after meeting in my riding of Rouville, in the district of Montreal, in the province of Quebec generally, in Ontario and also in the Eastern Townships. On every occasion, basing my statements on the pledges given by the Government, I told my electors and my fellow-countrymen that the aid which Canada was giving to the Mother Country was purely voluntary; that the people of Canada would never be required to serve the Mother Country under compulsion. Sir, if to-day I were to support a measure of compulsory service I should be a deceiver of my fellow-men. I and my friends around me are not afraid to swim against the current. We are quite ready to take an unpopular stand for the sake of a princiunpopular stand for the sake of a principle. We did this in 1909, in 1910 and in 1911.

Mr. SEVIGNY: Does my hon. friend say that the course which he is now taking is unpopular in the province of Quebec?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not say that, but I do say that public opinion in the province of Quebec is a respectable and above all a constitutional opinion. Since my hon. friend interrupts me, let me quote for his benefit what the Manchester Guardian said on this very question a few days ago. My hon. friend knows that the Manchester Guardian is the

leading organ of radical opinion in Great Britain; in my humble judgment, it is the most honest and most respectable of all the papers published in Great Britain. I can safely say this, as Lord Northcliffe has not yet reached Ottawa. The Manchester Guardian said:

A year ago conscription for Canada was agreed to be impossible. Various things have combined to remove some of the difficulties, but grave obstacles still stand in the way. When the National Service scheme was first launched, its director said conscription might lead to civil war.

A well informed paper!

That so soon afterwards it should be in fact proposed shows the striking effect on Canadian opinion of the entry of the United States into the war. Two courses are open to Sir Robert Borden—either to utilize the Militia Act to secure a large extension of the home forces—thus releasing other men for the front—or to put the issue of compulsion direct before the people. The latter method was adopted by Australia and though that Government failed of their aim, it is so clearly the more honest procedure that the Canadian Government is not likely to incur the odium of foregoing it.

May I not say to the Minister of Inland Revenue that after all the province of Quebec is not in such bad company when in the old country it finds such a supporter as the editor of the Manchester Guardian? It is true, Sir, that the larger proportion of the people of Quebec province are against compulsory service. But how does that happen? The leader of the Opposition gave a little bit of history yesterday; let me also refresh the memory of my hon. friend. He evidently forgets how that public opinion was nurtured in his native province, how it was hammered at meeting after meeting, through resolution after resolution, on platform after platform, by the very men who surround him, and of whom he was one of the leaders. My hon. friend has had the courage to confess that he was wrong. He was wrong, he says, because he was young—he was only thirty. I accept my hon. friend's admission that he was young at thirty and that he was wrong because he was so young! But what can we expect from him when, at fifty, he will have the illusion of being young, and will still be making mistakes? In 1911 we had to swim against the current. My hon. friend will admit that; we stood like men by our guns.

Mr. SEVIGNY: You did it in a very clever way.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend's cleverness is, of course, greater than mine, but I shall always prefer my own which, at least, is honest and logical, as compared with his. My hon. friend in 1911 paraded from one end of the province to the other, holding in his youthful hands the banner of the Nationalist party, on which were emblazoned the principles of that party. What were those principles? I call the attention especially of the member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) to the principles which he, above all others propagated in the Eastern Townships, in the counties of Northern Ontario and of Western Canada wherever there was a sprinkling of French Canadian electors to be seduced. These were the principles: First, no participation by Canada in Imperial wars outside her territory. Second, to spurn any attempt at recruiting for British troops. Third, to oppose the establishment in Canada of a naval school with the help and for the benefit of Imperial authorities. Fourth, control over our militia and our military colleges in time of war as in time of peace and for the defence of our territory exclusively. Fifth, refusal to grant leave of absence to any military officer in order that he may take part in any Imperial wars.

Mr. MURPHY: What was that second one, again?

Mr. LEMIEUX: To spurn—the word is so euphonic and does convey so much—any attempt at recruiting for British troops. My hon. friend propounded that principle in the province of Quebec, and the member for St. Antoine did more, he financed the Nationalist party to propagate it at that time. In 1911 I pledged my word of honour—and the right hon. leader of the Opposition and other Liberal members also pledged their word of honour—when bitterly and eloquently assailed by the hon. gentleman and his friends, that under our naval policy there would be no conscription. About half the province of Quebec followed the lead of the Nationalist orators, and half—perhaps a little more—followed the lead of my right hon. friend. Events have proved since that the right hon. gentleman was right, and that the other gentlemen were neither right nor honest.

Sir, I repeat that, if to-day I were to support a measure of conscription, I would be a deceiver. I would rather relinquish my privileges as a member of this House, in which I have sat for now nearly 21 years, than be a deceiver of my electors, of my province and of the people of Canada.

I am opposed to this military Service Bill because, before conscription of manpower, the least the Government should do is to enact a Bill for conscription of the

accumulated wealth in this country. There are shocking inequalities in the various taxation measures which have been voted by this House since the beginning of the war, and can we ignore the circumstance that the cost of living in this country is abnormally high to-day? The June report of the Department of Labour reveals the fact that the cost of living is still increasing. In retail prices of food, the cost of the weekly food budget, including some 30 staple foods, of the average workingman's family, rose from $10.37 to $11.82 during the month of May. Of this increase of $1.45, one-third occurred in meats, one-third in bread and flour, and one-quarter in potatoes. Rice, beans and sugar also showed some increases; cheese was a little higher, but milk and butter declined, although only slightly, whereas the increase is usually substantial. And no relief is in sight for the consumer. The present Bill is all risks for the poor and all immunities for the wealthy. It is said, and rightly so, that equality of protection carries with it equality of obligation of service. This is a fair principle. When the other day this measure was introduced by the Prime Minister, he said that he realized that the future of civilization and humanity was at stake and he added:

> All citizens are entitled to equal protection of the laws, and upon them is imposed an equal obligation. There can be no national unity unless this principle is accepted. I cannot bring myself to believe that any class or community will expect to assert for itself the right or the power to defy the law, and to set up for itself different standards from those which are applied to the people as a whole.

This is a fine doctrine, preached by the Prime Minister, but does it apply merely to man-power? Cannot accumulated wealth be called into the service of the nation? There is as much obligation on the well-to-do people of this country to give service to the Crown and to the country in this emergency as there is obligation of service on the part of the man on the street. By this Conscription Bill you confiscate the liberty of the subject, and yet by ignoring the accumulated wealth of the country, you release that wealth from the obligation it owes to the country in which it has been made. Not only does the Government, in this drastic measure, ignore in a friendly way the accumulated wealth of the country, but the Government, in the course of this session and of the preceding session, have practically created in Canada, on account of the war, what I will call a bonded aristocracy. The Minister of Finance, an able man—I agree with my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie)—yes, he is an able man to tax the poor, but a very unable man to tax the wealthy to their due proportion. He was forced to borrow money from the United States, the country with which a few years ago he would not truck nor trade. Finding, however, the financial market of the United States a little stiff, he came back to Canada and borrowed millions and hundreds of millions of dollars from the Canadian people. I am told that the great financial institutions, the large investors, the millionaires, have exchanged their securities for Canadian bonds, and for what reason? Because under the legislation passed by this Government, through this eminently able Minister of Finance, those bonds are exempt from all taxation, and thus of the remaining wealth little will be left to develop the resources of this country after the war. The Minister of Finance will have to come yet to an income tax, but the clippings will be very few on the coupons of the wealthy, as they will have been exchanged for war bonds of the Canadian Government. Again, I say that before enacting a law for the conscription of man-power, it is the duty of the Government to first enact a law for the conscription of accumulated wealth in Canada. If Brown, or Jones, or Smith must be conscripted as regards his blood, the least we can expect is that the plutocrats and the war profiteers should be conscripted as regards their accumulated wealth. I may be told by my hon. friends opposite that this is the language of a demagogue. I am no demagogue. My hon. friend (Sir Herbert Ames) nods his head as much as to say that I am a demagogue. I will give him the opinion of a Toronto paper, edited by a good Tory editor, a financial authority from Toronto, but with a conscience. This is from the Financial Post:—

> Not only are the taxless Government bonds likely to create a new aristocracy who will take their revenue from the nation and pay no share of it themselves, but, if other bonds and stocks are subject to heavy taxation, there will be direct discouragement to the upbuilding of that productive capacity so necessary to create the required national wealth. To-day there is a movement on the part of the millionaires—

The Ames, Holden and others.

> —to take their funds out of investments where they have a productive capacity and put them into Government issues where, for their lifetime they will be free from taxation.
>
> Their action may be due to patriotism; but if so they should be willing to subscribe and still pay their share of future tax burdens which it may be necessary for the country to impose. To prevent the sinking away in this

manner of immense blocks of wealth upon which the country may have no future call, provision should be made now that tax immunity apply only to holders of reasonable amounts of Government bonds, say up to $100,000.

The editor of the Financial Post is very modest; he is going to give them some leeway to the extent of $100,000. I thought there were no demagogues in the good sanctimonious Tory jingo party in Toronto. Sir, if it is the act of a demagogue to preach equality of taxation I confess I am in good company, with Adam Smith and Mr. Thiers, the greatest statesman, indeed the liberator of France after the Franco-Prussian war. Has the Government done anything to equalize taxation in this country since the war began. They started by adding 7 per cent to the general tariff, and by cutting away the British preference; that is what this party of super-loyalists did. Since then they have taxed a little here and a little there, but have never come whole-heartedly to the rescue of the poor consumer. I repeat that the issue to-day is not conscription of blood, and I call the attention of my hon. friend from St Antoine particularly to this—

Sir HERBERT AMES: Do you want to know what I think? I think that instead of wasting our time here we should send men to the front. Now call on me again.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend is very anxious to send other men to the front. Will he finance them as he financed the Nationalist party in 1911? Notwithstanding the assumed superiority of my hon. friend, I repeat that the issue before Canada to-day is not conscription of blood but the control of foodstuffs. Let us see what other countries have done as compared with Canada. It was only this afternoon that we heard of the appointment of a food controller in this country. The United States on the very first day of entering the war appointed Mr. Hoover as food controller. Great Britain in the very first year of the war established one fixed maximum price for foodstuffs, decided what unnecessary imports should be debarred to make room for essentials, established the eight hour day, a minimum wage, and equal pay for women workers; took control of all railroads on the basis of 1914 profits, also mines and other industries, prohibited landlords from raising rents, increased wages in proportion to the increased cost of living, confiscated exorbitant profits, established meatless days, forbade the making of fancy bread and pastry, jailed war profiteers and grafters. France established a moratorium for rents and mortages, fixed a maximum price for foodstuffs, established a minimum wage and an eight-hour work day, bought flour abroad and sold it to bakers at cost price, encouraged production by all possible means, took control of all industries, mines and railways, requisitioned all necessary war material and supplies, paying for them in Government bonds, established meatless days, forbade the making of fancy bread and pastry, confiscated exorbitant profits, jailed war profiteers and grafters.

The United States are following the same course. It was only to-day, think of it, after three years of war, that Canada appointed a food controller and only yesterday a fuel controller. In Canada, the great wheat-producing country of the world, we are paying 12 cents a pound for bread; France is paying 4 cents and England 5 cents a pound for bread made of wheat imported from Canada. That is where Canada stands after three years of war as compared with France, Great Britain and the United States. Yes, the duty, the pressing duty of the hour, is not the conscription of blood but the relief of the consumer, the control of food and the fixing of maximum prices.

Mr. NICKLE: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he considers that regulation of food prices should take priority over sending reinforcements to the thin lines of the Canadians in Flanders?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I put the case clearly —something which the Minister of Labour never does. I repeat to my hon. friend that the pressing duty of Canada at the present day and hour is not the conscription of blood for election purposes, but the control of food.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Mr. LEMIEUX: So far from being ashamed I repeat that at the present moment, when 400,000 men have been recruited under the voluntary system, when farms are being depleted—the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario stated only the other day that there was not one man available to every 100 acres of arable land in that province—when the cost of living is going sky high, the duty of Canada is not to conscript blood but to conscript wealth and to protect the consumer of this country.

Sir HERBERT AMES: What do you propose to do for the men at the front?

Mr. LEMIEUX: To keep the men on the farms of Canada so as to produce wheat and send them food, for one thing, and to equip them with munitions. That is what the Government themselves proposed to do not so very long ago. Only a few days before Judge Galt's report was published, the following notice was published in the newspapers of the United States.

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. Broughton, 112 W. Adams St., Chicago, Ill., Authorized Canadian Government Agent.

Raise High Priced Wheat on Fertile Canadian Soil.

Canada extends to you a hearty invitation to settle on her FREE Homestead lands of 160 acres each or secure some of the low priced lands in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. This year wheat is higher but Canadian land just as cheap, so the opportunity is more attractive than ever. Canada wants you to help feed the world by tilling some of her fertile soil land similar to that which during many years has averaged 20 to 45 bushels of wheat to the acre. Think of the money you can make with wheat around $2 a bushel and land so easy to get. Wonderful yields also of oats, barley and flax. Mixed farming in Western Canada is as profitable an industry as grain growing.

The Government this year is asking farmers to put increased acreage into grain. Military service is not compulsory in Canada, but there is a great demand for farm labour to replace the many young men who have volunteered for service. The climate is healthful and agreeable, railway facilities excellent, good schools and churches convenient. Write for literature as to reduced railway rates to Supt. of Immigration, Ottawa, Can., or to O. C. Rutledge, 301 East Genesee St., Syracuse, N.Y.; F. A. Harrison, 210 North Third St., Harrisburg, Pa.

You have my answer in that advertisement, published under the authority of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hear the Tories jeering and laughing. They are jeering and laughing not at me but at the Minister of the Interior, at their own Government and they may well afford to jeer and to laugh for have you ever heard of anything so ridiculous, so nonsensical? A few weeks ago that advertisement came out in hundreds of newspapers in the United States calling for 50,000 farm hands to replace the young Canadians who have gone to the front.

Mr. MURPHY: And they will not be conscripted?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The farm hands from the United States are assured that they will not be conscripted. And yet, a few days afterwards—I do not say for what motive but hon. gentlemen know it full well—they suddenly bring in a conscription measure. My hon. friend from South Wellington, speaking before dinner, thought that he detected something like a mobilization of the economic forces of the country in some of the sections of the Bill. But no, Mr. Speaker, it is an exclusive conscription of the blood of Canada whilst on the other hand 50,000 young men from the United states are invited to take the place of our kith and kin and against whom there will be no conscription measure applied.

Sir HERBERT AMES: May I—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Wait a moment. My hon. friend, I hope, will speak. Surely, he will not sleep as he did during the naval debate. My hon. friend, I know, takes exception to my language. Of course, I have no right to express my views; the Milnerized type of politician will not allow another man to honestly express his convictions. But I intend to boldly speak the language which I believe to be right.

Sir HERBERT AMES: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. LEMIEUX: My opposition of this Bill and the opposition of the province which my hon. friend (Sir Herbert Ames) represents just as much as I do—

Sir HERBERT AMES: I do.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —is based on old and respectable traditions. Quebec belongs to the minority and all minorities in the world are jealous of their constitutional rights. It is said that Quebec is always beside the mark, is not with the rest of Confederation on this or that issue. But let me, Sir, take an example from the United Kingdom. The Isle of Man, with a handful of population, has kept for centuries its constitutional rights. It has a Parliament and laws of its own. Wales has kept its schools, its language, and Mr. Lloyd George, the great rebel of the Boer War, has exacted that

the Welsh Fusiliers shall be sent to the front wearing a distinct national uniform. The Scotch have maintained their customs and their kilts, their language and their schools. So, for one who reads and observes, it becomes a truism that after all diversity is one of the elements of beauty. We in Quebec have our own laws, our own language, our own customs and we have for the constitution the jealous regard which is due to that enactment. The view taken by the sober people of Quebec, is that, according to the constitution of Canada, there is to be no conscription of blood for service abroad. For the defence of the territory, certainly, and that they have proven again and again from the time of the cession until now. The province of Quebec, while asking for a referendum on this question, is willing to loyally abide by the result.

The province of Quebec is not alone, Sir, in opposition to this drastic measure. Let us be frank and sincere with ourselves. The first rumblings against conscription came from the city of Winnipeg represented by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), then from Calgary, then from Vancouver, from Hamilton, from Toronto and from Ottawa. This afternoon my hon. friend from South Wellington cited the very severe language used by the Federation of Labour of British Columbia. I do not approve of that severity. The Federation of Labour of British Columbia ask that due consideration be given to their opposition and conclude by stating that

It is the intention to use all the forces at our command to resist conscription in any form.

The French Canadian race, to which I have the honour to belong, is a law-abiding race, and although it is practically a unit against conscription, yet it pleads for a referendum and it is ready to abide by the verdict of the majority, whilst the people of British Columbia, of English blood, mark my words, are ready to use all the force at their command to resist conscription in any form.

Let us now take the attitude of organized labour people in Canada:

We are positively of the opinion that this situation has not arrived.

That is to say a situation calling for conscription.

The necessities for the effective conduct of the war are: Food, munitions, shipping and military man power, and Canada is geographically well situated to supply the first named three essentials and can do much to assist in winning the war by developing her production of these essentials to her fullest extent.

We are strongly of the opinion that this is the best service that Canada, with her small population, can render. We declare ourselves as most emphatically opposed to the proposed conscription measure, and we urge the workers of Canada to oppose by every means in their power enactment of such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the French-Canadians in their meetings have protested against this measure of conscription being imposed by a rump, by a moribund, by an unrepresentative Parliament; but never in any of the meetings held by them protesting against this measure, has it been threatened that when the people shall have pronounced by a majority in favour of conscription, they favour conscription, they will resist it. On the contrary, the French-Canadians pledge their respect to the law.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I stated a moment ago that at the present moment the pressing question was not the conscription of blood but the mobilization of labour, the taxation of wealth, and the controlling of all food. Am I stating something extraordinary? Has it not been stated over and over again within my hearing by the hon. Minister of Finance? From one end of the country to the other his slogan has been: "Production, production, and production." And there are some goodly people from the wild and woolly West who claim that there was a slip of the tongue when he first uttered that slogan, that he did not say production, production, production, but that he said protection, protection, protection.

I am surprised to find in some papers published in Ontario, and generally in English-speaking Canada, reflections upon the loyalty of the French-Canadians because of this question of enlistment. It is said that up to the 30th of April there were in round figures 125,000 Anglo-Canadian born, 155,000 British born and only 14,100 French-Canadians who had enlisted. Mr. Speaker, I said last year at the Canadian Club here in Ottawa, basing my statements on the figures which had been given me by my friend the present Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp), that there were 17,000 French-Canadians enlisted in the various contingents that had gone overseas or were about to go. I see nothing in the incomplete information tabled in this House that would tend to alter my calculations in this regard. I say that since the beginning of the war several members have tried in vain to obtain from the Department of Militia and Defence a complete and detailed statement of the number

of French-Canadians who had enlisted, not only in the province of Quebec, but in the various units of the different provinces. I claim that we have enlisted 20,000 to 22,000 French-Canadians who are at the front or about to leave for the front. That is the information I have. I have some relatives at the front; I have lost one at the front; at Ypres I lost a nephew last year—and I happen to possess some information. Our regiments have been merged into larger units from other provinces; I will ask my hon. friends from the northern sections of Ontario, from western Canada which is represented by my friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and from the Maritime Provinces if it is not a fact that in every unit coming from these sections there is a large, yes, a generous sprinkling of French-Canadians within the ranks. So far we have been unable to get from the Minister of Militia and Defence the exact figures, but I assert, and I think my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) will not deny it, that there are at the front, or about to leave for the front, at least 20,000 to 22,000 French-Canadians.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. gentleman not think that those brave French-Canadians who have gone to the front should have the support of their compatriots in overwhelming numbers without waiting for any talk about referendums?

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend speaks the language of the Orange Sentinel. There is a sting in his question. I feel there is a sting in his question. Who has ever told my hon. friend that the French-Canadians were recreant to support the boys at the front?

Mr. MORPHY: It does not look like it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the hon. gentleman thinks that there can be a wave of enthusiasm in the province of Quebec in favour of recruiting with the methods that have been employed, he is sadly mistaken. I will explain to my hon. friend at once. A few days ago my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best) rose from his seat in this House and read a statement which had been published by the Orange Sentinel to the effect that the soldiers passing through the province of Quebec had been insulted, and that some of them had even been stoned at Rivière du Loup. Immediately the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), understanding the sinister meaning of that dastardly campaign, challenged the accusation and asked for an investigation, and this was immediately granted by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Edward Kemp). That story has circulated from one end of the country to the other; it has gone from one paper to the other; it has inflamed passions from one end of the country to the other, and my province has been branded by those papers as a province of shirkers, of slackers, of cowards! Is that not a fact?

Mr. MORPHY: Will the hon. gentleman permit another question?

Mr. LEMIEUX: And now an investigation has taken place presided over by a commission appointed by this Government. I have the report before me; it was laid on the table of the House the other day. It is a public document, and I challenge —no I will not challenge my hon. friend because he is fair—but I will challenge the editor of the Orange Sentinel to publish as prominently as he published the charge, the findings of the report. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to create enthusiasm when a whole province is vilified by proceedings of that character? Sir, we must trust each other, we must respect each other, respect not only our qualities—every race has its own qualities—but respect even our prejudices and our failings. That is how I have in my public career endeavoured to understand the British character. I have found failings, I have found shortcomings with that race, but on the whole I admire and respect the race. I believe as Clémenceau so well said last year when the British parliamentary delegation went from London to Paris, I believe that we ought to know each other, that we ought to understand each other, and thus by knowing and by understanding each other we would come to love each other.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Clemenceau added with some humour: "I expected you Englishmen from across the channel, yes, I awaited you, since endless centuries, since the days of Hastings and since the Black Prince." To my fellowmen of British extraction, may I not say: "We are awaiting you since the Plains of Abraham and since the battle of St. Foye. Why do you not trust us, as your fellowmen, as your partners, just as the British overseas have trusted the Boers, as they have trusted the Scotch and the Welsh, as they are about to trust the Irish, after so many years

of misunderstandings, contentions and miseries? ".

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Referring to the small number of French Canadians who have enlisted so far, I desire to quote from a very illuminative article on this subject published in the Montreal Star on Saturday last, comparing the quota of the British born with the English Canadians and the French Canadians in this war. The article reads as follows:

The British-born with their instantly-acting instinct of patriotism, enlisted at once. They constituted something like eighty-five per cent of the first contingent. This was not because they were more loyal than the rest of us when we all had time to think it out—it was merely because their patriotism was more instinctive and automatic. It took the Canadian-born a little longer to emerge from the miasmic fogs of pacifism; but they were presently marching into the gap bravely.

French Canada—with much the same mental attitude to begin with— was much slower in taking fire. Why? Largely because their instinctive patriotism had become wholly local. They were loyal to Canada alone. They were long divorced from France—first, by the conquest when they were deserted; next (let us remember in fairness) by the British demand that they cease to look to France which was then our enemy; next, by the Revolution and its subsequent war upon their cherished religion.

Mr. Speaker, you have in these well poised sentences the explanation of a peculiar psychology. There it is pointed out how it happens that, instinctively, the British-born were first to respond to the call; then the English Canadians and then the French Canadians.

I have said on many other occasions, and I repeat this evening, that recruiting is largely, if not wholly, carried on successfully in urban centres. The province of Ontario is dotted with industrial centres. In the province of Quebec, outside of Sherbrooke, Three Rivers. Sorel, Montreal and Quebec, we have few or little industrial centres. Quebec is a mostly rural province, and bear in mind that she gets no influx of immigration from the old country.

Mr. Speaker, I will with your leave complete the statement I have made to the House this evening in all frankness and sincerity. Sir, no effort worthy of the name has been made to intelligently recruit in the province of Quebec since the beginning of the war.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hon. gentlemen know that from the session of Parliament in 1914 I urged the Government to appoint General Lessard as recruiting agent. He is the best and most qualified officer, and a man in whose judgment and ability our people have all confidence. Yet, General Lessard was only appointed on the 29th March, 1917, and my hon. friends will be honest enough to grant that all that delay was due to some bickerings and quarrels which happened at the time of the Boer war between General Lessard and the Minister of Militia and Defence. Is that a motive which should have deferred the early appointment of General Lessard to promote recruiting in Quebec? Sir, we had another excellent officer, a veteran from South Africa, Colonel Pelletier, of Quebec, son of the late Lieutenant Governor, Sir Alphonse Pelletier. At the beginning of the war he was ignored and finally he was given his pension. There was in Montreal Colonel Roy, who was the district commanding officer. He knew our people, was trusted, and spoke the language of the majority. He was sent to British Columbia, and later on was pensioned and replaced by General Wilson of Montreal, who is a personal friend of mine, a gentleman, but who hardly speaks a word of French. I was chairman of the civilian committee of the Asselin regiment, and I must say, in all justice to my friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence, that he gave us, the French Canadians of Montreal, a most loyal support in the recruiting of that regiment. I thank him publicly to-day, as I thanked him publicly on many, many occasions previously. With the help received from his department, in less than two months, Major Asselin, who was very popular, who was exceedingly brilliant, succeeded in raising a regiment, but what happened? We founded great hopes on that regiment. We expected that it would be the nucleus of many similar regiments in the province of Quebec. It was even hinted that my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) would take a course at Kingston, in order to do as Major Asselin had done. What happened? Major Asselin's regiment was sent to Bermuda for several months. I do not blame the Government for that. There were military reasons, I suppose, for that action. Several other regiments have gone there. But what I and the people of Quebec resent is this: the regiment was transferred to a camp in Great Britain, I forget which camp, and, as soon as it reached Great Britain, the first order received by Major Asselin was that of the dislocation of his unit. It was divided

into several drafts and distributed amongst many regiments. The same fate happened to Colonel Piuze who raised a regiment in the district represented by my hon. friend the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). I know there are reasons for that and I do not blame the Government. But there is some pride in our people; they would have been glad to read of the Asselin regiment at the front as the Asselin regiment, just as they were proud to hear of the 22nd battalion at the front as the 22nd battalion. True it is that there may have been military reasons for disbanding the battalion, but it is to say the least most unfortunate that the Government did not see its way clear to do for the Asselin battalion what was done for the Irish Brigade that was raised in Montreal. Although that brigade had not the required numbers, its identity was maintained and it was given a tour in Ireland to arouse the people in that country as well as the Irish people in Canada to the necessities of the hour. That was wise policy on the part of the Government.

Mr. MURPHY: What has been done since with that brigade?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not know.

Mr. MURPHY: Neither do I.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY: Does the hon. member not know that the matter of which he complains was one of serious complaint also throughout western Ontario, because of units from the various counties there being broken up by reason of militia regulations and orders of the British War Office?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I quite understand that; I know it is a fact. But there is a distinction.

Mr. MORPHY: None whatever.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, there is, and my hon. friend is too fair not to admit it. The battalions from Ontario which were scattered amongst other units in Great Britain were composed of men speaking the English language. They could be understood by the Welsh and Irish Fusiliers, the Durhams and the Yorks, that were so jauntily mentioned this afternoon by the ex-Minister of Militia. But the men recruited by Major Asselin were young French-Canadians, mostly speaking only the French language. The battalion was sent to England, and there dislocated, the men being spread amongst various units where they did not understand the language; where they did not speak the language of their commanding officers. I will give my hon. friend another instance —and I hope that the member for Kingston will listen to me for a moment. This will give the House an idea of how something unfair may sometimes be done unwittingly. Last winter I was travelling from Quebec to Montreal. It was a bitterly cold evening. I was in a pullman car—although I am not a minister of the Crown, I sometimes travel in a pullman car. I noticed a young man, rather short and stocky, dressed in kilties. As I looked at him I said to myself: surely this is not a Highlander—yet he has the kilties, and a Scotch cap. As I looked at him he also looked at me, and then addressing him in French. I said: "Are you not a Scotchman?" He said: "No, I am Albert Martel, from Quebec." I said: "Under what guise are you travelling?" "Oh, well," he said, "I was in Ottawa; our regiment, which was being recruited by Colonel de Salaberry, was disbanded for certain reasons, and I offered my services to the Kingston Queen's Highlanders, which left a few weeks ago." What was the strength of that unit?

Mr. NICKLE: About 700.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As Martel was passing from the pullman to the first class coaches, I said: "Where are you going?" He answered: "To see my men." "Your men?" "Yes," he said, "I am recruiting in Quebec for the Queen's Highlanders; I will introduce you to 17 Highlanders from Sir Wilfrid Laurier's constituency. I am going to Ottawa—it is not the shortest way to Kingston —but I am going there with my men because Ottawa is dry and I want to spend a Sunday in that place." They came to Ottawa, and I saw alighting from the train the 18 kilties, fine, bright fellows, not one of them speaking a word of English. That is the first chapter of my little story.

A few days ago the bell was rung at my residence. A gentleman in kilts was ushered in. "Bonjour, monsieur; I am Lieutenant Martel." "Oh," I said, "the gentleman I met this winter. Are you still recruiting for the Queen's Highlanders?" "I have recruited," he answered, "101 men; they left a few weeks ago with a battalion made up of about 700 Scotchmen." "Did you not follow your men?" I asked. He answered: "No." Now there comes a blank in my story, but if the member for Kingston will come to me after the sitting I will tell him why Lieutenant Mar-

tel did not follow his men, though he promised the fathers and mothers of those French-Canadian Highlanders that he would follow them to England. Bear in mind that they were confided to his care, because he spoke their language, because he understood them, because they and their families had confidence in him. At the last moment, for reasons which I will give my hon. friend—and which I gave to the Minister of Justice the other day, who told me since that I had a very good case indeed—Martel did not go. The men who left with the Highlanders will never be accounted as French-Canadians from Quebec. Lieutenant Martel, who is in Ottawa, can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that 35 of his recruits do not speak a word of English; yet they are distributed among an English-speaking unit. I have faith in the Scotch. I love the Irish and I love the English, but I confess that I have a failing for the Scotch. These French-Canadians are in good company; I do not fear for them. But, Sir, do you not think that, in all fairness and in all justice, Lieutenant Albert Martel, who promised the fathers and mothers and relatives of these men that he would follow them to the last ditch, should have accompanied them when they marched off? I will not say why he did not accompany them.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Why do you not?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will not; I will tell the member for Kingston. The reason is stated in the letters that I sent the other day to the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. gentleman agree with the reasons given?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No.

Mr. MORPHY: You dissent from the reasons?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly, and I will appeal to the fairness of my hon. friend when I tell him the facts.

Mr. NICKLE: Unless my hon. friend thinks that on grounds of public policy those reasons should be kept secret, it might be just as well to remove this air of mystery. Perhaps I may be able to give him some information and enlightenment.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will tell my hon. friend. I will now unbosom myself to the House in all sincerity and in all honesty of purpose. I do not see in the Chamber any hon. gentleman representing a Toronto constituency.

If one of them were here, I would say this: What would he think if I, being Minister of Militia, or better still, if the Minister of Inland Revenue being promoted to be Minister of Militia, were to appoint as chief recruiting agent for the city of Toronto the Superior of the Jesuit Order? With all due respect for the Jesuits and for my hon. friends from Toronto, would the Superior of the Jesuit Order have any success in the cause of recruiting in Toronto or say in Guelph, Kingston or St. Thomas? The answer is only too obvious. What has happened in Montreal? As I stated the other day to Maréchal Joffre, the district and suburbs of Montreal are, outside of Paris and possibly Lyons in France, the largest French district in the world. The chief recruiting agent in Montreal, appointed by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes), is a personal friend of mine, but he is the pastor of St. James Methodist chuch. He is a Liberal in principle; he is a home-ruler also. I have spoken with him in his own church, and I was taunted by some of my Catholic friends that I had turned Methodist, but as I was preaching for recruiting purposes, I was easily absolved. But, in all fairness and common sense, is it reasonable to expect that a Superior of the Jesuits would meet with any success in recruiting in the city of Toronto, and is it to be expected that one of the ministers of the Methodist church would have any success in recruiting in a French and Catholic district like the district of Montreal? To put the question is to suggest the answer at once. That appointment was made, not for the purpose, I grant, of putting obstacles in the way of recruiting, but it was made all the same and there it is. I do not wish to impute motives to the ex-Minister of Militia.

Mr. ROGERS: Does he not get any English recruits in Montreal?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, he has some English recruits, but does my hon. friend think it was conducive to bringing in French recruits which he and his friends say they expected from the province of Quebec, to so appoint a Methodist minister in that large French and Catholic district? It is useless to play upon words. My hon. friend must be credited with common sense. He might have appointed a Jesuit as recruiting officer in St. Boniface, but he would not have appointed a Jesuit in the city of Winnipeg. The matter is too self evident; it seems, Sir, as if every obstacle were put in

the way of recruiting in the province of Quebec.

Mr. BOYCE: Does my hon. friend not know of the opposite case where, for instance, Ontario regiments have had their officers taken away from them and have been put under French-Canadian officers? If he does not, I can give him some instances.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is not the point at all. I am speaking of the recruiting work, of the appeals made to the laymen to join the ranks. Those appeals were made in the English language; the recruits were merged into English-speaking units. The moment a French-Canadian officer speaks the English language, if he retains his rank and receives no favour, I see no objection to him taking command of an English-speaking regiment. In Quebec and Montreal, there have been and there are cases where the chief officers are English-speaking, and no objection is taken, far from it.

Mr. BOYCE: French-speaking officers have been appointed in preference to English-speaking officers, and that has been done without objection in instances which I can quote to my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly. There is no objection when there is no preferment, when it is only a matter of course. I do not object to an English officer having precedence over a French-Canadian officer if his rank will command that precedence. What I am pointing out is this: In the district of Montreal, the chief recruiting officer, a personal friend of mine, a charming, enlightened and great speaker for those who understand him, was a pastor of the Methodist church. The Minister of Militia and Defence might have done better if he had appointed a gentleman whose language and whose ambient air would have been more congenial to the men to whom he was appealing.

I have only a few words to add and it is on this question of a referendum. I will then conclude. This is of all measures the most vital that has ever been introduced into this Parliament; it is a departure from all our traditions; it means the alienation of human liberty; Parliament, functus officio, unrepresentative, moribund, with more than 20 seats vacant, with a West under-represented, cannot and dare not attempt to legislate for the people of Canada under such circumstances. There is only one solution and that is a referendum. The referendum, it is true, is more familiar to Latin than to British countries, but it has been accepted in Switzerland for many years; it has been accepted in some of the states of the neighbouring Republic with a measure of success; it has been accepted by some of the western provinces; it is the law of the land in Australia and New Zealand, and we ourselves, sometimes refer matters of municipal government to the people before enacting them. The other day we received as our honored guest one of the foremost statemen of the world. I refer to the right hon. Arthur James Balfour, who represents, I believe, in the Empire and in the world, the most enlightened conservatism that I know of. His noble language, the other day, establishes that fact. He, a Conservative, asserted his belief, his faith in democracy and in democratic rule. On the question of tariff reform which, a few years ago, agitated public opinion in Great Britain, the position taken by Mr. Balfour, which is well worth the consideration of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) was as follows:

> The advantage of the referendum is this—that the issue is quite clear and quite precise. . . The referendum has an enormous advantage. It does not involve a general election; it does not involve all the personal bitterness inevitably involved in the 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. . . Nevertheless, I frankly say that without question tariff reform is a great change. I admit that this election, or any election perhaps—certainly this election—cannot be described as taken upon tariff reform simply; but I have not the least objection to submit the principles of tariff reform to referendum.

If Mr. Balfour was willing to break away from the traditions of England and take a referendum on such a purely theoretical question as tariff reform, surely we in Canada, can afford to take a referendum on the conscription of the yeomanry of this country. But Mr. Balfour is not alone of that view. Professor Dicey one of the highest authorities on constitutional government, has declared himself favourably on the principle of referendum in British affairs. Lecky, who is also one of the foremost authorities on the British Government and constitution, in "Democracy and Liberty" volume I, p. 287 and following presents a most elaborate argument in favour of the referendum. I have prepared a short synopsis of it. The referendum would prevent the placing of the essential elements of the constitution at the mercy of a simple majority

in a single Parliament—a majority perhaps composed of heterogeneous and discordant factions combined for a party purpose without the direct and deliberate assent of the people. It seems as those words of his were uttered on this very question and under the circumstances of to-day. The referendum would have the immense advantage of disentangling issues, separating the one great question from the many minor questions with which it may be mixed. Confused or blended issues are among the gravest political dangers of our time. Revolutionary and predatory measures are less likely to be carried on their merits because their purposes have obtained a majority by joining with them a sufficient number of other measures appealing to different sections of the electorate. It would be a great gain to English politics if a capital question could be decided by the electorate on its own merits, on a direct and simple issue. If the nation is moving towards revolution it should at least do so with its eyes open and with a clear and deliberate intention. Such a vote would prove to be the most powerful bulwark against violent and dishonest change. It would bring into action the opinion of the great silent masses of the community and reduce to their true proportion many movements to which party combinations or noisy agitations had given a wholly fictitious prominence. It would lift above the dominion of party a capital measure, and thus greatly increase the probability of its representing the genuine wishes of the electorate. It would enable the nation to reject a measure which it dislikes without destroying a ministry of which it approves. Democracy has been crowned king. The voice of the multitude is the ultimate court of appeal. It would be an appeal from a party majority, probably made up of discordant groups, to the genuine opinion of the country.

Besides Professor Dicey, Mr. Lecky and Mr. Balfour, we have another opinion, that of the right hon. leader of the Government on this question. The late Mr. Monk once moved for a referendum on the naval question, to which a sub-amendment was moved by the present Prime Minister; this being lost, the right hon. the Prime Minister was given the privilege of voting for Mr. Monk's amendment for a referendum. Yes, he and all his followers, with the exception of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, voted for the referendum.

If it was necessary to submit the naval policy of the Laurier Government to a referendum—a policy which did not involve conscription, a policy which had been dealt with by the Imperial Conferences of 1902 and 1909—surely, Sir, it is much more logical and much more urgent to submit to a referendum such a momentous question as that of the conscription of the blood of the young men of this country, enacted by a moribund and unrepresentative Parliament.

I have trespassed too long on the time of the House, but I will say this in conclusion, and I say it with all the firmness and all the good faith that I can attach to solemn statement: knowing the people of my province to be above all things a law-abiding people, if a referendum is taken, whether it goes for or against conscription, the French-Canadians, who are the descendants of those who defended Canada in 1775, in 1812, will abide by the verdict of the majority. If conscription comes they will not have to be bullied or dragooned into the ranks, but will obey the law and fight the battles of Canada as valiantly as their fellow-men of a different race and a different creed.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Crothers, the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, June 20, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE moved:

That the recommendations contained in the first report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the printing of Parliament, presented to the House on June 7, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILL.

Bill No. 90, respecting The Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

NATIONAL SERVICE REGISTRATION CARDS.

Mr. SMITH:

1. How many registration cards were sent out by the National Service Board?

2. How many were answered in full?
3. How many were only partially answered?
4. What portion were not answered at all?
5. What is the number of cards received from single men of military age?
6. What is the estimated number of single men of military age now in Canada who are not in military service??

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. No record was kept of the number of cards distributed. Distribution was made by the postmasters of Canada, and a sufficient number of cards was sent to each post office to meet the estimated requirements at that post office. In some cases additional quantities were requisitioned by postmasters; in other cases they were over supplied.

2. 1,342,755.

3. 97,640.

4. 108,965 cards were returned in envelopes without any of the questions being answered, but in most cases the names of the senders were obtained.

5. 252,034 single men, 18 to 45 years old, indicated that they were British subjects by birth or naturalization, and apparently fit for military service; that is to say, they had normal use of their eyes, ears, feet and arms, and did not suffer from illness for a period of more than one month during the twelve months preceding the filling in of the cards.

6. Answered by the papers laid on the Table by the Minister of Militia and Defence on June 13, 1917.

The Secretary of the National Service Board has submitted the following comment concerning the answers to questions 5 and 6:

"Our figure is 252,034 single men of military age and fitness. In our record we have, at the request of the militia authorities, discarded absolutely the following:

"(1) Those who are not British subjects.

"(2) Those who had more than three persons dependent upon them.

"(3) Those who suffered from obvious physical disabilities such as defective eyesight, hearing, or loss of limb.

"(4) Those who had lost over one month from any illness whatever during the preceding twelve months.

"(5) Those who on their own statement had been rejected for military service.

"From the best estimate we are able to make, we received returns, in connection with the man-power inventory, from approximately 80 per cent of the total males in Canada between 18 and 65. It must, however, be borne in mind that out of the 20 per cent who failed to send in cards, the majority would likely be single men, apparently fit for military duty."

SALE OF SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Has the Government recovered the $15,000 said to have been deposited in a trust account in the Bank of Montreal, New York, arising out of the sale to the Admiralty of small arms ammunition made by one Colonel J. Wesley Allison?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: No, in view of telegram from Mr. Bonar Law to the Governor General under date of 16th June, 1916, in which he states that "the special account opened with the Bank of Montreal at New York is not yet closed, there being a balance on deposit which will be accounted for to the Admiralty."

CLARENCE WELLS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was Clarence Wells, of White Head, N.S., convicted for violation of the fishery regulations?
2. If so, when and what fine was imposed?
3. Was the fine collected?
4. If not, why has the fine not been collected?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. A search of the records for two years back shows that during that time Clarence Wells was not convicted for violation of the fisheries regulations.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILE.

*Mr. FORTIER:

1. Did the Department of Public Works purchase, in 1914, an automobile from one Alex Morrison of Montreal?
2. If so, what was the price paid for such automobile?

Mr. REID:

1. No. On 3rd October, 1916, an automobile was purchased from Alex. Morrison, of Montreal.

2. $400, and accessories, $214.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. What are the names of the members of the military staff at North Vancouver?
2. What are their respective duties or occupations?
3. What is the rank and rate of pay of each?
4. What amount has been paid to each?
5. Upon what date or dates did the members of the said staff enlist, and how long have they been attached to the staff?

THE RELEASE OF EDWARD LEVI BAUGH.

On the notice of motion:

For a copy of the reports made by the trial judge and the penitentiary surgeons in connection with the release from penitentiary of Edward Levi Baugh.—Mr. Murphy.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: This notice of motion has been called a number of times. Once, when I chanced to be out of the House for a few minutes, the Minister of Justice said that it was not customary to bring down reports made by the medical officers in such cases as that referred to in this motion. If it is agreeable, I am willing that the motion should pass on the understanding that those papers are not asked for. The motion has been called several times when the Minister of Justice has not been present.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman has no objection, I would suggest that the motion stand until the Minister of Justice is here.

Mr. MURPHY: Very well.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is some practice in the department about these matters, with which I am not very familiar. If I were familiar with them, I should not ask that the motion stand.

Motion stands.

THE FRENCH HANSARD.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: May I ask the Prime Minister whether it would be possible to have the French version of Hansard issued earlier? We have received none since last Monday.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really have not anything to do with these matters. I shall ascertain what authorities have direction, and shall commend my hon. friend's request to their attention.

COST OF LIVING IN THE YUKON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: I desire to bring to the attention of the House a further telegram which I have received from Dawson in regard to the cost of living conditions there. It is dated at Dawson, Yukon Territory, June 19.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman intend to ask a question?

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to ask if the Government has communicated with the Commissioner of the Yukon with regard to the subject matter of this telegram, or if it intends to do so. The telegram is as follows:

Wiring open letter to Premier Borden. Please publish where it helps most. Situation most desperate; God alone knows what will happen unless Ottawa intervenes immediately. Premier's letter follows: "Dawson, Y.T. At mass meeting June 18, attendance six hundred, mostly working people, following resolution passed, with four dissenting votes: Whereas Yukon conditions have reached a stage where the cost of living so far exceeds the rate of wages that the very existence of the community is threatened; whereas George Williams, the present incumbent of the Commissioner's chair, has shown strong sympathy and decided partiality towards those directly responsible for the recent unwarranted increase in the cost of foods; whereas owing to these facts he is not a safe person to be at the head of the local administration at the present crisis; whereas at the last session of the Yukon council two votes of censure were passed on Administrator Williams, one for extravagant wastefulness of the public funds, and one for usurping the rights of the council by paying out unwarranted sums of the public moneys: therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this mass meeting of the citizens of Dawson and vicinity the Ottawa authorities be asked to suspend Administrator Williams from his office as Administrator of the Yukon Territory until his official actions shall be fully investigated. Moved by L. C. Nelson, seconded by J. D. Sheppard. Sir, we regret you did not realize urgency of message June 1. Writing the heads of firms in San Francisco too slow method of relieving situation. President Sloss and General Manager Fairbanks of Northern Commercial Company arrived Dawson from San Francisco June 16. Situation is desperate. Majority of Yukon Gold Company employees on strike because company refuses 10 per cent increase wages to meet 60 and 100 per cent rise on foodstuffs. Big business completely controls Yukon Territory. We cannot win unless Ottawa takes prompt and decisive action. Regret to say Yukon administration is the obedient servant of big business. Dawson press the servile mouthpiece of local administration. Only possible remedy complete immediate investigation. We can ill afford the cost of these telegrams. General public opinion that Government telegraph should relieve us of further expense.

Have the Government communicated with the Commissioner of the Yukon in connection with this communication that has already been received, and if not, will they be good enough to communicate with the commissioner in regard to the subject matter of this communication and to inform the House of the result?

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): So far as I am aware no word has been received from the Commissioner of the Yukon, and I have not heard anything of the substance of this telegram beyond what was received about a week ago when I told my hon. friend what we had done in the matter.

RECRUITING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. G. W. KYTE: Has any Order in Council been passed affecting the change in enlistment referred to yesterday by the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) in these words:

> In my absence in England, the debilitating plan of draft was resorted to, but I cancelled it on my return.

If there is any such Order in Council, it should be laid on the table of the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: All Orders in Council with regard to recruiting were laid upon the Table a long time ago. If the hon. member will refer to what has been laid on the Table, he will see an Order in Council that was passed about the 12th day of January, 1916, increasing the authorized forces of Canada to 500,000 men. At a subsequent date in March, April, or possibly May—I do not recollect the precise date—another Order in Council was passed providing that new regiments should not be organized under the Order in Council of the 12th January without the authority of the Governor in Council, the reason being that it had been represented to the Government that too many regiments had been authorized in one place at one time.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the Prime Minister explain whether recruiting has been discontinued officially, or whether it is still proceeding? I refer to Quebec particularly.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Recruiting has not been discontinued.

LABOUR STRIKE IN WESTERN COAL MINES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: Has the Minister of Labour any further report to make in regard to the coal strike in the West? There is a report that the negotiations have broken down.

Mr. CROTHERS: The negotiations have not proved successful. The rumour to which my hon. friend refers is well founded. We are taking steps immediately to see to it that the mines shall be opened under Government guidance.

RECRUITING OF BRITISH SUBJECTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: In the Canadian press of yesterday, there appeared this despatch:

[Mr. Crothers.]

> New York, June 19.—Recruiting headquarters for French-Canadians in New England and New York will be opened here by Major L. J. Daly, Gingras of the Canadian 258th Battalion, who arrived yesterday from Quebec. There are 500,000 French-Canadian males in the district he said.

Is there such a mission to the United States, and if so, is it being conducted under any arrangement with the United States Government?

Hon. Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of Militia): By an Act of the United States Congress passed a few days ago, permission was granted to the British Government and the Canadian Government to recruit British subjects in the United States in connection with the organizations which the United States' Government purpose establishing in regard to recruiting United States citizens for the war. Our military officers have therefore arranged with the United States military officers to carry on recruiting through such agencies, and that work is being carried on not only as regards people of French-Canadian nationality in the New England states, but in other parts of the United States among all British subjects. After such recruits have been passed as being medically fit for service, if they desire to go to Great Britain, they are sent there direct, and if they desire to enlist in the Canadian army, they are sent direct to Canada.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS.

SUGGESTED TRAINING IN CANADIAN CAMPS.

On the Orders of the Day.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL: Is there any truth in the rumour that the United States Government is going to train a large number of troops at Valcartier during the summer?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The United States Government has not yet made application to the Government of Canada for permission to occupy any of our Canadian camps, but if they do, the matter will be considered.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: On the 25th of April last, an Order of the House was passed for a copy of the correspondence in the Post Office Department with respect to the vacant postmastership at Charlottetown. That Order has not yet been obeyed. The correspondence cannot be voluminous, and

I think a clerk could make a copy within an hour or two. When will the return be brought down?

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY: The matter has not yet been brought to my attention, but I will make inquiry at once and expedite the bringing down of the return.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING.

Consideration of the motion of the right hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, resumed from Tuesday, June 19.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the adoption of this measure longer than a few minutes, for I believe that in a few sentences I can fairly show ample justification for the acceptance of the principle of this Bill both by the House and by the country. There are a few outstanding facts which I desire to bring to the attention of the House. In the month of August, 1914, we determined not only to join in this world-war, but to stay in it until victory should crown the efforts of the Allies. The time has come when, in order to continue in the war properly, we must have more men to send to the front. It is admitted by every one that more men cannot be secured under the voluntary system.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all.

Mr. CROTHERS: Well, if that is not admitted by my hon. friend, the facts show that is the case. The time has come when the only way of filling the gaps and answering the call of our men who are fighting in the trenches is by the adoption of compulsory service, and the question before the House at the present time is whether or not we shall adopt the principle of this Bill. A considerable time has been devoted to the discussion of the details of the Bill, but I submit that it is entirely out of order at this stage. It is the principle of this Bill which is or which should be under discussion on its second reading.

When war was declared against Germany by the British Government on the 4th of August, 1914, every part of the British Empire, including Canada, became thereby at war with Germany. It is within the memory of the members of this House that on the 1st of August, 1914, when a declaration of war appeared imminent, this Government proffered the assistance of Canada to the British Government, and that offer was accepted as soon as war was declared. We at once proceeded to get ready to render all the assistance in our power. Parliament was summoned for the 18th of August, 1914. There were then three or four courses open to us. We might have sat down and calculated the cost of participating in this world-wide war. We might have considered that it would involve the organization, equipment, and transportation of a large army. We might have reckoned on losing thousands upon thousands of our best and bravest lives in this great contest. We might have calculated that it would make thousands of women widows, and thousands of children fatherless. We might have thought of all the burdens that would be placed on our shoulders by participation in this war—burdens which are not likely to be removed during our day. We might have considered all these things and said: We refuse to take any part in this war. That, of course, would have meant severing our connection with the British Empire. But there was not a man in this House, or in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, who suggested that we should sever our connection with the Mother Country and strike out for independence. Or we might have said: We are nearly three years removed from consultation with the electorate, and the last time we consulted them the question of war was not considered at all. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, if he had been as anxious for a referendum then as he is to-day, might have said what we have heard repeated over and over again in this House, "We have no mandate from the people to participate in this war, and we ought therefore to have a referendum;" and then there would have been some reason in it. Or he might have said: The House should be dissolved and a general election held. But no one in this House suggested that we should have a referendum or a general election before participating in this war. We were here representing the people of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and we thought we knew how the people of this country felt on the question of the war. We were all agreed as to the course to be taken.

Let us see what was said at that time by the right hon. Prime Minister and the right hon. leader of the Opposition. Sir Robert Borden said:—

As to our duty we are all agreed;

No dissenting voice.

We stand shoulder to shoulder with Britain and the other British dominions in this quarrel. And that duty we shall not fail to fulfil as the honour of Canada demands.

Mark the words: As the honour of Canada demands.

Not for love of battle, not for lust of conquest, not for greed of possessions, but for the cause of honour, to maintain solemn pledges, to uphold principles of liberty, to withstand forces that would convert the world into an armed camp; yea, in the very name of the peace that we sought at any cost save that of dishonour, we have entered into this war; and while gravely conscious of the tremendous issues involved and of all the sacrifices that they may entail, we do not shrink from them—

Are any of us proposing to shrink from them to-day?

—but with firm hearts as we abide the event.

Further on he said:—

But, let me say that while we are now upborne by the exaltation and enthusiasm which comes in the first days of a national crisis, so great that it moves the hearts of all men, we must not forget that days may come when our patience, our endurance and our fortitude will be tried to the utmost. In those days—

Those days are upon us now.

In those days let us see to it that no heart grows faint and that no courage be found wanting.

Those words show that the Prime Minister saw into the future. The right hon. leader of the Opposition on that occasion spoke as follows:—

The gravity of the occasion which has called us together makes it incumbent upon us even to disregard the formalities and conventionalities which in ordinary times the rules of the House written and unwritten enjoin as a wise safeguard against precipitate action, but which, on such an occasion at this might impede us in dealing with the momentous question before us. This session has been called for the purpose of giving the authority of Parliament and the sanction of law to such measures as have already been taken by the Government, and any further measures that may be needed to insure the defence of Canada and to give what aid may be in our power to the mother country in the stupendous struggle which now confronts her. . . .If in what has been done or in what remains to be done there may be anything which in our judgment should not be done or should be differently done, we raise no question, we take no exception, we offer no criticism, and we shall offer no criticism so long as there is danger at the front. It is our duty, more pressing upon us than all other duties, at once, on this first day of this extraordinary session of the Canadian Parliament, to let Great Britain know, and to let the friends and foes of Great Britain know, that there is in Canada but one mind and one heart, and that all Canadians stand behind the mother country conscious and proud that she has engaged in this war, not from any selfish motive, for any purpose of aggrandisement, but to maintain untarnished the honour of her name, to fulfil her obligations to her Allies, to maintain her treaty obligations, and to save civilization from the unbridled lust of conquest and domination.

We are British subjects, and today we are face to face with the consequences which are involved in that proud fact. Long we have enjoyed the benefits of our British citizenship; today it is our duty to accept its responsibilities and its sacrifices.

We have long said that when Great Britain is at war we are at war, to-day we realize that Great Britain is at war and that Canada is at war also.

He said further:

From the day war was declared—nay, from the day the possibility of war was first mooted —our shipping to Great Britain and to Europe has been interrupted. Ships were lying at the docks fully loaded and ready to put to sea, but unable to do so because of the fact that when England is at war Canadian property on the high seas is liable to capture. . . . More than once I have declared that if England were ever in danger,—nay, not only in danger, but if she were ever engaged in such a contest as would put her strength to the test—then it would be the duty of Canada to assist the motherland to the utmost of Canada's ability.

When we came to this House, on the 18th of August, 1914, the right hon. leader of the Opposition and every other member of this House must have had in mind the provisions of the Militia Act. Let me read certain of those provisions:

10. All the male inhabitants of Canada of the age of 18 years upwards, and under 60, not exempt or disqualified by law, and being British subjects, shall be liable to service in the Militia; provided that the Governor General may require all the male inhabitants of Canada, capable of bearing arms, to serve in the case of a levée en masse.

69. The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

The question was raised last night by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) as to whether we have authority to send our forces to France to fight. At the time the Militia Act was being amended in 1904, the then Minister of Justice, the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada expressed this opinion:

The Governor in Council may send the militia of Canada out of Canada at any time when deemed necessary for the defence of Canada. If, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, it should be necessary, because of a war going on in India, to send our militia out there for the defence of Canada, they may, in the exercise of their discretion, do it, because they are the sole judges of what is necessary to be done in defence of Canada.

So, when we met on August 18, 1914, every member of the House had before him the provisions of the Militia Act which give the Governor General in Council power to send the militia anywhere outside of Canada for the defence of Canada, and which made it compulsory for every male between eighteen and sixty to serve. In that session we expressed our approval of Canada's entering into the war, knowing that it might become necessary to the defence of Canada to send our soldiers to France; knowing that it was in contemplation at that very time to send our soldiers to France—volunteers of course, but they knew that under that Act we could compel them to go—and there is not a single representative in this House who objected to that condition of things. If there was a single member who felt then as some of them say they feel now, that they are opposed to all war; that they do not want to take any part in a European war, that was the time for him to rise in his place in this House and say so. But not one of them said that he objected to the war, or objected to sending our forces to France, or that he opposed the terms of the Militia Act under which they might be forced to go to France. As silence gives consent, all the membership of this House agreed, not only that it was our duty to enter the war, but to pledge ourselves that we would continue in it until it was won. Is there a gentleman within the sound of my voice who will say that that is not true? Will the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) or the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) or the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) say that he did not personally, individually, express approval of our entering into the war and our determination to continue in it until victory should be ours? But that is not all. Every member of this House is here in a representative capacity, he represents thousands of constituents; and every one of us pledged his constituents to the declaration that we ought to enter the war and ought to continue in the war until victory should be achieved. Thus collectively the people of Canada, without any referendum, without any general election—not the people of one province but of all the provinces—declared themselves in favour of Canada taking part in this war and remaining side by side with our Allies until the war was won. We pledged ourselves individually. We pledged our constituents also, that they would use all reasonable means for the prosecution of this war, that they would provide men and money to carry on the war. Was not this implied in the attitude we took? Did not we declare to the British Government, to our sister nations overseas, and to our Allies, that we individually, our constituents to a man, and the people of Canada as a whole, were unanimous in joining them in this struggle and in remaining in it with them until victory should be achieved? We not only gave our pledge to the British Government and to our Allies, but we pledged ourselves to the brave young men of this country, that if they would go to the front and fight for us, we would stand behind them so long as the war should last.

We entered into a covenant with every young man who enlisted that if he would take the position of the greatest sacrifice possible to a man and go to the front and risk his life for the freedom of this country, we would supply him with food and equipment and munitions and guns, and send him assistance as might be necessary, as long as the war lasted. Did not we promise him that? What do we propose now—some of us? What do we propose now? To abandon the men who have gone to the front, desert the men who have risked their lives for our freedom? The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) made a similar pledge to that which the rest of us made. I believe that personally he has redeemed that pledge, because he has done a great deal throughout Ontario to assist recruiting. I believe his constituents have redeemed the pledge he made for them on the 18th of August, 1914. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) made such a pledge, not only on his own behalf but on behalf of his constituents in the city of Vancouver. I believe that he has redeemed the pledge that he gave personally; I believe his constituents in the city of Vancouver have redeemed the pledge that he gave on their behalf. My hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) gave a like pledge for himself and for his constituents and for the people of Canada. Has he redeemed his pledge? Have his constituents redeemed the pledge he made on their behalf? I put the question; I do not answer it. My hon. friend from Megantic (Mr. Pacaud) was here. He made a pledge on his own behalf; he made a pledge on behalf of his constituents, that they would stand behind the boys at the front, that they would supply a fair share of men and money to back up the boys who had gone to the front. Has he discharged his duty? Have his constituents discharged their duty? Let us get this question home to each one

of us and see what the answer is, putting our hand on our heart and appealing to our conscience—has each one of us redeemed his pledge? The member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) made a promise of that sort, made it on his own behalf, made it on behalf of his constituents; has he redeemed the pledge? Have his constituents redeemed the pledge? Let us ask ourselves that question, and let us answer it. The question now is, and it is a very simple question, whether or not we are to declare to the world that, having put our shoulder to the wheel, we have determined to turn back; having promised the Allies, having promised especially our young men who went to the front to sacrifice their prospects in life and perhaps to make the supreme sacrifice of life itself, having promised them that, are we prepared to declare to the world that we are quitters? That is what it means. There is no way of getting these men to send to the front except through compulsory service. That I think is admitted by every one.

Mr. MARCIL: That is where we disagree.

Mr. CROTHERS: Oh, disagree! I wish my hon. friend from Bonaventure would back up his arguments by producing some men and not merely leaving it to argument.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask a question? I do it because I am relying on information in newspaper reports. I have seen it stated that during the last month something over 7,000 men enlisted. Is that correct?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not know I am sure, whether it is correct or not. Suppose it is—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Should not the minister know that? I was told the other day in St. John that the enlistments are as great upon the average as they have been since the war began. A good many are for the artillery. I would ask my hon. friend why recruiting for the artillery has been discontinued by order.

Mr. CROTHERS: Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to answer these military questions.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CROTHERS: Is there anything to laugh about because one minister does not know everything that is going on in the other departments?

Mr. PUGSLEY: He ought to know before he makes these statements.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. CROTHERS: I can explain.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend pardon me—

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think that I will.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister has made a statement that recruiting has absolutely stopped. The minister ought—

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister of Labour has the floor; unless with his consent he should not be interrupted.

Mr. CROTHERS: Let me give you an explanation as it has been given to me from several sources, of considerable recruiting during the last few weeks. I know two young men who came forward when Sir Robert Borden made the announcement of conscription and said: Well, we will have to go under the Military Service Act, and we would rather go now; we will go as volunteers; and the two went that day and volunteered. A great many have come in that way. Why, if they desire to come from Bonaventure, or Rouville, or Megantic, or anywhere else, we will receive them with open arms, and if they were to come as numerously from that province as they have from some of the other provinces, neither the Militia Act nor the Military Service Act would be necessary at all. It ill becomes these men, it seems to me, to ask these questions. They say it is not necessary to have the Military Service Act or to enforce the Militia Act. Give us your proof of your statements by bringing forward recruits, bringing them forward as you promised you would on the 18th of August, 1914, when you promised that your constituents would do a fair share in the work of carrying on this war. That you promised, and that promise you have not carried out; and if it had been carried out by all of us and by all of our constituents it would not be necessary to have either a Militia Act or a Compulsory Service Act at this present time. As I said a moment ago, the question is whether or not we are going to announce to the world that we are quitters, whether or not we are going to announce to the world that we are going to abandon the men who went to the front under a covenant that we made with them that we would stand behind them until the war was won. Is that what the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) desires to announce to the world? That is what it means if you reject compulsory service. It is said now that we ought to have a referendum. A referendum! When the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wil-

frid Laurier), who was then Prime Minister, arranged that a number of our soldiers should go to South Africa, not for the defence of Canada—there was no talk about an invasion of Canada—he did not take a referendum; he did not call Parliament together. If I remember aright, when he proposed to build the National Transcontinental Railway at a cost of about $200,000,000 he first entered into the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway before he brought the proposal to Parliament at all, although he was three years away from a consultation with the people.

On the 18th August, 1914, when the leader of the Opposition, with greater show of reason than now, might have said, "Let us have a referendum," he did not do so. He gave a pledge that the people of this country would take part in the war and continue to the end. Now, he wants to ask them whether they wish to continue or not. It is an insult to the people of Canada to propose this referendum.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CROTHERS: What does it imply? On the 18th August, 1914, we said the people of Canada were unanimously in favour of our entering the war, and of continuing in it till the end. The referendum implies that they have wearied in well-doing, that the people of Canada are quitters and wish to abandon our boys at the front, and these gentlemen suggest that a majority of the people will be against conscription.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How is that implied?

Mr. CROTHERS: If my hon. friend from St. John cannot see how it is implied, I do not think I will enlighten him. None are so blind as those who do not wish to see.

Mr. MARCIL: Australia voted against conscription, but did not go back on the boys at the front.

Mr. CROTHERS: Conditions in Australia are very different from conditions in Canada. I do not know the pledges that they made in Australia.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In what respect are they different?

Mr. CROTHERS: I want to say to the hon. gentleman from Bonaventure that we have it on very good authority that "by their fruit ye shall know them"—not by their words or their eloquence, or their promise that their constituencies will produce a fair share of men and money—but by their works ye shall know them. Something has been said about the working men of this country. Having been pretty intimately associated with the workingmen during the last five years, I wish to say that of the 160,000 members of labour organizations in Canada, 30,000 have abandoned the bench and gone to the front to fight for us and liberty.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CROTHERS: There being 160,000 members of labour organizations and assuming that the workingmen of Canada who are not in organizations have volunteered to fight for their country in the same ratio as have the union men, then there are at the front 150,000 men who were employed at manual labour, fighting for liberty. What is the proposition placed before us? Is it to abandon them? Does any man mean to tell me that the labour element in Canada is opposed to a war, which is waged to secure liberty and freedom when 150,000 of them have left the bench, shouldered the rifle, risked their lives, left fatherless children, all for the sake of human liberty. Do hon. gentlemen mean to tell me that the working people of this country are opposed to conscription when our continuance in this war depends absolutely upon compulsory service. That fact has sunken deep in the mind of every member of this House, and no matter what any man may say, he knows it in his heart. The only way we can back up the boys at the front is by applying the Military Service Act. It is sometimes asked, "Why do you not enforce the Militia Act?" It was enforced in August last. That law was on the statute-book which provided that every male in Canada between the ages of 18 and 60, whether in Quebec or British Columbia, could be compelled to serve his country. It was only a question of how he should be selected. The Militia Act provides that it could be done by ballot, by mere chance—haphazard. If the most important man to this community were to pick out a ballot which meant he should go, he would have to go.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why should he not go?

Mr. CROTHERS: Because he is of more use at home.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CROTHERS: The main difference between the Militia Act and the Military Service Act is in the mode of selecting the men, and in this Act provision is made for keeping at home the men urgently needed in Canada, and those we can spare

go to the front. We all know that it is as important to feed a soldier as to give him a rifle. It is as important that he should have suitable clothing, shells and guns, as it is that he should be there in the firing line. He cannot be provided with food, equipment, and shells, unless men are left at home to do their part. There are men in this country who are not sufficiently robust to go to the front, but who can work here. Under the Military Service Bill we can select them. The people of Quebec, under the Militia Act, since 1868 have been bound to serve in our army sent beyond Canada, according to the opinion of the Chief Justice of the highest court in this country. So it is in any country in the world that makes any claim to civilization. The state must be protected, and that means protection to the individual. The individual must bear his responsibility, and, if need be, save the state. Under this Militia Act, we are bound to serve the state, if we are between the ages of 18 and 60.

I digressed a little from the question of labour. I think it my duty to say that the best elements in labour to-day in Canada are in favour of conscription, and of going to the front. What have they been doing for their brethren who have gone to the front? They have been paying thousands and thousands of dollars in insurance premiums from time to time when their brothers were away; and, when the breadwinner had sacrificed his life for the liberties of the country, they have seen to it that his widow and fatherless children did not want. Does any man mean to tell me that men of that character are in favour of abandoning their brethren at the front to-day? No, God forbid. I know the workingmen of this country too well to believe anything of that kind. I repeat that the best elements in the working classes of Canada to-day are in favour of conscription, because they believe it to be necessary, in order to back up our men at the front.

There are on record some letters from representative labour men in the United States and in England. Mr. Gompers, who was appointed by the President of the United States as chairman of a committee to assist the National Council of Defence, wrote to a number of workingmen and asked them to join in assisting the President in this great war. John F. Curley answered:

> I will gladly serve, and to the best of my ability do my share for my country in the time of her need.

[Mr. Crothers.]

William Green, secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers of America, wrote that he would gladly join the committee and do his best for it. Andrew C. Hughes said that the members of the Coopers' International Union stood ready for service at any point designated by the Government. Thomas McNeill was proud to join in the defence of the country. James Lord said:

> Real patriotism can only exist with the conservation of human liberties, and when the people of our nation can read the situation in this spirit, the things we all hold dear will not perish, no matter what situation or crisis may confront us. I will be at the meeting at the appointed time.

On May 27, the British Workers' League adopted the following resolution:

> We hope that this manifestation of popular sympathy and solidarity on the part of the masses of London's citizens will help to silence the few weak and sinister voices that have been raised in pleas for a premature and dastardly peace—a peace whereby all the sacrifices and all the courage of your brothers and ours would be wasted. We have lived through hours as dark with impending disaster as any that nations have ever suffered, and now that the sun of victory is dawning on our horizon, the masses of the British people are more determined than ever to be worthy of their dead, to be worthy of their past, and with you to be no unworthy architects of a future in which war and tyranny shall be banished from the world for all time.

I believe that the wage-earners of this country are in favour of continuing the war and of backing up our boys at the front. They are, therefore, in favour of the application of compulsory service, as there is no other way of backing up our soldiers.

Mr. VERVILLE: How long after United States declared war was this famous committee named?

Mr. CROTHERS: I could not tell my hon. friend. Perhaps he knows.

Mr. VERVILLE: I am asking my hon. friend.

Mr. CROTHERS: My hon. friend does not know; neither do I. I know that on May 27 last this resolution was adopted.

Mr. GRAHAM: It could not have been very long after war was declared.

Mr. CROTHERS: Why?

Mr. GRAHAM: Because the United States declared war only recently.

Mr. CROTHERS: This resolution was adopted by the British Workmen's League.

Mr. VERVILLE: I was asking about the United States. How long after war was de-

clared in the United States was this famous committee named?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not remember; very shortly after.

Mr. VERVILLE: I think it was before.

Mr. CROTHERS: No, I do not think it was before. For some time compulsory service was distasteful to the people of England, but they finally found that conscription was absolutely necessary in order that the ranks at the front should be filled. Every European nation participating in this war has adopted compulsory service. United States, that great democracy to the south of us, has adopted compulsory service. Away back in 1865, fifty years ago, at the time of the Civil War, they had compulsion. Abraham Lincoln made many drafts upon the people for military purposes during the course of that war. It was implied in August, 1914, that the time might come when compulsory service would be necessary in Canada. Let me repeat what the Prime Minister said at that time:

Let me say that while we are now upborne by the exaltation and enthusiasm which come in the first days of a national crisis, so great that it moves the hearts of all men, we must not forget that days may come when our patience and our fortitude will be tried to the utmost. In those days let us see to it that no heart grow faint and that no courage be found wanting.

These are the days that are upon us now. Are any hearts growing faint? The right hon. leader of the Opposition thinks that the hearts of the people are growing faint. He says that while they were all in favour of going into the war at its commencement in August, 1914, and of continuing it to the end, they have changed their minds; they want a referendum. The right hon. gentleman wants to ask a slacker in British Columbia or in Quebec whether he wants to be coerced into fighting. What sort of answer would he get from such persons? It is an insult to the people to suggest that they want to quit at this hour. Everybody hates a quitter; everybody admires perseverance; everybody admires the person, party or Government who will stand up for what is right in days of stress as well as in days of peace and plenty. The proposal that has been made would, if accepted, declare to the world that we are quitters. It would be an everlasting shame to the people of Canada if anything of that kind should occur.

Some picayune criticism has been made of the Government in connection with this war. Certainly mistakes have been made; the man who makes no mistakes, makes nothing. On the whole, the people of Canada have done well in recruiting. We are proud of the work that most of the men have done; of some we are not so proud. We are proud of the work that all the women have done. We are proud of the young men who have gone to the front and have covered themselves with glory for the sake of humanity. But we are not living in the past. The question is not what has been done, but what shall we now do? The question is not whether our sires fought valiantly at Queenston Heights or Chateauguay—some people think we should live on that as long as possible—but whether the sons of those sires have inherited the heroism and the valour that enabled their fathers to do credit to themselves and to their country on the field of battle. If the spirits of our sires who fought at Queenston Heights and Chateauguay hover over us to-day; God grant that they do not look down upon any degenerate or recreant sons.

A very extraordinary position was taken by the member for Edmonton. I am bound to say that I was amazed at the position which he took while speaking in this debate. When the hon. member was making some objection to the details of this Bill—and he, an ex-minister of the Crown, knows perfectly well that at this stage it is only the principle of the Bill that should be discussed, and that the details may be altered in committee—the Prime Minister said to him:

I really did say, in introducing the Bill and again to-day, that we would be very glad to have suggestions which would improve the Bill. If my hon. friend is so strongly opposed to the provision which we have suggested, would he be good enough to give us the benefit of his suggestion as to what the provision should be?

The Prime Minister says to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), an ex-minister of the Crown, a man who has been in public life for many years: This Bill is not like the laws of the Medes and the Persians; it may be amended in detail when it reaches the committee stage; you object to some of the details; what do you suggest instead? This is the reply of that statesman from Edmonton:

Mr. Oliver: Really I do not appreciate that as being my function.

No; a great war is on; our boys at the front are dying by the thousands; hundreds of them are coming home as cripples, and yet the hon. member does not deem it any portion of his duty to make sugges-

tions to improve a Bill, to the details of which he objects. He says:

That is the business of the Government of this country.

I think he said on another occasion that it was his business to criticise, to find fault. It is apparently his business to do nothing to help the Government or to help the boys at the front, if his doing nothing would incidentally help his political party. The hon. member says:

That is the business of the Government of this country. They have brought down a Bill, they are challenging public opinion upon it; they have a right to do so. My business in this House is to show how and where this measure falls short of being in the best interests of the country, if in my judgment it does fall short. Having done that, I have discharged my responsibility.

And he continues:

And I again point out that this Government has brought forward a measure here, under the pretense that it is a measure that shall be a fair measure of conscription, and it is a measure that does not contain within its four corners the first elements or fairness in the matter of conscription.

Sir Robert Borden: What would be fair?

The Prime Minister asks this old Parliamentarian, this old politician, an ex-minister of the Crown: What would be fair? The answer is:

Mr. Oliver: I am saying to the Prime Minister that that is his business.

The hon. member says to the Prime Minister: That is your business; I will not say one word to help out the boys at the front; I will not say one word to make more perfect this legislation that aims at compelling men to go to the front; that is your business; if I should say one word that would make the Bill more perfect, it might by some circuitous route confer some benefit or advantage upon the Government of the day. Therefore, partisan as my hon. friend is, he lets the boys at the front suffer; he is willing to let this Bill go through imperfect if may be: he lets the people of the country be deprived of his experience, because if he offered any suggestion, it might turn out to be advantageous to the Government of the day. Well the people of this country do not appreciate such conduct.

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps the minister will be good enough to say what I should have done.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am glad that my hon. friend was moved off his seat anyway. He must have thought what the Bill should be when he pointed out that it was defective. Therefore, it was his duty, not perhaps as a dyed-in-the-wool partisan, but as a citizen of Canada interested in our success in this war, in the welfare of our boys at the front and of those who may hereafter be chosen to go to the front, to offer suggestions which would improve the Bill. I am sorry to say that his attitude for the past three years has been as I have described. I am sorry to say also that I can look at others opposite who have adopted the same attitude. In their opinion, partisanship is the more important, to injure the party in power and to secure advantage to themselves than to advance a measure designed for the benefit of those brave men who are fighting our battles. I believe, with the hon. member for Edmonton, that compulsory service, under a selective draft, is better than the other method.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg the minister's pardon. I did not speak in favour of the selective draft; I spoke in favour of compulsory service.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am glad that my hon. friend sees that fine distinction. He would perhaps prefer the Militia Act that was in force for many years while he was in power. He is in favour of taking men from eighteen to sixty years of age under the Militia Act in preference to the method adopted under the Military Service Act. I believe the people of this country want their representatives in this House to use their experience and ability in the interest of prosecuting the war successfully. I think they expect the Prime Minister, the leader of the Opposition, and every other hon. member to carry out the pledge made on the 15th of August, 1914. Each hon. member should carry it out, and his constituents should carry out that pledge made on their behalf. I ask every hon. member: Are your constituents doing their fair share, according to what they have promised to do?

Mr. OLIVER: On behalf of my constituents, I can say that they are.

Mr. CROTHERS: I said that.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to compare them with my hon. friend's constituents, if he is willing to make a comparison.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am perfectly willing to make a comparison, but I did my hon. friend the justice a few minutes ago of saying that I believed he had carried out his promise.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg your pardon, I did not know that.

Mr. CROTHERS: I will not detain the House any longer. I sincerely hope every hon. member will vote in favour of conscription. Conscription is the only logical action to take; it is absolutely necessary unless we are going to allow our men at the front to be bowled out. It is just possible that it may not be necessary to put conscription into force as recruiting is reviving, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has mentioned. Conscription is in force in the United States; it is in force in every country in Europe, and it is necessary to have it here unless we are going to break down and be compelled to bow our heads in shame before the civilized world.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Labour commenced his speech I really thought he was serious and was going to deal with a serious question in a serious manner, as ministers of the Crown are expected to deal with the business of this country in an enlightened and serious manner. The minister did not go very far into his speech when I was reminded of the old Scotch divine who spoke only Gaelic, and who was rather unexpectedly called upon to preach an English sermon. This divine took as his text: "The Devil goeth about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour."

Mr. CROTHERS: That is a chestnut. Give us something fresh.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am glad there are other nuts besides the one the hon. member is rubbing. This Scottish divine, in his Presbyterian way, divided his text into three parts: Who, the devil, he was; where, the devil, he was going; and what, the devil, he was roaring about. Those were the questions which suggested themselves to me when the Minister of Labour was on his feet. He tells us that we shall be known by our fruits. If that test were applied to the minister he would be a wanderer and a stranger on the earth, and nobody would know him. He would certainly be like that accursed fig tree at the root of which the axe was placed, and which bore no fruit henceforth for ever.

Mr. KYTE: He is already marked.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister said at the start that he did not want to delay the House and would only speak for a few minutes. I am not complaining about the time he took, but if he would only pass around a little brief saying that he was going to read the speeches of the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition on the war we could look these things up for ourselves and save the expense of having them duplicated on Hansard. It would have taken him about the same time to read the 119th Psalm, and we should have had no objection to his reading that in preference to the speeches of the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition, because in reading those he was simply repeating facts the truth of which nobody questions.

He also told us that everybody hated a quitter. Perhaps so, but it depends upon when he is quitting, and how. To judge by the physiognomies of hon. gentlemen opposite when the Minister of Labour sat down, I think they preferred a quitter to one who kept on threshing old straw and beating the air. Is there anybody in this House, or in this country, who says that we are not in favour of Canada's participation in this war? Is there anybody in this House or out of it who takes a different position to-day from the position we took on the 14th of August, 1914? When the war broke out hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were in favour of Canada taking part in it and standing by the Mother Country, of which we are all so proud; that was the position we took in August, 1914, and that is our position to-day. But the Minister of Labour talks to us as if we were a kindergarten class, and tells us what our duty is and what we ought to be and do. We on this side of the House know what our duty is just as well as the Minister of Labour and those who sit around him, and are just as loyal and determined to carry on to the end.

The Minister of Labour speaks as if the leader of the Opposition had departed from the attitude he took at the beginning of the war. Nothing of the kind. Anything that was said by the Prime Minister or the leader of the Opposition in the war session of 1914 must be read in the light of conditions existing at that time. We had then a voluntary system. For nearly fifty years nobody in this country had ever thought of compulsory service, and nobody ever said anything about compulsory service in the war session of 1914. Everything that was then said in regard to the force we expected to put in the field and the support they should receive had reference to the voluntary system; that was the system under which we intended to fight. To suggest that the leader of the Opposition would have any-

thing to say against Canada's standing behind the Mother Country is simply absurd. Any one who talks that way should be reminded of the history of Canada in connection with matters of this kind. We all remember what took place in 1884 when the great Tory chief, Sir John A. Macdonald, was in charge of the destinies of this country. England was then at war, and suggested to Sir John A. Macdonald that it would be well to have assistance from Canada along certain lines. Did Sir John A. Macdonald give any assistance to the Mother Country at that time? Nothing of the sort. He turned the suggestion down cold. Not a ship, not a man, not a dollar was sent from Canada at that time, but Sir John and his supporters in Ontario were never accused of being disloyal because of his action at that time. It remained for Sir Wilfrid Laurier when the Boer war broke out in 1899 to make the great departure of sending soldiers from this country to fight the battles of Great Britain. It is not very likely that the man who took upon himself the responsibility of first sending soldiers from this country to fight the battles of Great Britain, in the face of what might be regarded as strenuous opposition in some parts of this country, will go back on the precedent which he himself created, and behind which the people of this country firmly stood. The Minister of Labour said that nothing further could be done to support our soldiers at the front unless this Bill was passed. I would expect him to have some knowledge of the facts when he makes a statement of that kind, but when he was asked by the hon. member for St. John how recruiting was going, he knew nothing whatever about it. He did not know that 8,000 men had been recruited in Canada in the last month, yet only the moment before he had been proclaiming to the world that the voluntary system had fallen down in this country and nothing further could be expected from it. The next question he was asked was why recruiting for the artillery had been stopped in this country. It is reported that in Great Britain and France they have more artillery men than they require, but the hon. gentleman knew nothing about it, and all he did was to launch a volume of words upon this House and country without knowing what he was talking about. If it is a fact that we can get more artillery men in Canada than we have room for, it does not look as if the voluntary system had fallen down in this country.

Nobody knows better than the minister knows—or ought to know—that there is no better arm going to the front than that of the artillery. If we have as much artillery as we require—and it is said that we have and that of the very best kind—why should the minister seek to impress upon us the belief that recruiting by the voluntary system has fallen down? I submit that the facts go to show that if the voluntary system were given a fair show we should get all the men we want, and we should retain the pride, and dignity, and honour, of having done our part under the voluntary system and not by compulsion.

The Minister of Labour told us that labour was in favour of the war. He read letters from a certain committee, but he knew nothing about them, their position, or their tendencies, and so what he said on that point was perfectly in line with the rest of his speech. Nobody need be disturbed by any of the noise we have heard this afternoon in connection with conscription or voluntary service. I think it only right to remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crothers) that as Minister of Labour he has not done much to keep the labour element, which is a very important element, in proper shape for the service they have to do at home, or in proper temper for the service they might do their country at the front. The record of the hon. gentleman in connection with labour questions shows that he does nothing at all with regard to any problem until it is too late—he is rather of the post mortem variety. A few days ago we had a gathering of labour leaders in the city of Ottawa, the men who are supposed to know the conditions of labour, and the feelings of labour, with regard to the Government and with regard to the war. These men presented to the Prime Minister a memorial setting forth what they thought of the action of the Minister of Labour and of the Government generally. The contractors for munitions are under Government control and subject to Government regulation—for this we have the word of the Prime Minister. This being so, the relations existing between labour and these contractors should be governed, and governed as far as possible to the satisfaction of labour. The memorial that these labour leaders presented was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte). So far the allegations made have not been denied, but, on the other hand, we do not hear that anything has been done to improve the conditions under which labour is carried on. As

I am following the Minister of Labour, I think it only right to present to the House the statement of the labour men. I hope there is still prospect of the minister doing something about it, even though of a post mortem character. I put this in Hansard in the hope that more attention will be paid to it and some remedy found for the evils complained of:—

1. Violation of sanitary requirements—gross negligence in regard to the protection of the health of the workers, in camp and plant construction.

2. Lowering the wage standards already established in different sections of the Dominion.

3. Elimination of the eight hour day and the introduction of the 10, 12 and 14 hour day, and seven-day week.

4. The unnecessary dilution of labour by the introduction of female labour, before proper steps have been taken to utilize available skilled mechanics.

5. Where dilution has occurred no general effort has been made to maintain the same standard wages as received by the men.

6. Substitution of cheap, semi-skilled labour from rural districts for construction work, because of their willingness to accept less than the Trades Union rates.

7. A declared policy of refusing to recognize Trades Union representatives in determining the wages and hours on contracts let by them.

8. Challenging Trades Union officials to obtain reasonable conditions by use of their organized power instead of through negotiations which would result in strikes.

The unanimous conclusion was reached that the time had arrived for the re-organization of this board on the basis of equal representation of labour with the employing interests.

We therefore ask that you endorse the conclusion arrived at by forwarding a letter to Premier Borden, House of Commons, Ottawa, and to the federal representatives from your constituency. Give this immediate attention. It is important.

These are the conditions of labour under the benign control and direction of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House. By dealing with these matters, he would be doing something calculated to assist in bringing more men to the support of the country and towards making the voluntary system more popular. I need hardly tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it is highly important that the people of this country should be as well treated and as carefully looked after as possible, if we expect them to be in a proper frame of mind to volunteer to meet the public demands made upon them in connection with the war, or any other public matter.

The hon. minister has spent a great deal of time in proving that this law is not new, that it is merely the law that has been on the statute-books for the last fifty years. If so, why then introduce this new Bill? If it is the same law, a law which has produced good results, with which the people are contented, and which has raised no trouble or obstacle in the minds of the people, why does the Prime Minister introduce this new measure causing trouble, dissatisfaction and fear among the people? Is this of the nature of a war dance? We know that savage tribes, when engaged in war, hold war dances to get up their fighting blood. But there was no necessity to stir the blood of the people of Canada after the fashion of an Indian war dance. I trust not; the old plan is always as necessary, and I trust we shall fall back upon it and that there will be no further trouble and no further question of the people with this new law.

When we said in 1914 that we would do everything we could in this war, and when we are saying to-day that we are willing to do everything we can do in this war, it must certainly be borne in mind that we are going to do everything we can do as a united people, that we are going to do everything that Canada can do as a nation, working together, every man from the Atlantic to the Pacific a Canadian, a true subject of the King, doing what, according to his best conscience and his best knowledge and his best understanding of his constitutional rights, thinks is his duty to do. And if we are going to introduce in Canada any other methods of carrying on the war or assisting in it, we are taking steps that are going to break up this country, and the end will be worse than the beginning. I assure you that the getting of 50,000 men or even 100,000 men in Canada, after we have broken up the ties of love and affection and good-will that are to-day binding together every nationality and province, if we smash Confederation in doing it, the Kaiser would be very much more pleased at the breaking up of Confederation than he would be afraid of the number of men we would so obtain. It is therefore up to those who are in charge of the Government of this country, to carry on the war, to help the war, to bring it to a satisfactory conclusion, along lines, that are not going to break up happy communities in the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. gentlemen opposite may think that I am not sincere in anything I say on this point, and that I am disposed to talk politics. But there is an hon. gentleman sitting among themselves who, until a few days ago, occupied the high position of a minister of the Crown and who was honoured by the Prime Minister by being picked out from the large number of good

followers he had about him from Quebec and made Secretary of State for Canada. That hon. gentleman sent a letter to the Prime Minister a few days ago just on this point, and in order that hon. gentlemen opposite and on my own side of the House may know that that gentleman concurs exactly in what I have stated, I will read his letter to the Prime Minister:

Dear Sir Robert,

On the 18th of May last when you acquainted the House with your intention presenting a Bill providing for compulsory service during the present war.

From the moment you submitted your intention to the Council, I drew your attention to its extreme gravity and to the consequences which, to my mind, would follow.

I have, however, thought it my duty in these critical times, to abstain from any hasty decision, as long as I could entertain the hope that these considerations, as well as the very serious events which were meanwhile developing, would induce you to modify, if not to completely change your decision.

I cannot now expect that my hope will be realized; you have in fact decided to introduce, without further delay, your proposed Bill, and have it passed during this session.

Therefore, I feel bound to sever my connection with the Cabinet on this question.

I have always thought, and do yet think, that the best interests of Canada make it a duty for this country to give to the cause of the allies its most generous support. But to do this, I cannot concur in any measure which in my estimation imperils national unity. The proposed law, I have every reason to fear, threatens to destroy this unity, and to give rise throughout the country to deep internal divisions of long duration, and even detrimental to the needs of the present moment. Indeed it is better to keep the country united in the present effort than to attempt a mightier one at the cost of national disruption.

I, therefore, find myself unable to approve of the intended law, and the only course open to me is to offer my resignation as a minister of the Crown.

That, Sir, is carrying out precisely what my own view is on that point and connecting that up with what I have already said, I think it is the duty of this country, and that we are doing our full duty, when, in the first instance, we exhaust every legitimate effort to get the number of men we want by the voluntary system, and give the voluntary system a fair show. If finally it is proved to us that that cannot be carried out, it will then be time enough to resort to the compulsory system.

The Minister of Labour talked lightly of our duty in the matter of conscription. I want to bring home to this House and to this minister that it is not a light matter to force anybody to go to the front, and perhaps be shot. I have, perhaps, as much interest as any man in this House in the winning of the war. I do not come to this House with any handicap that anybody can throw slurs at my loyalty or the country or people from which I sprang. I stand upon as good a foundation from the standpoint of loyalty and the history of my people, as any man in this House. Therefore I do not fear any taunts or slurs being thrown at me in connection with my loyalty to my King and country. But, at the same time, there is a duty devolving upon us to accomplish this end, and to accomplish it in the easiest possible way, and in the way that will bring least responsibility and heart rending to ourselves and to the country in days to come. A young man may be married, with two or three children around him. He volunteers to go to the front. That is his own act, we are glad that he does it, and we pray that he may return happy to his wife and family. But if anything happens to him, if he is shot down and leaves a widow and two or three little orphans, we have not any great responsibility about it, in a way, because he is a volunteer, he went himself, and it has been his own free voluntary act that has brought that condition about. But if we send an officer of the Crown into that house and tear that man away from his wife and his children and send him to the front and he is shot, it comes home to us with trying feelings indeed that we are responsible for sending the officer after him; we are responsible for sending him to the front; we are responsible for throwing his children upon the mercy of the cold charity of this country, and leaving his wife a widow. These are the conditions that come about in this country, and must of necessity come about, by a compulsory system. Let me impress upon the House and upon you, Sir, that it is only when there is the clearest possible evidence that there is no escaping from compulsory service, that it should be adopted in this or any other country. I submit to you that if the voluntary system had received a fair trial and a fair start in this country, there would be no necessity whatever to resort to means such as the effect of the Bill which is now before the House should it become law. I submit to you, Sir, that voluntary enlistment did not receive a fair show at the hands of our hon. friends. I submit to you that from the very beginning of the war, throughout every day and every month of it from the day of the declaration of war down to this day, hon. gentlemen opposite, who are supporters of the Government and who are members of the Government, were

just as rigid in their party affiliations, and just as rigid in their dispensing of patronage, in connection with the war as in connection with anything else. And, that being the case, they created a cleavage in this country which they cannot very well overcome. They have made two camps, as far as their favourites, and advancement and promotion were concerned. They have given favours to their friends, and left nothing attractive to the other side. We have had appropriation after appropriation voted in this House, and we have had money Bills introduced by the Minister of Finance, and I have always taken opportunity, when a vote was passed, to say: I do not object to any moneys you are getting, but see to it that the money is used in the best interest of the country, and give up your partisan dispensing of patronage. I have had promises that that would be done, but never any fulfilment of those promises. That has been the state of affairs from the commencement of the war to the present time. It is possible, Mr. Speaker, for a man to create dissensions and dissatisfactions in his own house. If a man has six boys, and he gives three of them boots and clothing, and treats them lavishly, although perhaps not better than they ought to be treated, but he lets the other three go barefooted, with no proper food, and does not look after them properly, could it be expected that the same service, fealty, love and affection would be accorded to the parent by the three neglected sons that he would expect from those upon whom he lavishes his goods and his love? That would not be natural. That is the way this country has been treated by the Government. They have given their moneys, promotions, offices, advancement, and, if they could, would have given military crosses and knighthoods to the Tories, and they have left the Liberals out in the cold. I think it is a most marvellous thing that we obtained the result we did in this country under the voluntary system, judging by the way it was handled by hon. gentleman who had the responsibility of procuring enlistment and the conduct of the war generally. What say you as to the fairness of the way in which matters were conducted in this country by the Government themselves since the outbreak of the war, if we are to believe the correspondence—not merely stories—between the ex-Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister? That correspondence has been brought down, and is on the records of this House over the signature of the ex-Minister of Militia, and it shows that four long months had passed while he was trying to get the second contingent to the front, when it was just as necessary to send assistance to the boys in the trenches as it is now. That period elapsed with something like 40,000 or 50,000 men ready to be sent, but they were held. And why? Because they had no equipments? Not at all. Were they held because they were not trained and ready to take their places at the front? Not at all. They were held, Sir, because there was a faction in the Cabinet, fighting for graft, and wanting to get the money of the country, to apply it to their own purposes and the purposes of their friends.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: Nothing could be more fiendish, and nothing or more deserving of crucifixion, if it were possible to invoke such a punishment in this country, of every man in the Cabinet who had anything to do with that nefarious act of holding up men for three months, because there was a wrangle in the Cabinet, as to who would get his hand deepest into the Treasury, or the fund to be obtained from the purchase of equipment furnished to these men. That statement is published and is a matter of record. It is official, as between the retiring minister and the Prime Minister, and it never has been denied. I will repeat what I stated in the presence of the Prime Minister and the Government, that, partisan as I am, I would not believe such a thing, if it came to me through the newspapers, or through sources of my own party, but when it comes over the signature of the Minister of Militia, who knows what is going on in the sanctum-sanctorum of the Government, I have nothing to do but believe it, until substantial evidence to the contrary is produced. As, such evidence has not been forthcoming, nothing remains but for the country to believe that the facts are just as they were presented, and that members of the Government were content to sit down for four months, bickering about how much money they could make, and permitting the boys at the front to be killed, while the support that should be sent to them, in the nature of forty or fifty thousand men, remained idle in this country, at a cost of twenty-five or thirty million of money, absolutely to no purpose. It would have been better for them to have voted some money between themselves, put it in the Estimates and let the country pay for it. There would be

no trouble about their friends behind them forcing it through Parliament, and they could divide it up between them. That would show they had some manhood about them, instead of leaving the boys at the front exposed to death and danger, while they were squabbling over matters here. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce told us the other day that voluntary recruiting failed. If it failed, these are the hurdles on which it stumbled. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has never given us any explanation, and he is responsible for these things, just as much as any other minister of the Cabinet. So far, we have heard no word of explanation from him or anybody else. The ex-minister told us yesterday that it was a heresy, a doctrine that could not be sustained in this country, that one minister was responsible for the conduct of another, and that it was busybody practice on the part of a minister to interfere with another minister. That is not the constitution of this country. That is not the responsibility which is regarded in this country as devolving upon ministers. The ministers are themselves responsible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: And the one is answerable to the other, and they are all answerable for the conduct of the Government. But yesterday we heard from the ex-minister this pernicious doctrine pronounced, and there was not a murmur of dissent from any gentleman on the Government benches. They accepted that proposition as being all right. I think they were so thoroughly scared of the hon. gentleman who has left the Cabinet that he can say what he likes and kick just as much as he pleases. Nobody will answer him, but they allow his statements to go unchallenged, all of them praying: Lord be merciful to us, because we have all sinned, and come short of thy glory, and if we allow the statements of this gentleman to pass without saying anything to him, it is possible he may leave us alone. That is the only reason I can advance why, when such a pernicious doctrine as that was propounded, that a minister had to be king of his own department and, that he could do just as he pleased, no answer was made to him. If the ex-Minister of Militia could have done as he pleased those four months of expensive and painful waiting would have been saved, and the men would have been sent to the front. But this pernicious system of mutual responsibility of members of the Government stood in his way, and, as far as I could see, every man on the Government benches said, amen.

These are matters which, as far as partnership is concerned, I desire to bring to the attention of the hon. gentleman who now leads the House (Sir George Foster). I am sure that hon. gentleman is not without influence in the cabinet. We are now in the midst of the war, and if those things were bad, if those blunders have been made, and if we have paid dearly for them, and are suffering on that account, there is certainly no logical reason why they should be continued.

Even at this fifty-ninth minute of the eleventh hour we ask the minister who is leading the House to take this matter in hand, to use his influence to prevent graft and to do away with the abuses resulting from political patronage. He told us long ago that these things were pernicious, that they were poisoning the very body politic of our country. Let him now see that everybody is treated fairly; that the cleavage which has taken place among the great masses of the people be done away with; that every man who wishes to join the military forces may realize that whether he is Grit or Tory he has friends in the Cabinet who will stand by him and give him a square deal. If all persons were treated on an equal basis things would be very different from what they are to-day.

You may ask me, Mr. Speaker, what is my authority for saying that partisanship has been rife. My authority is my own knowledge and my own eyes. In the counties of Cape Breton and Victoria we had and still have a battalion known as the 94th Highlanders. Though that battalion has not been asked to go to the front, it has been the means of organizing and training over 600 men who have gone to the front, some of whom have since died, many of whom are bravely serving their country in France and Flanders. That battalion was in charge of its old officers, Colonel McRae, Major Gillies, and Major McLean, first-class military men. A year ago or so, when the ex-Minister of Militia went to the county of Cape Breton he made a tour of those camps, accompanied by a couple of Tory spies. Of course, he was given the secret sign as to who was Grit and who was Tory. He was told that Major Gillies was a Grit, that Major McLean was a Grit; that Colonel McRae was not just as docile as he should be; that he was exercising some little will of his own; that he was not discharging men as he was asked to discharge them and that he would not take on some

of the cripples that he was asked to take on. It was pointed out, therefore, that these men were thorns in the flesh of the Tory party, and should be put out of the way. What happened? After the ex-Minister of Militia returned to Ottawa, Major McLean, Major Gillies and Colonel McRae were dismissed; and to-day they are degraded and disgraced. No explanation for their dismissal was given; they were simply told to quit. When things like this get abroad, the men say: what is the good of being attached to the 94th Highlanders? What is the good of giving our services? These three officers were attached to the battalion for twenty-five years. Simply because a Tory heeler, a local M.P.P. for Cape Breton county, went round with the minister and pointed them out, they were branded for death, and death was meted out to them. That, Sir, is the condition of things in my county; that is one of the reasons why I say that partisanship has been rampant in Canada since the war began. As to the time before the war I find no fault. I am a partisan myself, and if, in time of peace, party business is carried on decently along party lines, I have no objection., But in war times, when all persons should be treated fairly, patronage should have no part in the management of the affairs of the country, particularly those which have to do with the prosecution of the war.

I may be asked what further evidence I have. Men are appointed to positions from day to day; do you see any Grits appointed? Far be it from hon. gentlemen opposite to appoint a Grit, no matter what ability he may possess. A Fuel Controller has been appointed by the Department of Labour. With the gentleman who was appointed—a former member of this House—I have no fault to find; but he is a partisan of the deepest dye. I do not know where I could put my hand on a stronger partisan—that is, if I may judge from his conduct while he was in this House. We have a Food Controller. Is he a Grit? One would almost think that the Government would reason this way: we have appointed a Tory as a Fuel Controller; we will appoint a Liberal as Food Controller. That will please the Liberals, and show them that we desire to be fair. But that would never do. The Government went to Ontario and found this man Hanna. I suppose he is a good man, but he is a strong Tory. His partisanship and Toryism were brought to the attention of the country during many months—perhaps not for good reasons; but he is known in the Maritime Provinces as a man whose zeal for party has sometimes got him into financial difficulty. These Tory officials go around the country with orders to call upon other Tories less influential, perhaps, than themselves, and with less sense of responsibility. Whatever is done is done through the agency of partyism, from start to finish. When there is a suggestion that a coalition Government be formed we are told that we should all come together and set aside party considerations. If that spirit is abroad, and if the members of the Government want to give any evidence of their good faith they should make some appointments along the lines that I have indicated. But they would be very sorry to do that, because they would then be departing from the principle to which they will adhere to the end. I do not know that it is worth my while giving further evidence of the baneful effect of partisanship upon recruiting. Although the ex-Minister of Militia has denied any such partisanship, the evidence is so profuse, prolific and overwhelming that we must accept it in preference to the denial of the ex-Minister of Militia.

On January 1, 1916, the Prime Minister made a proclamation that Canada would enrol 500,000 men. About that I have nothing to say; the action has already been criticised and fully debated. But when the Prime Minister made that proclamation he knew what the law was; he knew what the practice was; he knew by what means the people expected these 500,000 men to be recruited. And we have it on the authority of the ex-Minister of Militia that a few months afterwards, in March or April of the same year, a further proclamation went out to the Minister of Militia of that day telling him to let up on recruiting; not to put forth any further effort in that regard. If voluntary recruiting fell down, that was another hurdle that was thrown in its way by the leader of the Government himself. When the ex-Minister of Militia referred to this matter in the House yesterday I did not hear any murmur of complaint either from the Prime Minister or from any person sitting on the other side.

I have already put on Hansard some of the things that were said by the ex-Minister of Militia. So far we have heard no denial of these charges, some of which are very grave. He charges the Government and its officials with being under the influence of German gold.

That may be, I do not know; but it would strike me as most extraordinary that ministers of the Crown, unless they were under some disability or under some control of the ex-Minister of Militia, would permit him to use language of that kind if they could well contradict him. Those are things which are well calculated to lessen confidence and cause recruiting to fall down, as has been described by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. If it be true that this fighting has been going on in the Cabinet; that the ministers cannot get along together; that the outgoing Minister of Militia had no confidence in the Minister of War Overseas or in the Minister of Finance, and that there was a general broil all around, how can they expect the people of this country to have confidence in any of them, either separately or collectively? That being the case, and the evidence of it being that this gentleman was sent about his business and that he has been telling abroad and plainly what his ideas were, why he went out and what he did with the other ministers while he was with them, and no one denying his statements, we have a right to believe these stories the ex-Minister of Militia has been telling.

A great deal of objection is raised to the taking of a plebiscite; it is said that this question should not be submitted to the people. The Minister of Labour says that we are insulting the people by speaking to them about a plebiscite, but there is a very good authority to the contrary. We were all delighted the other day to see in this House Mr. Balfour, that excellent representative of English ideas and politics. When the House of Lords turned down the Lloyd George Budget and said that they would not pass it until it was referred to a decision of the people, there was a good deal of talk that that course should not be taken. Mr. Balfour, however, is reported in the English House of Commons as saying:

> Why should the people object to this course? Why are you told that you are insulted, that the Lords insulted you? It is a most extraordinary thing that the House of Lords should insult you by simply asking you your opinion.

That is what Mr. Balfour said about the plebiscite to which the House of Lords sought to have that question referred at that time, and I would not find it easy to understand how it is that myself or any other member of this House is insulting the judgment of the people of this country by asking their opinion on a question of this kind.

When we were elected over five years ago, there was no talk of war. We had on the statute book for fifty years a law in connection with the militia under which it was always regarded as optional whether men went to war or not. There was no war in sight at the time, and we have from the people who sent us here no mandate along that line at all. At this hour of the day, when the five years have expired, when we are in a sixth year which is not constitutional, and which is only a term that we have given ourselves by our own act, and when we are representing only ourselves in this House and not the people by the voice of the people, it is only fair and just, when a new question of this kind is coming up for decision and judgment, and when we have no mandate from the people on this point, that the people should be called upon to lead the way as to what they want done on this question. There is no question in the world about the people being behind us in whatever we do to bring this war to a successful issue. At the same time, when there is evidently no great hurry, so far as the Government is concerned, there is no excuse why we should not submit this matter to the people. One would gather from some of the speeches made on the other side of the House that there is a great hurry about this matter; that it should be forced along very hurriedly; that it is a great shame to delay it for one minute, and that the law is to be put into force immediately. I find on the Order Paper this notice, dated May 23:

> Sir Robert Borden—The following proposed resolution:—
>
> Resolved,—That an humble address be presented to His Most Excellent Majesty the King, in the following words:
>
> To the King's Most Excellent Majesty:
> Most Gracious Sovereign:
>
> We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, humbly approach Your Majesty praying that you may graciously be pleased to give your consent to submit a measure to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, to amend the British North America Act, 1867, in the manner following, or to the following effect:
>
> "An Act to amend the British North America Act, 1867."
>
> Be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:
>
> 1. Notwithstanding anything in the British North America Act, 1867, or in any Act amending the same, or in any Order in Council, or terms or conditions of union, made or approved under the said Act, or under any Act of the Canadian Parliament, the term

of the Twelfth Parliament of Canada is hereby extended until the Seventh day of October, 1918.

This resolution asking for an extension of Parliament until October, 1918, is, I presume, to be brought before the House of Commons. That means, of course, that if it goes through, we shall be here for another year after October 1917. The Prime Minister has said in this House—and he has said it in the negotiations for a coalition Government—that he is willing that this Bill should not go into force until after a general election. The Government is certainly going to ask for an extension of Parliament, the end of which will be about a year and a half from now. After that, at some time, there will be an election, and according to the declaration of the Prime Minister, after that will come a proclamation bringing this measure into force. Therefore, we have in prospect an extension of Parliament of a year and a half at least, a general election, and a vague and indefinite idea that at some time in the dim future a proclamation will be issued by the Governor in Council bringing this measure into force. There can therefore be no hurry about this matter; there is plenty of time, and if there is such an abundance of time as nearly two years before the Government has any intention of bringing this measure into force, the question of haste is not the reason why this matter cannot be submitted to the judgment of the people.

So far as the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite is concerned, have we any precedent for this thing? It is not very long since the attitude we took upon the Naval Bill was at issue in this country, and when we began to deal with that matter, we were a new Parliament with all the seats filled. The resolution out of which the Naval Act originated was introduced by the hon. member, who is now the Minister of Trade and Commerce, on the 29th of March, 1909, when we were just fresh from the people, a general election having taken place in the fall of 1908. That resolution was introduced and the Bill passed through Parliament, and steps were being taken to implement the will of Parliament in regard to it.

Compare the importance of that question with the measure before the House to-day. In 1909 it was simply a question of building ships, simply a question of spending money for a useful purpose. We were not touching the property of any person; we were not depriving the wife of her husband, the mother of her son, or the child of its father. We were not dealing with any sacred, civil or religious rights. All that was involved was the expenditure of money for the building of ships. But the measure before us to-day involves the sending of the sons and husbands and fathers in this country to the trenches where they may be shot down. It surely requires no time to bring home forcibly to every man in this country that the question now before the House is much more important and far-reaching than the naval question of 1911. Nevertheless, hon. gentlemen opposite clamoured on that occasion for a referendum, and refused to have anything to do with the Naval Act until the people were consulted. What was the situation then? On the 29th March, 1909, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, then the member for North Toronto, moved in the House of Commons a resolution practically as follows (a few minor changes being subsequently made in the wording):

> The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, as far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence. The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian Naval Service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial Navy, along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial Conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the Empire, and the peace of the world. The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises, the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifices that are required to give to the Imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the Empire.

When the Naval Bill was introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the implementing of the above resolution, Sir Robert Borden, then leader of the Opposition, on the 3rd February, 1910, moved the following resolution (Hansard 1909-10, p. 2991):

> That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditures of this character until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

In support of that resolution, Sir Robert Borden spoke in part as follows (Hansard 1909-10, p. 2989):

> I venture to recall to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the reason which he gave in a speech delivered at Sherbrooke, in the Province of Quebec, in the month of January,

1900, that was after he had considered his attitude in regard to the participation of this country in the South African war. His words are as follows: "We believe it our duty as a British colony to take part in the war and permit 2,000 Canadian volunteers to enlist in the English army and to fight for the mother country. We did it because we believed it our duty to do it, and in response to the unanimous sentiments of the people of this country. We are a free country. Ours is a constitutional Government, and our duty is to put into execution the popular will, and the moment the popular will was known to us we had that duty to discharge and we discharged it of our free will. There was no power to constrain us to act as we did, but in the plenitude of our legislative independence we had the right to reply to the popular will." I would invite my right hon. friend to-day to respond again to the popular will; and the will of the country to-day is that these different proposals ought to be submitted to the people, and the people ought to be permitted to pass upon them before any permanent policy of this kind is engaged in. I think there is a great deal to be said in favour of that course. I am as strong as any man in this country in the belief that it is the duty of Canada to participate upon a permanent basis in the defence of this Empire, and to do our reasonable share in that regard, but I say that to attempt to force a policy of this kind upon the people of this country without giving them an opportunity to say "yea" or "nay" in regard to it would be one of the worst mistakes that could be made by any man who really favoured that policy.

The Prime Minister then took the view that it would be one of the worst mistakes to force upon the people a policy on which they had not had an opportunity to say yea or nay. There voted for that resolution moved by Sir Robert Borden, Messrs:

Armstrong, Arthurs, Parker, Barnard, Best, Blain, Borden (Halifax), Boyce, Bradbury, Bristol, Broder, Burrell, Campbell, Chisholm (Huron), Cowan, Crocket, Crothers, Curry (Simcoe), Daniel, Doherty, Donnelly, Edwards, Elson, Fraser, Goodeve, Gordon (Nipissing), Haggart (Lanark), Haggart (Winnipeg), Henderson, Harrow, Hughes, Jameson, Kidd, Lake, Lalor, Lancaster, Lennox, Lewis, Macdonnell, McCall, McCarthy, Madden, McGrath, Marshall, Meighen, Middlebro, Northrup, Owen, Perley, Porter, Price, Reid (Grenville), Rhodes, Roche, Russell, Schaffner, Sexsmith, Sharpe (Liskeard), Sharpe (Ontario), Smythe, Sproule, Stanfield, Staples, Stewart, Taylor (Leeds), Taylor (New Westminster), Thoburn, Thornton, Wallace, White (Renfrew), Wilcox (Essex), Wilson (Lennox & Addington), Worthington, Wright.

That was the opinion of that army of gentlemen who think we should now be insulting the people if we asked them for their opinion of this measure. The present Minister of Labour was among those who voted for the resolution. He took the view that the people should be consulted on the question of building ships, which only involved the purchase of some hemlock and steel rivets and so on. Now he says it would be an insult to get the people's opinion on a measure the object of which is to drive our men to the cannon's mouth. It is remarkable how one's geographical position changes one's mind. I do not think I could find any better support for the argument for a referendum than the resolution I have just read. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce was practically the only hon. gentleman opposite who did not vote on that resolution. I remember the occasion well. The Minister of Trade and Commerce suddenly discovered that he had to go to Toronto, and although his train did not go until eleven he left the House at ten o'clock.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What a memory the hon. gentleman has.

Mr. MURPHY: We all remember that.

Mr. McKENZIE: He certainly left with a great deal of alacrity that night, and that accounts for his name not being on the list I have just read, but I suppose that if he had had the opportunity he would have declared as paired members do "Had I voted I should have voted for the resolution."

From the facts I have placed before the House it is perfectly clear that we are doing no new thing when we ask that the people be consulted on this question. It has already been brought to the attention of the House that a referendum was taken in Australia, where conditions are entirely different from here. In Australia there is only one language, and practically only one people, holding probably the same ideas regarding constitutional rights. Nevertheless, it was thought proper to consult the people of Australia before a law was enforced interfering with their freedom of action. The ex-Secretary of State for Canada, a gentleman of standing in the province of Quebec and in the Conservative party also, or he would not have been Secretary of State, takes the same view, that it would be disastrous to attempt to enforce any law in this country which might have the result of bringing about a condition of affairs that could not be remedied for perhaps centuries to come.

There is no doubt about our ability to stand behind the men at the front and to do all that is necessary to maintain the glorious position which the Canadian people and the Canadian armies have taken in this war. We should get together and consult the people on this question, and we

have the promise of the best men in the province of Quebec that the people of that province will cheerfully abide by the verdict of the people, no matter how Quebec province itself may vote.

As a humble member of this House I submit that the best course to take is the peaceful course. It may be a little slower, but it will keep this country united from the Atlantic to the Pacific for the one great purpose of winning the war. I submit that we should not attempt to force upon the people of this country a law which, although it may mean temporary glory and success for the Conservative party, will in its ultimate results be disastrous not merely to the Conservative party, but to the country as a whole.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) told us that we should give light and leading, that we should blaze a trail for the people in this matter. It is not our right to blaze a trail for anybody in a matter of this kind. It is for the fathers and mothers of boys to say whether they are in favour of passing this law; it is not for me as a member of this House, after the term of office for which I was elected has expired, and when I am here by the grace of my own vote,—it is not for me to say to fathers and mothers that their boys shall be rent from their hearts and sent to the trenches, with all the disastrous results that may follow. I wish to relieve myself from any such position by letting the people themselves pronounce judgment in this matter. Let that be done, and then, whether I am a member of this House or not, or in whatever position in life I may be, I shall do everything I can to carry out the law; I will give it all the support that a humble loyal subject of His Majesty can give in a great crisis such as this. For the present, I have no hesitation in taking the ground that this Bill should not pass until the people of Canada have an opportunity to declare their will regarding it, thus maintaining the unity of this country.

I am prepared, as a Scotchman and a Presbyterian, to stand behind my leader. He has led his party, whose membership covers the country from ocean to ocean, for the last thirty years; and we have no more reason to doubt his leadership now than we have had at any time in all the years gone by. I receive letters from Scotchmen, from Irishmen, from all classes and all denominations in my county. They do not ask me for any reasons about the course of the leader; they say, "Sir Wilfrid will steer the ship right." They have ample and absolute confidence in him. It is no small matter to break up a party. The party system is one of our institutions, and the Liberal party is a great and noble part of our party system. I belong to the Liberal party, and I deem it my duty, as it is my right, to seek to make it successful by using every effort from within the party to better it and advance its interests, and not to go outside its lines or to throw obstacles in its way. I have confidence in my leader; and I believe that I shall better serve the cause of the Liberal party, the cause of our country, and the best interests of the boys at the front by standing with my leader than by anything else that I can do at this juncture. We were told yesterday by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that the Presbyterian church had passed certain resolutions. I am not going to speak for any other church, but this I do say—that if there is one institution in this country more than any other that is a free institution, one that consults the will of the people, that institution is the Presbyterian church. That church had to deal with the question of the union of the churches. Its General Assembly might well have said: We are sent as representatives of the people; we are a Parliament and can pass this measure. But let me tell the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that they resorted to a plebiscite; they sent the question down to every humble individual, every boy and every girl, every old man and old woman who belonged to that church was called upon for his or her opinion on that question. That is the course that was taken by the Presbyterian church in the case of a departure such as this is, and if the hon. member for Wellington wants to get any precedent or solace from the conduct of the Presbyterian church in matters of this kind he will find that they are believers in the will of the people, believers in consulting the people throughout before they take any new departure or break away from old conditions.

An hon. MEMBER: Did they not say they were in favour of conscription?

Mr. McKENZIE: All they said was that they were in favour of conscription provided there was conscription of wealth and material and all the rest as well. But that is not this Bill, and the resolution is not divisible; you cannot approbate and reprobate, as the old saying was; you cannot take

the part of the resolution with which you are complying and ignore the other part. That resolution cannot be used at all unless it is used in its entirety, and I submit, therefore, that the resolution is no authority. Let me say that I hope and trust that the Government will come to better reasoning about this matter and will steer a course that will answer the purpose which no doubt they have in view of bringing the war to a successful issue and filling up our ranks; but let them do it without breaking up Confederation; do it without having civil war in this country; do it by having peace and unity and going forward hand in hand, as this great people have done in the past and as they hope to do in the future.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAM S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey): Mr. Speaker, as hon. members of this House know, I have not of recent years, troubled them much by expressing my opinions upon the various matters which have been brought before Parliament, but the Bill, the second reading of which is now before the House, is of such tremendous importance that I feel impelled to express my views on it. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie), who has just spoken, made several references to the question of a referendum. I do not purpose to follow him through the devious courses of his speech, but I should like to touch upon one or two questions with which he dealt, more particularly, as I observed, that at the conclusion of his speech he seemed to be heartily congratulated by some of his friends upon the argument he advanced in favour of a referendum. I should like to preface my remarks by saying that I desire that anything I say may be received in the most kindly spirit, which is certainly the spirit by which my remarks shall be inspired. The hon. gentleman from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) cited as a precedent for submitting this Bill to the people by referendum, thus following the amendment of his honoured leader, that in 1910, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier introduced his Naval Service Bill for the establishment of a permanent naval policy for Canada, we on this side voted that the matter should be submitted to the people. I should like to point out to the hon. gentleman, in the first place, that he begs the question, because the passage of the Naval Service Bill in 1910 meant the enactment of an entirely new law on the statutes of Canada, while the present Bill is merely a variation of the law as it stands on our statute-books to-day. In other words we are not now introducing any new principle or any new law; we are simply taking a portion of the old law, and making it conformable to the circumstances and conditions now existing in our country. But, even if that were not so the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton has again begged the question in this respect. In 1912, when Sir Robert Borden initiated his policy for immediate contribution of money for the purpose of providing ships for the British Navy to meet the emergency, he did not ask the Government to go to the country. But in regard to the permanent policy, which the Government in 1910 proposed to impose upon the people of Canada, he urged that the Government should consult the people.

And so, to-day, we are not introducing any new permanent policy. Any man who looks within the four corners of the Bill can see that the present Bill is simply a temporary urgent measure to enable the selection of 100,000 men for a particular purpose, namely to fill up the gap and assist those gallant Canadians who voluntarily have gone overseas to defend the principles of freedom and justice. There is no parallel whatever between the two cases, because the only instance in which we voted for the submission of a question to the people was not by way of a referendum, but by way of an election in order to have the people approve of it. The only case in which we said that the matter should be submitted to the people was in regard to a permanent policy, such as the Naval Service Act introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1910. Upon that question we said that they should consult the people by means of a general election, and, when we came into power, we took exactly the same ground. Then Sir Robert Borden proposed to provide three dreadnoughts as an emergency contribution to Great Britain, and he introduced and passed that through the Commons but was unable to put the measure through Parliament by reason of the action of the Senate. But at the same time he said:

> Then, Sir, as to the permanent policy, I think the people have a right to be consulted.

So that the argument of my hon. friend from Cape Breton falls to the ground for two reasons. This is not a new thing, and it is not a departure from the statutory law. It provides for the selection of 100,-

000 from hundreds of thousands who would be liable for service, under the law as it stands on the statutes to-day. The hon. member for Cape Breton said:

> There is no question whatever that the people are behind us in whatever we do to bring this war to a successful conclusion. There is no hurry.

If the people are behind us in whatever we do to carry this war to a succesful conclusion, what is the use of a referendum?

Those are his own words. I submit the whole argument my hon. friend attempted to deduce this afternoon in favour of a referendum to the people has been cut from under his feet by his own very words. The hon. member further said:

> If this Act is not new law, what is the use of introducing it?

Again my hon. friend has failed to grasp that practically the only object in introducing the present Bill was not to say that certain men should be liable for military service who were not before liable but it was to say that only the men of those classes specified should be liable for military service, and if we had these provisions giving power to make selection, in the old Act, no doubt the present Act would not have been introduced. But, that would not get us away from the fact that under the existing law the man power of Canada would be subject to conscription, if we may use that term, or to compulsion, just the same as under the present Bill.

Let me say a word or two with reference to the marks made by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). I feel almost like apologizing to the House for attempting to controvert his contention. Notwithstanding all that has been said in this House, he seems to be of the opinion still, that there is no constitutional right or authority in Parliament to pass the Bill now before us. If that is the kind of doctrine he is preaching to the people of Quebec, I can easily understand why the people of that province have the opinion which they appear to have on this question to-day, and it is unfortunate that these people should be led to believe that what we are attempting to do in this House to-day is unconstitutional unless the question is first submitted to them. Perhaps the House will excuse me, if I, briefly, place my views before the House on the constitutionality of this question.

By the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 41, it is provided that "His Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for active service, either within or without Canada, at any time when it appears advisable to do so, by reason of war, invasion or insurrection, or danger of either, and the militiamen, when so called out for active service, shall continue to serve for at least one year from the date of their being called out for active service, if required to do so, or for any period longer that His Majesty appoints."

If we read the English language and take the ordinarily accepted meaning of words, then there is no doubt that the militia of Canada may be called out for active service either within or without Canada at any time under the above section, and under that Act "militia" is declared to include all male inhabitants 18 years old and under 60, and that all male inhabitants capable of bearing arms may be called out in case of a levee en masse.

It is a peculiar thing that by the Militia Act of 1904, while the words "for the defence of Canada" were added by the Laurier Administration, upon being questioned in the House as to whether or not the addition of those words made any difference in the meaning of the then existing Act, as to the rights or powers of the Government to call out the militia for service outside of Canada, it was admitted by the then Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), notwithstanding what my hon. friend from Rouville said the other day, that it made no change whatever in the law or the policy of the old Act. The Act, as then changed, reads as follows:

> The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada for the defence thereof at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of any emergency.

The words "for the defence thereof" were added.

So that if what we are doing can be in any way construed as being for the defence of Canada, no hon. gentleman in this House has the right to say that we have not absolute authority to call out the militia of Canada for service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force abroad.

As to the interpretation of the words "for the defence of Canada," Sir Frederick Borden, as reported on page 6492 of Hansard, 1904, said that the insertion of these words constituted no change of policy. He said:

> There has been no change in policy. It seems to me that we have made clear in this section exactly what is understood as the object of a militia force in every country. In the mother country, and in every province of this Dominion prior to Confederation, this has been the rule. We are always able to meet times of stress and emergency. If it becomes

necessary to send troops to assist the Empire at distant points, we always have the means at hand of doing so. Parliament can be called and a special force organized.

I believe that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, then Mr. Fitzpatrick, was Minister of Justice at that time. He was afterwards appointed by the late Administration to the position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. If my right hon. friend had such confidence in the ability of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick as to appoint him to the position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, he should be willing to accept the opinion of that gentleman as to the constitutionality of this Act and as to our power to send troops out of Canada for the defence of our country. This is what Sir Charles Fitzpatrick said at that time:

The Governor in Council may send the militia of Canada out of Canada at any time when deemed necessary for the defence of Canada. If, in the opinion of the Governor in Council it should be necessary, because of a war going on in India, to send militia out there for the defence of Canada, they may, in the exercise of their discretion, do it, because they are the sole judges of what is necessary to be done in the defence of Canada.

The then Minister of Justice said that the Governor in Council were the sole judges of where troops should be sent in the defence of Canada; they might send them out of Canada as far, he said, as India. Then he went on to say:

But we do not think it advisable that that power should be absolutely and unrestrictedly in the hands of the Governor in Council. We think it advisable that the period during which they may exercise that power should be restricted and that Parliament should be called together and be consulted at the earliest opportunity. Parliament must be summoned in 15 days and then the whole matter will be in the hands of the people's representatives.

Is that not quite clear? The whole matter would then be in the hands of the people's representatives, whereas for the first 15 days it would be absolutely in the hands of the Governor in Council.

Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Lavergne, then loyal followers of the then Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) were in the House on that occasion and took part in the discussion. Upon the particular clause in question Mr. Bourassa expressed himself as follows:

I admit that an emergency may arise when the Government should have the power to call out the militia immediately. I do not dispute that; but suppose an occasion should arise on which Canada should be called upon to organize its militia and send a large portion of it outside of Canada when in the judgment of a large number of the people and the Parliament of Canada, it would be to the disadvantage of the country to have so large a number of troops sent out. Parliament should be the final judge of that question, and the Government should call Parliament to deal with that matter.

Later he said:

Before we proceed to another clause—

They were at that time dealing with the clause respecting the right to send the militia out of Canada.

—I wish to say that if there is to be a new clause making it obligatory on the Government to call Parliament within a fixed date, after having made use of the power granted under clause 77, then I shall not propose any amendment. But if there be such a new clause, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I shall be at liberty to move some amendment to this clause.

In accordance with the views of Mr. Bourassa, a clause was added making it obligatory for Parliament to meet within 15 days. As Mr. Bourassa said, Parliament would then be supreme.

Mr. Lavergne was in the House at that time, and interjected some remarks. He was present when Mr. Bourassa made his speech, and he made no objection to the doctrine and the principles there enunciated and laid down by Mr. Bourassa: that Parliament was supreme in this matter, and that we had the right to send troops outside of Canada for the defence of Canada. That is the position he took in 1904, when he was a member of the House and a supporter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

War was declared on the 4th of August, 1914. Parliament was summoned within 15 days, namely, on the 18th day of August. Between the 4th and the 18th the Governor in Council had authorized the raising of troops for service abroad, and in the August session of 1914 this action was unanimously ratified by Parliament. There can be no doubt, therefore, that according to the principles announced by Sir Frederick Borden, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick and Mr. Bourassa, the Canadian Expeditionary Force is abroad to-day by reason of authority contained in the statutes of the Dominion of Canada. These gentlemen all recognized that the defence of Canada might necessarily take place abroad. Will any man in this House say that our first and most effective lines of defence to-day are not those in Flanders and France? If our soldiers are pushed back from Flanders and France they will ultimately be on the banks of the St. Lawrence. Is it not better to make our fight effective in France and Flanders and to be successful there in order that we shall have no need of trenches in Canada? In this

way we shall avoid the devastation and destruction that go with first line trenches, and we shall accomplish all that we could accomplish were we to defend ourselves upon the shores of Canada. With this difference: our being compelled to defend ourselves upon the shores of Canada would mean our being defeated in Europe and if we were defeated in Europe there would be no use in attempting to defend ourselves in Canada from the aggressions of a power like a victorious Germany.

My right hon. friend has said, in his speech on the second reading of this Bill, that he has never feared and does not now fear an invasion of Canada. Well, I do not know how he can say that. I think the right hon. gentleman is mistaken in his belief. I recall an occasion not more than six months prior to the declaration of war when the right hon. gentleman, taunting Sir Robert Borden because of his Naval Emergency Bill to give three dreadnoughts to Great Britain, used these words:—

> Emergency? Who speaks to-day of emergency?
>
> Twelve months have passed since my right hon. friend the Prime Minister introduced his measure.
>
> The Naval Bill.
>
> Twelve months and more have passed since that time when he saw the German peril. He saw Germany almost ready to jump at the throat of Great Britain. He saw clouds on the horizon; he saw these clouds rent by lightning; he heard the murmurs and rumbling of distant thunder. But my right hon. friend to-day may live in peace. The atmosphere is pure, the sky is clear. . . . The German peril has disappeared, if indeed there ever was such a thing.

That was only six months before the war. My right hon. friend had a great deal more ground and reason for making that assertion then that the German peril had disappeared than he has for saying to-day that he sees no danger and has no fear of an invasion of Canada, and that since the beginning of the war he never had any such fear. I think I am quite safe in making that statement.

I will now come to the question of conscription. I have always maintained that the bogey of conscription in advance is much more unpopular policy than conscription actually put into force. We have to-day 400,000 men who have voluntarily conscripted themselves, and all that the present Bill asks is that 100,000 more, by intelligent selection, should join the 400,000 and go across the seas and help to do their bit to bring this war to a successful conclusion. That is all that the Bill means, the careful selection of 100,000 more men, men who can be spared, men who are not required in those avocations and occupations which are essential to the winning of the war. I would like to place upon record a few quotations from some of the British statesmen who have spoken upon this question. First of all I would like to give to the House the words of the Right Hon. Mr. Balfour, because we have had the pleasure of hearing him in this House, and I know when he spoke he made a most favourable impression upon all the members. Mr. Balfour, speaking upon the occasion of the introduction of a Conscription Bill in the British House of Commons in January, 1916, referring to those who were opposed to the principle of conscription, said:

> Let them remember they are living in a world of fact and reality; that we are face to face with great perils, and that great sacrifices are demanded of us. Let them not go forward, and in obedience to what I cannot help regarding as merely speculative difficulties deny to the Government what the Government think is absolutely necessary for the conduct of the war, and without which the Government cannot possibly carry on that war with any hope of success. These are considerations which I most earnestly press upon their minds. This is not a debating society dealing with abstract resolutions. This is not even a great legislative assembly, legislating for all time. All you are asked to do is to help the Government to give adequate support to the forces of the Crown during a period which cannot, measured by the life of nations, be long, the period of this war, which may be but a few months and may be more, but which cannot be long even compared with the life of Parliament. Surely for the moment you can abandon these abstractions. Deal with the situation as you find it, acting on the advice of those who, whatever their shortcomings, whatever their failings may have been, at all events have greater knowledge from their very position, of the facts of the case, and of the necessities that have to be met than any private, unofficial member of this House can possibly have.

Then Mr. Asquith, speaking on the same occasion, said:

> Will any general sympathy be felt for men, for the most part still young—all of them under forty-one—who, unable to bring themselves within any one of these exemptions after full opportunity of presenting their case, are required to do what every one recognizes to be their duty as a matter of moral and national obligation in the time of greatest stress in all our history.

And then Mr. Bonar Law used these words:

> When this war broke out I felt as strongly as those who had taken the most active part in what is called the National Service movement, that our method of raising recruits by the voluntary system was not a good method for such a war as this. I thought it was not

a good method, first of all, because it seemed to me utterly unfair that in the same town, or perhaps in the same street, three or four sons of one family should go and another family on whom the State had precisely the same claim should not send a single man to the army. I thought it a bad system for another reason, the very reason on which many of those who are opposed to this Bill oppose it now—that it was a wasteful system, and that if we were to make any attempt to have a proper correlation between the men employed in the necessary Civil Services and those who go to fight our battles, that could not be arrived at by a system of haphazard enlistment and recruiting which depended on the voluntary will of individual people.

At this point I wish to say that in my opinion the introduction of this Bill can in no way be considered as a precedent for a permanent policy of conscription for Canada. In the years to come, when we look back upon this historical occasion, the verdict of future generations will be that it was a triumph for voluntarism that we raised 400,000 men by a voluntary system reverse ,and as we require only 100,000 men by military compulsion. This will not be considered as a precedent for conscription; it will be considered as a precedent for the reverse, and as we require only 100,00 men to be raised by this method, there is no question of a permanent policy being adopted by this country. The Bill itself shows that there is not. The Bill is practically dead when 100,000 men have been conscribed under its term, and it has no further effect without additional legislation by this Parliament.

The British Parliament never asked that the policy of conscription should be referred to a referendum. In New Zealand the people never asked for a referendum on that policy; the Parliament of those countries acting upon their own authority and according to British practice, put a conscription measure into force without consulting the people. Notwithstanding what has been said by my right hon. friend, the Premier who now controls the destinies of Australia, as he is known to be a conscriptionist, as he fought his election upon that ground and as he was returned to power, the people knowing what his policy was, would have the right to-day to enforce some measure of conscription in Australia, and no doubt he will do so in a short time. In the great republic to the south of us, after an experience of three years of this war, when the people of the United States were asked to participate in it, when they were asked to raise perhaps five or six hundred thousand men, did the Government submit the matter to a referendum? The measure was passed by the House of Representatives without consulting the people, and the people have submitted to it in a most remarkable degree. These are instances in which such matters have not been submitted to the people by way of a referendum, and I know of no instance whatever where any party in any Parliament in any country has asked that the question of conscription be submitted to the people, by way of a referendum, as the leader of the Opposition is asking here to-day. I would like to read a few of the provisions of the United States Bill and compare it with the Bill before the House. Under the United States Act the president is empowered to raise 500,000 men:

Such draft as herein provided shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens, or male persons not alien enemies who have declared their intention to become citizens, between the ages of twenty-one and thirty years, both inclusive, and shall take place and be maintained under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of this Act.

The quotas for the several states, territories and the District of Columbia or subdivisions thereof, shall be determined in proportion to the population thereof and credit shall be given to any state, territory, district, or subdivision thereof for the number of men who were in military service of the United States as members of the National Guard on April 1, 1917, or who have since that date entered the military service of the United States from any such territory, district or subdivision either as members of the regular army or the National Guard.

According to these provisions every state in the Union must contribute its quota of the 500,000 men. But the Act goes further than that. It says:

Notwithstanding the exemptions enumerated herein each state, territory, and the District of Columbia shall be required to supply its quota in the proportion that its population bears to the total population of the United States.

So notwithstanding disabilities or anything else each state must supply its quota according to population. The exemptions are as follows:

The Vice President of the United States, the officers legislative, executive and judicial of the United States and of the several states, territories and the District of Columbia, regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, students who at the time of the approval of this Act are preparing for the ministry in recognized theological or divinity schools.

These exemptions are not mentioned in our Bill but are left to the good sense of the Boards of Selection. The President of the United States is given the right to ex-

empt either totally or partially the following:

> County and municipal officials, custom house clerks, persons employed in the United States in the transmission of the mail, artificers and workmen employed in the armouries, arsenals and navy yards of the United States, and such other persons employed in the service of the United States as the President may designate. Also pilots; mariners actually employed in sea service of any citizen or merchant within the United States; persons engaged in industries, including agriculture, found to be necessary to the maintenance of the military establishment or the effective operation of the military forces or the maintenance of national interest during the emergency; those in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their exclusion or discharge advisable; and those found to be physically or morally deficient.

Then there is a provision, as in our Act, for the establishment of local boards, one for each county, and one for each 30,000 of a city population. They are appointed by the President to hear and determine all questions of exemption. Except that they have no jurisdiction—I do not exactly know the reason for this—over the class of persons described as "engaged in industries, including agriculture, found to be necessary to the maintenance of the military establishment or the effective operation of the military forces or the maintenance of the national interests during the emergency." It may be that there is something in the argument of my hon. friend from Edmonton. It may be that the United States have taken the position that local boards should not have the wide powers of discrimination in the class I have just mentioned, for "maintenance of national interests during the emergency" is a very wide term indeed.

The United States Act also provides for a district board which hears appeals from the local boards, and which has original exclusive jurisdiction in determining what persons shall come within the class I have just read. Appeals are provided for the same as in our Act.

So for all practical purposes, with the exception that the United States Act specifically mentions some classes who are exempt, their Act is the same as ours, except that it requires each state to supply its quota according to population. Our Act is a very simple one, requiring very little study to see what it means. Clause 2 is the operating section, and describes the classes that shall be subject to military duty. The balance of the Act is practically devoted to the selection of the men and the necessary machinery therefor. Under this Act there is an intelligent selection of the persons called for military duty having regard to conditions in Canada to-day, whereas under the old Act the selection by ballot was a most haphazard affair. The operating section reads:

> Every male British subject who comes within one of the classes described in section 3 of this Act . . . shall be liable to be called out as hereinafter provided on active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force for the defence of Canada, either in or beyond Canada.

That is the exact wording of the old Act, and Sir Charles Fitzpatrick construed it as giving the Governor in Council and Parliament power to say that the men so called out could be sent to India or any other place.

I wish to say a word or two with reference to some remarks made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) yesterday. He made what seemed to me a most remarkable statement when he said that the conscription of wealth should be a condition precedent to the conscription of man-power. Apparently, he is firmly convinced that the first and essential consideration at the present time is the conscription of wealth; he thinks that is more necessary than the conscription of men. So far as I know there has been no appeal for wealth to be used in this war that has not been met; that is, we are not suffering by reason of the lack of wealth in our conduct of the war. Up to the present time the needs of the Government have been met by means of taxation and other means which have proved sufficient for the effectual carrying on of the war. In view of that, there is no need to seek vengeance on somebody who has not a son to send to the front, by extracting from his pocket something that is not yet actually needed at the present time, and throwing it up against a corner of the fence; that will not help to win the war. Arms, ammunition and wealth are necessary for the winning of the war, but of what avail are they without man-power? Major W. P. Purney, the president of the Great War Veterans Association, has expressed some views on this question. He thinks there should be some conscription of wealth, but he believes that the conscription of men should come before the conscription of wealth. He goes further and says:

> If the conscription of wealth is in any way going to interfere with the conscription of men I would brush it aside.

I should like to put on Hansard what he said before the Committee of Returned Soldiers last month:

While we have very broad and far-reaching views on this question, and while we may connect the conscription of manhood for fighting purposes with the conscription of the other resources of our country, yet I want it to be clearly understood that we stand, and stand clearly for selective conscription. The other phases of conscription which may be dealt with here this morning or elsewhere later, while they also may express our views and our hopes, yet we want it clearly understood that we are quite willing to sacrifice the consideration of them if they should have the effect of blocking or delaying the main scheme of simple selective conscription, for our comrade across the sea is calling and he must not call in vain.

That is the opinion of the president of the Great War Veterans Association representing 10,000 returned soldiers from all over the Dominion.

While on this question of the conscription of wealth, let me say that the use of the phrase is a very general one and that very few people seem to know exactly what it means. If it means imposing upon the people of Canada sufficient taxes for the purpose of effectively carrying on the war, I am in favour of the conscription of wealth. If it means anything different from that, or anything more than that, will some hon. gentleman please give us an accurate definition of it. If the conscription of wealth means the collection of taxes for the purposes of the war, we have already carried out that policy in large degree. According to the figures I have before me, the Finance Minister, since the beginning of the war, has been the cause of Parliament enacting legislation by way of taxation in various forms which, he estimates, by the end of the present fiscal year will have brought into the treasury, in round figures, $200,000,000. There seems to be an idea abroad that the great capitalists of this country are not being taxed, that there is no conscription of wealth so far as they are concerned. Let me read a few figures showing the taxes being paid to-day by great companies in Canada and that would have been paid by these companies had the new amendments to the laws for special taxation been in force, and which will be collected for the present fiscal year.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF TAXATION UNDER BUSINESS PROFITS WAR TAX ACT, 1916, and THE AMENDMENT THERETO OF 1917.

Name of Taxpayer.	Accounting period.	Amount assessed.	Statement showing what the Assessment would have been had the Amendment of 1917 been in force.
Imperial Oil Company, Limited,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	$ 734,045.80	$ 924,849.22
Ford Motor Car Co., Limited,	Oct. 1, 1914, to Sept. 30, 1915..	697,323.00	1,782,094.42
Canadian Explosives, Limited,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	609,537.01	1,337,630.90
Northern Aluminum Co., Limited,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	341,679.17	822,331.62
Steel Company of Canada, Ltd,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	308,240.34	337,054.68
Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., Limited,	Sept. 1, 1914, to Aug. 31, 1915..	280,885.55	547,478.05
Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co., Ltd.,	Jan. 1,1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	237,251.57	320,753.81
Metal Drawing Co., Limited,	Jan. 1, 1915, to March 31, 1916..	223,839.86	669,550.85
Canada Foundries & Forgings, Ltd.,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	222,367.73	590,691.36
Alberta Pacific Grain Co., Ltd.,	Aug. 1, 1914, to Aug. 15, 1915..	178,669.30	377,220.22
Richardson & Sons, Ltd., James,	Aug. 1, 1915, to July 31, 1915..	155,092.18	380,326.98
British Empire Grain Co., Ltd.,	July 1, 1914, to June 31, 1915..	150,347.04	415,278.20
F. W. Woolworth Co., Limited,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	134,498.13	329,206.90
Grain Growers Export Co., Ltd.,	July 1, 1914, to Aug. 31, 1915..	130,776.90	387,955.69
Toronto Chemical Co., Limited,	July 1, 1915, to July 31, 1916..	130,520.31	378,326.54
Montreal Ammunition Co., Ltd.,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	124,172.93	358,396.28
Dominion Steel Foundry Co., Ltd.,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	112,048.39	273,180.17
William Davies Co., Limited,	April 1, 1914, to March 30, 1915..	109,623.99	223,062.08
John Bertram Sons Co., Limited,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	104,802.73	265,485.13
Penmans, Limited,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	104,129.74	145,041.86
Dominion Steel Corporation, Ltd.,	April 1, 1915, to March 31, 1916..	103,721.28	103,721.28
Canadian Fairbanks Morse Co., Ltd.,	Jan. 1, 1915, to Dec. 31, 1915..	102,748.35	131,766.73

When we brought these taxation measures into the House we were not commended by hon. gentlemen on the other side for what we had done; we got no thanks for the taxes placed upon these rich corporations; quite the reverse. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), speaking on the Bill to amend the Business War Profits Tax Act, 1916, said, as reported at page 1503 of Hansard:—

Mr. Nesbitt: I know that it will be a detriment to the obtaining of capital in this country for industry. . . . I do not know what the minister's aim is exactly. . . . If his aim is to stop big business in this country he

is going the right way about it. . . . So far as I am personally concerned, I think there is no one thing that we want in this country more than capital. We cannot possibly develop the natural resources of this country without it. We hear a great many people talking, both after dinner and before, about the wonderful natural resources of Canada, but we cannot develop them without encouraging capital to develop them. My hon. friend, I think, is discouraging capital by his peculiar legislation here. . . .

Sir Thomas White: My hon. friend from North Oxford has brought up an article in the Financial Times condemning this excess profits tax on the ground that it would be a detriment to obtaining special capital for industry.

Mr. Nesbitt: I read what the Financial Times said; I did not say it myself.

Sir Thomas White: Do you agree with what the Financial Times said?

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes, I do.

Then the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), speaking on the 22nd May last, said:—

Not a few industries engaged in the manufacture of munitions and other commodities influenced by the war assert that after the war there will be a very critical period of readjustment. Some of them fear that during that period of readjustment they will be able to do nothing more than pay running expenses. The most conservative of these have been preparing for that period by placing to one side each year a reasonable reserve, feeling that when their present large business ceases—as we hope it will very shortly—they will find themselves, under the new system of taxation, in a serious financial plight. They tell me that during the two or three years succeeding the war these reserves will be used up in their effort to readjust themselves to new conditions and to prepare for a staple business in the future. Some of them, I understand, think that the action of the Government in taking such a large proportion of the amount they now have on hand will cause them to come to a condition of practical bankruptcy during the period of readjustment. I feel confident that the minister, far from having that in mind, would like to protect our industries against this result. To my mind this is the most serious aspect of the matter; the figures that have been presented to me by some concerns lead me to believe that there is a good deal in the contention.

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) used these words:—

But my hon. friend's proposals do not come under that proposition, and the exactions he is taking will slacken the industry, impair the prospect of capital investment, and dampen the patriotic enthusiasm of the party who is being taxed.

In addition to that, I have before me articles published in the Financial Times, one of which is headed: "Sir Thomas White Puts Hands on the Throat of Canada's Productive Capacity by Iniquitous Taxation." And the article says:—

Sir Thomas White, by his extraordinary scheme of profit taxation, has simply put his hands on the throat of Canadian productive enterprise and if he does not squeeze the country's business to death, he will leave it with little or no vitality to meet the tremendous obligations which the country has entailed.

You find such statements as this in the Financial Journal:—

Canada expects this day that Sir Thomas White will do his duty and withdraw injurious tax plan. Action must be quickly taken to offset the tendency to cancel machinery and installation orders by Canadian and American firms. One Montreal firm withdraws $1,000,000 outlay on additional plant. An American firm cancels plans to erect $2,500,000 plant here, employing 2,500 men, and another firm cancels large order for lathes to replace worn out machinery.—A serious blow at Canada's whole buying position—affecting, labour and capital alike.

So we are doing what we can to conscript wealth; we are making these wealthy concerns pay these large sums of money, and making them pay them upon the principle that those who are making profits out of the war should be the first to pay taxes for the carrying on of the war.

Now, while I have said all this, I want it distinctly understood that, so far as I am concerned, just so soon as it is necessary to raise further taxes for the further revenues for the purpose of carrying on this war by the imposition of income tax or by any other method, I am prepared to vote for any reasonable measure along that line and I think I am safe in saying that the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), who has guided us so successfully through our financial storms up to the present day, will be able to take care of the nation when that time arrives.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) touched upon another question, and found fault with the Government because they had delayed so long in appointing a food controller; and he instanced the cases of the United States, Great Britain and other nations of Europe, which earlier in the war had appointed food controllers. But he forgot this fact, that there was not the same necessity for the appointment of a food controller at so early a date in Canada as, for instance, in Great Britain, and why? Because this country is a large exporter of food products, while in Great Britain they have to depend to a very large extent upon imports of food products from abroad. And there they found it necessary to control their food prices, while here the price is practically controlled by the production and export of this country. But we have arrived at a time when, in the opinion of the Government, it is necessary to appoint a food controller, and I think

I am safe in saying that the man appointed in the present instance, Hon. W. J. Hanna, who has offered his services free of charge to this country, is a man pre-eminently fitted for the position.

The hon. member for Rouville says that the present Bill confiscates the liberty of the subject. Well, is that not begging the whole question? The present Bill confiscates the liberty of the subject in order that the liberty of the subject may not be confiscated. That is the proper argument. The present Bill to a certain extent confiscates the liberty of 100,000 men in order that the Dominion of Canada and the Empire, and indeed all the nations of the entent Allies, may have permanent liberty for all time to come. I should like to ask the hon. member for Rouville, if he were in the House, what is that liberty worth which is not worth fighting for, and how do you expect to get it if you do not fight for it? Do you expect to have somebody else do the fighting in order that you may maintain your liberty? That is a fair proposition to put to him. If he is not willing to fight for liberty but wishes to let other people fight for him, he has a right to be deprived of a certain amount of his liberty in order that other people may get the benefit of permanent liberty hereafter. The hon. member for Rouville said that no effort had been made worthy of the name to intelligently recruit in Quebec. I am not going to dispute that with him, that no effort worthy of the name has been made to intelligently recruit in the province of Quebec. I only know that, according to the returns brought down by the Minister of Militia and Defence the other day, there are only 8,196 French Canadians now serving overseas who enlisted from the province of Quebec; and I would agree with him that there must be some reason to account for that very small enlistment. But who is responsible for public opinion in the province of Quebec? I have no sympathy, and I say it boldly and frankly. I have no sympathy with many of the expressions that have been made in the past by so-called Nationalist members of this House throughout the length and breadth of the province of Quebec, as to our relations with the British Empire. But I make bold to say that it surely cannot be so that the Nationalist members of this House have such influence in the province of Quebec that only 8,000 French Canadians have been sent abroad out of a total population of 1,700,000. It were idle to argue that Somebody has great political influence in the province of Quebec. I have always understood that my right hon. friend was the leader of public opinion in the province of Quebec. I know that when he goes down there in a political campaign he can come back sometimes with sixty out of sixty-five of the constituencies behind him. I know that not very long ago, indeed during this session, very recently at all events, he went down with his friend Sir Lomer Gouin and together they carried sixty out of sixty-five seats in a provincial election in the province of Quebec. If they have influence with my French Canadian compatriots in the province of Quebec to such an extent that they can take sixty out of sixty-five seats on a question of politics, why have they not sufficient influence to go down to that province and bring back more than 8,000 recruits, the number who have gone across the seas to save the Empire in this great time of national stress and emergency?

9 p.m.

Mr. PARDEE: Does the hon. member consider my right hon. leader the strongest man in Quebec for that purpose?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Well now, I do not think I shall answer that, I do not want to create any animosities in this debate; but simply to state facts, and the people can judge for themselves.

Mr. PARDEE: Another question. If what the hon. member says here, and I presume honestly believes, is true, why did Bourassa stump for the Conservative party in the last Dominion election in Ontario?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I am telling my hon. friend that I am stating conditions as I find them to-day.

Mr. PARDEE: Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I am not now blaming one party more than another in the province of Quebec; that would serve no good purpose in this debate, but I want to state the conditions in Quebec as I find them to-day. And I ask the question, can we not find a dozen broad-minded, patriotic, forceful, strong, independent men in the province of Quebec, uninfluenced by party considerations of the past, who will go out to-day and enter upon a campaign in that province to endeavour to make the people of Quebec see that their salvation lies in the upholding and upbuilding of the British Empire? There is no people on the face of the earth that enjoys more privileges than our French

Canadian minority in the province of Quebec. I should like to ask them under what other political constitution, under what other political formation, under what other form of Government they could live where they would have more freedom, both politically and religiously, than they enjoy in the province of Quebec to-day under the British Crown? That is the point I want to make, and I make it in all kindly spirit. It seems to me that the best interests of he French Canadian people themselves are inseparably bound and wrapped up in the welfare of the British Empire, and I cannot get away from that. I have spoken to men on this side of the House and on that side, and I ask, what is the reason that, instead of preaching the doctrines which have been preached in Quebec, twelve or thirteen strong independent men will not now say: We have made a mistake and believe that it is in the best interest of the French Canadian people themselves that we should campaign Quebec and endeavour to contribute our quota in this war as other portions of Canada are doing—and if that course were adopted we should have a happy, a united, and a free Canada, for all time to come. That is the position I take.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then you had better vote for the amendment.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: What are the figures with respect to recruiting in the various provinces? According to the figures which I have, up to the 31st of March, 1917, the population of the various provinces, the number of men enlisted, and the percentage of enlistments to the population are as follows:

Province.	Population.	Number Recruited.	Percent of Total Population.
Quebec	2,003,712	44,000	2¼
Prince Edward Island	93,728	2,700	2⅞
New Brunswick	351,889	17,500	5
Ontario	2,523,074	168,300	6⅝
British Columbia	392,466	39,200	10
Alberta	374,663	35,000	9⅓
Manitoba and Saskatchewan	948,046	79,500	6⅝
Nova Scotia	492,330	22,300	4½

I have some figures which I think will interest hon. members, and they are somewhat of a surprise to me. It is not fair to my own province and not fair to other provinces simply to take the population of the provinces and compare the number of men recruited to the population. The fairest way is to take the number of males of military age in each province, and compare them with the number of men who have enlisted, and I give both tables below:

	Males between 20 and 40 years.	Percentage of the total.
Prince Edward Island	14,328	15.3
New Brunswick	59,086	10.6
Nova Scotia	85,798	17.5
Quebec	342,149	17.1
Ontario	515,442	20.5
Manitoba	110,454	24.2
Saskatchewan	144,832	29.4
Alberta	112,321	30.0
British Columbia	146,740	37.1
Total males	1,531,156	20.1

From these figures one would imagine that for example that the province of British Columbia having sent 37 per cent of its population had made the best record, but as a matter of fact—

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman must be wrong. You say British Columbia is sending 37 per cent of its population.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The number of men of military age in British Columbia is 37 per cent of the total population. That is what I should have said and not that 37 per cent had enlisted . I have now the other table here which shows the actual number of men enlisted compared with the number of men of military age in the different provinces, and it works out in this way:

	Men of military age recruited.	Percentage of men of military age enlisted.
New Brunswick	17,500	30
Prince Edward Island	2,700	18
Quebec	44,000	12
Nova Scotia	22,300	26
Ontario	168,300	32
Manitoba and Saskatchewan	79,500	31
Alberta	35,100	31
British Columbia	39,200	26

There is another comparison, and that is this, that in the western provinces there are more single men in proportion to the population than in the eastern provinces. For instance, in Ontario the percentage of single men of military age is 45. In Quebec, the percentage of single men of military age is only 40, in Alberta the percentage is 55, while in British Columbia the percentage of single men of military age is 59 per cent. So that when British Columbia says she has sent 39 per cent out of a comparatively small population, as a matter of fact, she has not sent as many men as Ontario

in proportion to the men of military age in Ontario. In that regard I might point out that the province of Ontario has the highest percentage of enlistments of all the provinces out of its men of military age being one per cent over Manitoba and Saskatchewan, the next highest.

We have now reached the time when we must do something to increase our enlistment. I think it is admitted by everybody that there is now an absolute imperative necessity for some change in the method of selecting men for the purpose of assisting our boys who have gone overseas. So far as I can see, no method has been suggested by which we can do this except the one that is contained in Bill 75 before the House. Shall we send more troops, or shall we abandon our boys to their fate and allow all their past and future sacrifices to be in vain, disappoint our Allies and gratify our enemies by the acknowledgment that we have reached the limit of our manpower? So far as I am concerned, I would say absolutely, I will never consent to do that.

Then there is the alternative method of a referendum, as to whether we are in honour bound to go to the rescue of the boys we sent to the front and guaranteed to see them through—a referendum to ascertain whether we shall extinguish the fire in our house which is now burning and our boys in it, and await till the conflagration gets beyond our control, a referendum to ascertain whether the slacker is to be compelled to fight two or three months hence when he has refused for nearly three years to do so, a referendum which the "peace at any price" faddist, social cranks or extremists will hail as an opportunity for avoiding service or enforcing their own peculiar doctrines.

A referendum in which those most vitally interested and who should have the greatest say, namely, the soldiers overseas, would have no vote, or an insufficient opportunity of voting because of the difficulty of securing it, and which would cause such delay that if carried, the assistance may come too late.

A referendum which nevertheless would give to the voters of Austro-German and neutral sympathies the right to veto conscription, while our boys are at the front fighting for them who refuse to enlist.

A referendum which from its very nature would have the effect of stopping recruiting until the verdict was known. If carried the delay caused by submission might be fatal at this critical stage of the war.

A referendum which would be nothing more nor less than a secret, silent, safety first national register for the do-nothings of Canada.

At the last general election there were 1,307,528 votes cast. We have now sent overseas, roughtly speaking, 400,000 voters, a little less than one-third of the total vote cast at the last election.

And I think we are all prepared to say whether they are of age or not, that these men are entitled to the franchise upon the present occasion. That is pretty nearly one-third of the total vote of Canada at the last election. Will any man say that each of these soldiers overseas has not two friends in Canada who are sufficiently interested in him to say: I am in favour of conscription, because my brother, my father, my friend, or my relative is at the front? If each soldier overseas had two friends who were sufficiently interested in him to desire conscription that would add another 800,000 in addition to the votes to those of the soldiers overseas—for I assume that they also would be in favour of conscription. Adding these three together, you have in round numbers 1,200,000 voters who would be in all probability in favour of conscription. These are very rough figures, but they give some idea as to what the people would say if this matter were referred to them by means of a referendum. I am unable to estimate the number of persons, who, outside of the two friends of each soldier, would vote for conscription because they believed that they were absolutely in honour bound to do something towards sending to the assistance of their friends the 100,000 men asked for by this Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If 1,200,000 persons voted for conscription it would be sure to carry, would it not?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: If it is sure to be carried, what is the need of a referendum? It would be only a waste of valuable time. That was the argument of the hon. member for North Cape Breton. He said that it would be sure to carry and that the people would back up whatever we did here to carry the war to a successful conclusion. What we are doing here is designed to assist in bringing the war to a successful conclusion.

I do not know that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House realize the nervous and anxious condition of a great many of our people. In my town many people fear that the ring of the door-bell or of the tele-

phone or the arrival of a telegram may sound the death-knell of their hopes and prayers for the safe return from across the seas of those who are near and dear to them. That feeling prevails throughout various parts of Canada. I see no reason why the House should submit a question of this kind to the people, knowing their feelings at this time. Not very long ago I received from the city council of Owen Sound a resolution which was moved by John G. Hay, president of the North American Bent Chair Company, one of the largest industries in the town, employing four or five hundred men. As hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House know, Mr. Hay is one of the most prominent Liberals in my province. The resolution, which was seconded by Mr. Keith Webster, reeve of the town and treasurer of the Liberal Association in my riding, was unanimously adopted by a council of mixed political complexion, which included a defeated candidate of the Liberal party. The resolution, so far as it relates to conscription, is as follows:—

To the Senate and House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, and especially to the Premier, Sir R. L. Borden, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition.

This Memorial of the Municipal Council of the town of Owen Sound.

Respectfully sheweth :

We would suggest that the leaders aforesaid get together and agree on legislation that would give power to a small war council composed of both political parties, to make or unmake laws as may in its opinion be necessary to win the war as speedily as possible, and that said legislation be made broad enough to take into said war council any Canadian of outstanding ability whether he happens to be a member of the House of Commons or not.

We believe that if this line of action is taken it will make possible the quick building of standarized wooden boats in many inland water ports as well as at ocean ports and thus help to properly feed our sons and brothers who are fighting for our existence as an Empire.

And further, we feel that before this war is brought to a successful conclusion party politics must be dropped as it is by your memorialists, and that every means must be taken to make the best use of the energies of the whole population of the Dominion; those required for military service in the field to be taken by selective conscription, having regard to the vocations of civil life from which they can best be spared, and the remainder alloted to munition factories, farms and manufacturing industries the operation of which is essential to the winning of the war, thus bringing about an equality of service by compelling every military district to be represented pro rata in the field, and if it is found that any military district in the Dominion has not given its fair quota of men for the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, to compel said military district to at once do its share and by full co-operation win the war.

It is to our party leaders that we, your memorialists, earnestly appeal to do everything humanly possible to speedily bring this war to a successful conclusion, and then appeal to the people for their verdict. We feel that any other course would not be patriotic and that any party, or body of men, forcing a general election will be met by the disapproval of that portion of the people who have given their husbands, sons and near relatives, many of whom have made the supreme sacrifice, to the cause of Liberty and justice.

I may point out that that resolution was adopted before the Conscription Bill was brought down, and, I believe, before it was even announced.

I am supporting this Bill because I believe it is now the only available and effective method by which we may do our final bit in bringing the war to a speedy and successful termination, keep faith with the men who are so grimly fighting our battles, and ensure that their past and future sacrifices shall not be in vain.

We have reached a new milestone in the history of Canada, of the Empire, and, indeed, of the world; and we are in honour bound to see that the pages of our history shall reveal nothing at this crucial moment to cause regret on the part of those who shall in future direct the destinies of Canada. In a matter of such transcendent moment in our history, the fate of an individual member of Parliament is of small account as compared with the adoption of a proper national policy. It is gratifying to see party affiliations breaking asunder at the country's last imperative call, and I feel absolutely confident that time will amply justify the course of all those members of this House who combine on this occasion to support this Bill as a reasonable measure of selective compulsory military service.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, in rising to discuss this Bill, which I consider to be the most important piece of legislation introduced into this House since Confederation, I desire to claim for my opinion, which is the result of my own judgment of what is right, the respectful consideration which should always be granted to deliberate and conscientious opinions.

It is fortunate indeed, as is noticeable by the very moderate remarks of the member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) that this House has not been lashed into an hysterical fury, as has been represented by certain sections of the press. A difference of opinion upon this question, affecting as it

does the fundamental structure of our national constitution and involving a serious change in our national life, is not to be interpreted as an alliance with the German Kaiser and a manifestation of hostility to the great cause for which Great Britain and her Allies are fighting. If such a difference of opinion is not respected in this House or elsewhere in Canada, this country would not be worthy of the great sacrifices which have been made to sustain her honour in the great struggle on behalf of freedom and liberty.

As to the supreme object to be obtained, there is no division or controversy. Surely nobody thinks that any member of this House would like to see Germany victorious.

A difference of opinion arises, because we do not agree as to the best methods to pursue, taking into consideration the needs of the Allies, the particular conditions prevailing in this country, the imperative duty to maintain national unity, and the proper safeguarding of the provisions which govern our Federal constitution. It would be useless for me to discuss this proposal of the Government unless it is understood that those who hold the opinions I do are as sincere and honest as the supporters of the Bill, seeking as loyally as they do to solve the very difficult problems which confront us at this period of our history.

I am opposed to this Bill because I believe the voluntary system is the best and the only system suited for this country in the present war, and that coercion will be detrimental to the one aim we all desire to attain, namely, the winning of the war. My second objection is that this proposal is a flagrant and direct violation of all the pledges given by the leaders and public men of this country to the Canadian people since the beginning of the war, upon the strength of which pledges so many sacrifices have been made. I also oppose this Bil because it involves a radical and most serious change in our constitutional relations and constitutes a departure from well-known principles agreed to by all parties as to the constitution of this Confederation. I claim that this Parliament has no mandate to enact such a change without consulting the Canadian people.

In the first place, I do not agree with those who say that the voluntary system has been a failure either in this country or in Great Britain. We can fairly argue that we have raised under our voluntary system a larger army than was ever contemplated by any student of military affairs in this country. We have made and we are now making a very large contribution to the war which the Mother Country and her Allies are waging, and it is a calumny upon ourselves and upon the Mother Country to suggest that they do not fully realize and recognize the magnitude of our efforts and of our contribution. It was my privilege a few months ago to spend some weeks in England and France, and I heard in all quarters words of the greatest praise as to Canada's contribution to the war. No one there ever anticipated that this young country, with its population sparsely disseminated over a wide territory, could raise, equip and put into the field an army approximating 400,000 men, and that at a cost considerably larger than what is paid by any of the belligerent countries for the same number of men. Why should Canadians minimize and under-estimate the magnificent and heroic sacrifices our country has made?

It is not true that the voluntary system has been a failure in England. 5,000,000 men have been raised as volunteers in the British Isles, only one additional million has been brought under arms by conscription. Great publicity has recently been given to certain words of the Prime Minister of Great Britain who said that the United States should avoid the blunders made by Great Britain at the beginning of the war. It has been intimated that Mr. Lloyd George was there referring to the merits or demerits of the compulsory system. The British blunder was not in the method adopted to raise the men necessary to fight the battles, but in failing for a certain time to take proper means to provide those men with an adequate quantity of munitions and supplies upon the battlefield. The men were never wanting; what was needed was sufficient artillery and machine guns. Voluntary enlistment in England, however, was at all times hindered by the antagonism and hostility of the powerful class of conscriptionists who had been clamouring for years for compulsory military service. One of the largest and most influential newspapers in England was refusing peremptorily to publish advertisements for voluntary enlistment and was assailing the system every day. The conscriptionists were a strong and influential faction, and their policy was finally adopted to disarm dangerous opposition, and as a diplomatic measure rather than military necessity.

But historical, economic and political conditions are quite different in this country,

and the conscriptionists of Canada will not be as successful as those of Great Britain. It is true we have some newspaper editors who are vying with each other to play the Northcliffe part in Canada, but our democratic atmosphere is not congenial to that peculiar kind of autocracy. Our institutions are free; the people of Canada have made great sacrifices for freedom in the past, and they are not going to surrender even a portion of their liberties at the instigation of privileged classes or of titled or would-be titled editors. Canada of her own free will has agreed to help the Mother Country in this war. Our participation in this war, to the declaration of which we were no party, and in the settlement of which we shall have no voice, is voluntary and must remain voluntary. It is a voluntary participation, nationally and collectively, and it must remain a voluntary participation individually as regards all the citizens of this country. The greatest factor of our national unity up to the present time has been that spirit of true freedom animating our soldiers and our citizens, that spirit that comes only from being a free people. We want to prosecute this war as free men; we must not lose our own democracy in order to try to democratize Germany.

The selective conscription provided for in this Bill is the very opposite of democracy. We are going to appoint men who will prescribe that the son of a citizen will have to enlist and go overseas and give his life for his country, and to declare that his neighbour's son will remain comfortably at home. The whole system will be based upon discrimination; the sons of the poor and the workingmen will be conscripted; the rich and the wealthy will have appeal courts to delay and check their enlistment, and a paternal Government will see that soft places and easy clerkships are found for them if they cannot be exempted. Favouritism and patronage are not eliminated from the system which is now proposed; indeed, in many cases, they will actually control and influence the selection. Will the so-called selective conscription provide an equality of sacrifice? I maintain that the administration of this measure will be a source of continual injustice and inequalities. If a man does not report for service when called up he will be court-martialled or put in jail, and if, after enlistment, he absents himself from duty without leave he will be shot. On the other hand, the man who is exempted will receive high wages, and if he refuses to work he will likely be given a still higher wage. Is that equality of sacrifice?

To those members of the Government who contend that the voluntary system has been a failure I would recall the words of Lord Derby, director general of recruiting, in a letter to the British Nation, dated October 15, 1915:—

> No man has the right to say that a system is a failure unless he has done his best to make it a success.

I deliberately make the statement that this Government collectively and individually have not done their best to make the voluntary system a success. The former Minister of Militia has publicly stated that the Prime Minister actually directed that recruiting be stopped, or at least that there be a letting up. In the province of Quebec the voluntary system has not been given fair play. The military authorities have accumulated blunder upon blunder in recruiting. Men who could have exercised influence and authority have been systematically ostracized and their help refused.

It is a well known fact that military training and institutions have never been encouraged in Lower Canada.

As my right hon. leader pointed out in his address, the French Canadians were disarmed after the conquest and for reasons which I do not desire to discuss they have been kept out of the militia as much as possible. Nevertheless, they were able to save Canada for Great Britain on two occasions. Look at the list of staff officers and holders of other high military positions in this country and you will see that the parties who are so anxious to compile census statistics in order to show that the French Canadians have not enlisted in proportion to their population have never considered the population of Quebec in the distribution of military offices and commands. When the First Canadian Contingent was organized French Canadian officers who offered their services were not accepted. Fifty-three commanding officers were appointed and only one of them was a French Canadian, Mr. H. H. Panet, and he was the only man qualified for the position. Nobody thought of quoting figures and census statistics then in order that the officers of my race might be given a fair share of appointments.

The time at my disposal will not permit me to enumerate the errors made in recruiting in the province of Quebec, but my hon. friend from Rouville yesterday quot-

ed many startling instances. The misdeeds and blunders of the Government have been a permanent obstacle in the way of voluntary enlistment. In addition to that, it has been the misfortune of this country to have in the Cabinet during the war as representatives of the province of Quebec, men who do not command the support or even the respect of public opinion in that province.

This is a very serious debate, and it is my desire to avoid as much as possible anything which would have the slightest appearance of political partisanship, but the question of recruiting in the province of Quebec cannot properly be discussed without referring to the matter with which I am now going to deal. This Government is a combination of men who were elected on absolutely opposite platforms. It has properly been called a hybrid alliance. No union is possible amongst its members without the most flagrant violation of some of their pledges and promises. I believe history will hold the Prime Minister responsible for having set a premium on what was in point of fact public immorality. What authority could be exercised in the province of Quebec for recruiting purposes by those former Nationalists whom the Prime Minister called to his Cabinet? Most assuredly they can have no authority with the majority of the electors whom they could not lead astray in 1911, and they have still less influence with the other portion of the electorate whom they carried with them on their policy of no participation by Canada under any circumstances in the wars of the Empire. These gentlemen could not open their mouths at a recruiting meeting without contradicting themselves and swallowing their former doctrines. To blow and swallow at the same time is a pretty difficult feat, and these gentlemen were very unsuccessful in their attempts to accomplish it. Enlistment in Quebec has been carried on in spite of the Government, and it is rather a matter for wonder the degree of success that has been attained. If the leader of the Opposition is the dominant factor in the province of Quebec, as has been contended by the Government, and as was stated only a few minutes ago by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), why did not the Prime Minister take his advice and call him to the Council in 1914? All the other belligerent countries have brought their best men together in order to attain the highest degree of national efficiency. President Wilson at the present time has entrusted the most delicate and important missions to distinguished and eminent political opponents. Why did not the Prime Minister of this country do the big thing and the right thing in the same direction? Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been better for the unity and national welfare of this country if the Prime Minister had asked the leader of the Opposition to co-operate with him at the recent War Conference in London, even at the cost of dispensing for a few weeks with the company of the Minister of Public Works.

One great obstacle to recruiting in the province of Quebec has been the unfair, irritating, and in certain respects, the slanderous campaign carried on by one influential section of the Ontario press against the people of our province. They have charged that we are unwilling to co-operate in this great work. We do not pay much attention to the foolish and unreasonable statements of irresponsible men; there are fools in all parts of the world; no nation or race can claim a monopoly of them. But when the most influential section of the press of a province adopts as its permanent policy calumny and abuse of a sister province we have a pernicious state of affairs and one fraught with great danger to the present and future welfare of the country.

Only a few days ago two great Toronto newspapers were engaged in an acrimonious controversy as to which of the two had written the more violent, bitter articles against Quebec and her inhabitants. And I must confess that each seemed to be right in its contentions; it would be very hard to give a decision on the point. French Canadians have been slandered before the world; and from Ontario articles have been sent to, and reproduced in, the press of the United States, of France, of England, misrepresenting the people of Quebec in the most dishonest way. Was that all done in order to produce good? Was it a step towards a united and combined national effort? Again I say, it is a wonder that enlistment has been so large in spite of what seems to have been a deliberate effort to stop it. And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe in the accuracy of the figures which have been given by the Minister of Militia as to the number of recruits of French descent. I believe that a much larger number have enlisted than has been shown. Why, you cannot take up the casualty list from day to day—and I stand by that supreme test—without seeing the names of French Canadians in much greater

numbers than the figures of the department would justify. Are we to infer that French Canadians are always put in the lead in places of danger? I repeat that their number would have been still greater were voluntary enlistment given fair play, and had we in the Government of this country men who could carry the respect and support of the people of the province of Quebec.

I believe that the union of all Canadians is the greatest strength of national defence; one of the greatest factors towards the winning of the war is to have a united body of citizens all intent upon bringing about unity, in order to uphold the efforts of our soldiers in the field and show that there is behind them a united country. This Bill, in the circumstances which have preceded, which accompany, and which will follow it, is going to disrupt that national unity and irreparably divide this fair country. Conscription should not and cannot be enforced in this country, as in every other British country, without something like general consent. Does anybody challenge this proposition? I state it on very good authority, on no less an authority than that of the very distinguished British statesman who introduced compulsory service in the British Parliament, Right Hon. Mr. Asquith. Speaking in the House of Commons on the 2nd November, 1915, Mr. Asquith referred to the objections to compulsory service, and said:

> It is based upon an entirely different ground, namely, that the employment of compulsion under existing conditions would forfeit what I regard to be of supreme and capital importance, that is, the maintenance of national unity. That again is an abstract objection, but when translated into concrete terms it means this; if you were to apply, I do not speak of any particular method, but any method of coercion or compulsion, without something in the nature, I will not say of universal but of general consent, you would defeat your own purpose. It would not be a practicable or workable method of making good and filling up the gap left by the defects of the voluntary system.

And further he said:

> My proposition, if I were to formulate one, would be this: not that I rule out compulsion as an impossible expedient, but that compulsion, if resorted to, ought only to be resorted to, and can only from a practical point of view be resorted to, or, in other words, be made a workable expedient for filling up the gap which you have to supply,—with something in the nature of general consent.

And in the same debate Mr. John Redmond said:

> I, like the Prime Minister, am against compulsion. I believe that to impose compulsion in this country, unless, as he said, the country were practically unanimous in favour of it, would be a folly and a crime.

Hon. gentlemen may say that Mr. Asquith has modified his views in that regard. He has not modified them. When he introduced the first compulsory Bill on 6th January, 1916, he made it clear that public opinion in the country was calling upon him to redeem the pledge he had given to the married men who had enlisted under Lord Derby's scheme, that they should not be called upon to serve while younger and unmarried men were held back. And the opponents of compulsory service admitted that the great majority of the people of the United Kingdom were in favour of the Bill on account of the very diplomatic promise given by Mr. Asquith to the married men which had made all of them supporters of conscription. Ireland was not subject to the scheme of Lord Derby, nor to Mr. Asquith's pledge, and was excluded from the Bill. Have we in this country, in the language of Mr. Asquith, "something in the nature of general consent" to compulsory service? Why, the great objection to consulting the public on this matter that is urged by supporters of the Bill is the fear that it will be overwhelmingly defeated. My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) went so far as to suggest that if a vote is to be taken, it ought to be an open vote. Let me say to my hon. friend in the most friendly spirit that these words sound queer in the mouth of a Liberal. The suggestion seemed quite appropriate when made by a new nobleman in the columns of the Montreal Star. Such a proposal I deem to be moreover, rather a reflection upon, even an insult to, the people with whom my hon. friend from South Wellington is better acquainted than I am, as conveying the idea that they would not have the courage to say openly what they think and believe. Using again the language of Mr. Asquith, I say that from the practical point of view, conscription cannot be a workable expedient without something of the nature of general consent. I submit, moreover, that all the nations and dominions participating in this war must contribute their utmost in order to overthrow the menace of German militarism, but the best way for them is to contribute according to their respective opportunities. In June, 1916, Sir George Paish wrote in the Statist:

> Victory over militarism will depend as much upon the world's farmers in general, and upon those of America and Canada in particular, as it does upon the armies at the front.

In one of the recent editions of L'Echo de Paris, M. Maurice Barrès, a famous writer says:

We, the Allies, have the superiority in numbers, and in the French-British lines we have even 1,000,000 more men than the Germans who face us. As to industrial superiority, it is decidedly on our side by reason of America coming into the war.

In another French newspaper, Le Journal of Paris, Senator Humbert has written as follows:

There is no longer any stock. The neutrals even have to ration themselves. New arrivals grow less. Famine menaces the entire world. I foresaw this supreme outcome of this awful crisis some twenty months ago, when I said: let us be sparing of our reserves in men. I was not heard, any more than when a year earlier I called for cannons and munitions. To-day is the danger not self evident? There is but one remedy: Bring back 200,000 or 300,000 Frenchmen of the older classes, to place the fields again in a state of cultivation. Such is the necessary means of recuperation. The condition of the armies, the large numerical advantage enjoyed by the Allies on the western front, compared to the Germans, allow the adoption without delay of this plank of salvation. Let us hasten; it is already late in the day; to-morrow it may be too late.

Surely those men know what they are talking about, and it would be better for the Government to urge on and help the farmers and workingmen of this country to supply the troops of our Allies with all food and material absolutely necessary to carry on the war, instead of breaking national unity and antagonising public opinion by the enacting of an improper measure of compulsion.

I am opposed to this Bill also because it is a direct violation of all the pledges given by this Government, this Parliament, and all the public men of this country, to the Canadian people. The right hon. the Prime Minister has solemnly told the people of Canada that there shall be no conscription. If compulsory service is enforced, I do not hesitate to say that many sacrifices volunteered by Canadian citizens would have been obtained under false pretenses. The right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) spoke in rather light terms of pledges, and even of the constitution of the country. In time of war, he said, all these must be put aside. Sir, this is not good British doctrine. This is the German method, it is the very argument brought forth by the invaders of Belgium when they crushed the heroic little nation in violation of their pledges. But surely we must keep faith with our own people, and the spoken and written pledges of the rulers should not be treated as mere scraps of paper. Let me give a few quotations from speeches of our public men. Speaking in this House of Commons in 1914, the Prime Minister said, page 17 of Hansard:

The men of Canada who are going to the front are going as free men by voluntary enlistment as free men in a free country. They are coming forward voluntarily for the purpose of serving this Dominion and this Empire in a time of peril.

At the opening of the session of 1916, the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said, in commenting upon the offer of 500,000 men:

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.

To this the right hon. the Prime Minister replied:

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.

Speaking at Sohmer Park in Monteral on October 15, 1914, my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said:

It is a sacrifice that is quite voluntary. Canada is an absolutely free country. What has been done up to the present, what will be done in the future, will be absolutely voluntary.

Speaking at Montreal in August, 1914, the former Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) said:

No man who leaves these shores will go except of his own free will, purely voluntary, and no married man shall go except with the consent of his wife and family, and when they go to vanquish our enemies, as vanquish them they will, they will go as free men, subjects of the British Empire, soldiers of His Majesty.

Speaking at Vancouver at the Canadian Club on November 16, 1915, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) said:

We will continue to recruit just as long as there is an able-bodied man in the country who is willing to volunteer his services to his country, and just as long as we have a dollar or can raise a dollar to equip him and send him across the ocean.

In a statement issued at Ottawa on July 28th, 1915, the late Postmaster General (hon. T. Chase Casgrain) said:

I am pretty accurate in my political predictions, and I can say that there will be no conscription.

I could give many other quotations from many other gentlemen and from
10 p.m. the press of this country, but it is useless for me so to do, so

clear is the question to every citizen of the country.

A further objection I have to this Bill is that it involves a grave change in the constitution, and enacts an entirely new principle without any mandate from the Canadian people. The right hon. Prime Minister states that the principle of this Bill is the same as has existed in the law of this country since 1868, as defined in the Militia Act enacted by this Parliament at the instigation of Sir George Etienne Cartier. Section 61 of that Act, upon which the right hon. gentleman bases his contention, reads as follows:

Her Majesty may call out the militia or any part thereof for actual service, either within or without the Dominion, at any time whenever it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion, or insurrection, or danger of any of them.

Sir, I am surprised that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister did not go back a little further in the history of this country.

But, the Militia Act of 1868 was by no means the first Militia Act of Canada. The former Acts are of very great importance, in considering the true interpretation of the section I have just referred to. I propose to quote, from the various Militia Acts previous to 1868, the sections that correspond with section 61 of the Cartier Act. I will go back as far as 1808. In that year a militia law was enacted in Upper Canada, Statutes of Upper Canada, 48 George III, section 8 of chapter 1, which reads as follows:

Provided also that it shall not be lawful to order the militia or any part thereof, to march out of this province, except for the assistance of the province of Lower Canada (when the same shall be actually invaded or in a state of insurrection) or except in pursuit of an enemy who may have invaded this province, and except also for the destruction of any vessel or vessels built or building, or any depot or magazine, formed or forming, or for the attack of any enemy who may be embodying or marching for the purpose of invading this province, as for the attack of any fortification now erected, or which may be hereafter erected, to cover the invasion thereof."

In 1839 the province of Upper Canada enacted another Militia Act, Statutes of Upper Canada, 2 Vic., chapter 9. Section 7 of which reads as follows:

Or to march the said militia, or any portion thereof, to any place without the limits of this province, for the attack of any enemy that may have invaded, or may be marching or collected for the purpose of invading this province.

In 1846 the Parliament of United Canada enacted another Militia Act, 9 Victoria, chapter 28. Section 19 reads as follows:

And may march the militia into any part of the province and shall also have power to march the militia in any portion thereof, to any place without the limits of the province, but conterminus therewith, for the attack of any enemy that may have invaded or may be marching or collected for the purpose of invading this province.

In 1855 another Militia Act was enacted by the Parliament of United Canada, chapter 77 of the Statutes of the province of Canada, 18 Victoria. Section 66 reads as follows:

The militia so called out may be marched to any part of the province or to any place without the province, but conterminus therewith, where the enemy may be, and from which an attack on this province may be apprehended.

In 1863 a new Militia Act was enacted, chapter 2, of 27 Victoria, of the Statutes of the province of Canada. Section 33 reads as follows:

The Militia so called out may be marched to any part of the province or to any place without the province, but conterminus therewith where the enemy is, and from which an attack on this province is apprehended.

This is the last Act before Confederation. It is obvious that before Confederation, but pre-embodied in all the legislation relating to the militia, was a provision that it could not be sent out of the country, except in contiguous territory, to pursue an invader, or to meet him before he reaches this country.

Sir, Confederation was a compact entered into by the various provinces which compose it. Do you believe that Lower Canada would ever have agreed to this compact had it been stated, or even hinted, that her citizens and sons might be coerced at any time, by military compulsion, to go and fight with the Imperial troops and as part of the Imperial troops in European territory at Saloniki or Mesopotamia? Read the debates which took place at Confederation and accompanied Confederation and you will see that the only case which was thought of and discussed was that of a possible war between England and the United States of America. Sir John A. Macdonald, in introducing the Confederation Bill before the Parliament of United Canada, uttered the following words:

Although we knew it to be possible that Canada, from her position, might be exposed to all the horrors of war, by reason of causes of hostility arising between Great Britain and the United States—causes over which we had no

control and which we had no hand in bringing about—yet there was a unanimous feeling of willingness to run all the hazards of war if war must come, rather than lose the connection between the Mother Country and these colonies.

In the same speech he said:

Instead of looking upon us as a merely dependent colony, England will have in us a friendly nation, a subordinate, but still a powerful people to stand by her in North America—

—not in Europe.

—in peace or in war.

These words are taken from the speech of Sir John A. Macdonald when introducing the Bill. The Militia Act of 1868 was passed under the same principle, and with the same idea in the minds of those who enacted it. Until a few days ago, I do not think that anybody who has studied the constitutional history of Canada ever expressed the opinion that her militia could be sent overseas by virtue of that Act. The debates that took place in 1868 showed that there was no intention to change the principle or the meaning of the section I am discussing. In considering the words "either within or without the Dominion" in a subsection we must not forget that Canada at that time included only the four provinces, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and it was important that the authorities should be empowered to send the militia outside of the area of those four provinces to protect and defend the British territory which forms to-day the other provinces of the Dominion.

I come now to the Militia Act of 1904. Surely this Act did not change or modify the principles which I have enunciated. The language of the section was made clearer by the insertion of the words "for the defence thereof." The right hon. Prime Minister quoted a few words from a speech by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, then Minister of Justice. He took good care, it seems to me, not to cite the language of the father of the Act, the man responsible for the legislation, and who knew best what was the intention and aim of the Bill. Here is the language used by Sir Frederick Borden, then Minister of Militia:

Mr. Maclean: I would ask the minister if it is not the case that under the old section of the law as it now stands the militia of Canada could be used for the defence of the empire and sent out of this country for that purpose? But under the proposed law that is strictly prohibited.

Sir Frederick Borden: No. I am advised, and was advised at the time of the South African trouble, for instance, that under the law we could not do that.

Sir Sam Hughes: Could not do what?

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Sir Frederick Borden: That we could not send the militia to South Africa for service; under the law we were not able to do so. The present law has been changed, as I say, in conformity with that view and in sympathy with the idea which, as I said, controls the militia of the mother country and the militia of every one of the colonies of the Empire, where you will find precisely the same clause.

On August 1, 1904, in committee, he said:

Sir Frederick Borden: . . . .The troops we sent to South Africa were not sent under the militia law at all. They were sent under a special arrangement; they went as volunteers. The same thing could be done at any time. It certainly would not be done under the militia, either as it was or as we propose to make it, because there is no essential difference. Notwithstanding the fact that my hon. friend from Colchester questions my possession of common sense, I still believe that the Act as we propose it is essentially the same in that respect as it was before, the object being to make clear the actual intention.

The very fundamental idea of a militia force always has been, and is now, home defence.

He said further:

Sir Frederick Borden: I am sure my hon. friend would not pretend to say that under the law as it is to-day the Government could send a corps of the militia upon foreign service.

Mr Gourley: I have not the slightest doubt of it; you could send them anywhere.

Sir Frederick Borden: I am quite prepared to come to close quarters on that question and I am quite prepared to say that in so far as the militia are concerned I do not believe it is in the interests of the militia that a provision of that kind should be made.

Mr. Gourley: Why, every man in Canada wants to go.

Sir Frederick Borden: I do not think the hon. gentleman himself would seriously contemplate a proposition by which the Government would have authority to order the militia to serve a thousand miles away from Canada.

This is the language of the father of the Bill, the then Minister of Militia. The discussion continued:

Mr. Gourley: Why not? What are we here for?

Sir Frederick Borden: It is for the hon. gentleman to explain that.

Very sensible language. Sir Frederick Borden continued:

I do not think that any thoughtful man looking at the condition of things in this young country—

Mr. Gourley: Explain yourself. Tell me what you mean.

Sir Frederick Borden:—would seriously propose to enact a statute which would place in the hands of any Government the power of ordering out the militia to serve in distant parts of the world.

I repeat that until a few days ago nobody in this country thought that the Militia Act could be put in force except for purposes of home defence. The right hon. leader of the Opposition showed, by a cable-

gram which he read in the course of his address, that such was the opinion of the Government and of the Prime Minister himself. But I have another authority. Would it surprise members of the House when I say that the former Minister of Militia, who gave us yesterday a lecture on constitutional law, was of the same opinion? In Hansard of August, 1914, I read the following words, page 95:

> Mr. A. K. Maclean: In the event of further Canadian troops going to the front, will the system of volunteering be continued, or will the militia be asked to go in a body?
>
> Sir Sam Hughes: I might point out that upwards of 100,000 men have already volunteered, but we are only able to take 22,000, although I am told 27,000 have got on the trains. They simply climbed on and we couldn't keep them off.

Recruiting was going well at that time. He continued:

> So far as my own personal views are concerned, I am absolutely opposed to anything that is not voluntary in any sense—

These are the words that I want the House to note.

> —and I do not read in the law that I have any authority to ask Parliament to allow troops other than volunteers to leave the country.

Sir, holding as I do the strong opinion that this Bill is a departure from the rules and principles which have hitherto prevailed, I submit that such a departure cannot be made without the consent and the sanction of the people. The moral unity of Canada cannot be maintained or secured without government of the people and by the people, and the ruling of the majority. I believe in democratic principles in time of war as in time of peace. To this Parliament, which has outlived its constitutional existence, in which a large section of the people of Canada is not represented and which is asked to pass an arbitrary measure of compulsion, I commend these words of Burke:

> Let the Commons in Parliament assembled be one and the same thing with the commons at large. The distinctions that are made to separate us are unnatural and wicked contrivances. Let us identify, let us incorporate ourselves with the people.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that the proposal of a referendum was a dilatory expedient calculated only to delay the application of the law. My best answer to this argument is that the delay involved will not be greater than that which would have resulted had the proposal of the Prime Minister been accepted. The offer was to form a coalition Cabinet, pass this Bill and appeal to the country to put it into force. Where is the difference? Is it a crime that we should ask that the people be consulted in this matter by the only means which is at our disposal?

Sir, I ask the Government to be loyal to the Canadian people. I ask the Prime Minister to reconsider his decision; to reconcile the country, which is now threatened with internal trouble and disruption. The only way to do that is to accept the amendment of the leader of the Opposition and trust the Canadian people.

Mr. J. A. BARRETTE (Berthier) (translation): Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister introduced in the House the Military Service Bill, he stated in plain words that the measure was not inspired from Downing Street but that he it was who on his own impulse as head of the Canadian people, had taken upon himself to frame such an Act. He thinks the seriousness of the present emergency justifies his introducing compulsory service, whatever disastrous consequences may follow in the wake of such a measure, which may well be said to be the bane of Canada's welfare. My sense of duty urges me to express openly in this House my views in the matter and the opinion of my constituents. I shall discuss the issue dispassionately in the light of reason and facts.

I admit that since the declaration of war, all measures tending to Canada's participation in the struggle have received the undivided support of both sides of the House; no dissentient voice was heard. To this day we have done our share of our own free will, and so long as our participation has been voluntary the Canadian people have nobly done their duty. Last January, the Prime Minister was invited to London to attend the Imperial War Conference, and he came back more of an Imperialist than ever. Allow me to suggest, Mr. Speaker, the necessity of inserting at once in the Statutes a very important piece of legislation prohibiting the Prime Minister of Canada from going out of the country during his term of office. Since 1896, every time a Canadian minister has gone overseas to represent Canada at imperial conferences, he returned an imperialist to the core, blind to the true interests of the Canadian people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must acquaint the House with the position I took previously on this important matter. In October, 1916, at a largely attended meeting held at Berthierville, in the presence of the ex-Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude), I stated to the electors of my county and my pro-

vince that I was irreconcilably opposed to any kind of compulsory service and pledged myself to combat it in every possible way. This year, on the Sunday after the Prime Minister had stated his policy, I forthwith announced to the electors of my parish that I was as opposed as ever I was to conscription of any kind and recalled the pledge I had given in 1916.

When I made these statements, there was no question of conscription at all, and I was then acting freely, knowing I was acting in the best interests of my constituents as well as of my country.

As soon as the Prime Minister had announced to this House his intention of introducing a new war policy, the popular sentiment, which had been in favour of the war, was completely modified to such an extent that it has become hostile to any participation in the present war. In all sections of the country, protests were made at public meetings, and numerous petitions have been sent to the members of this House.

With your leave, Mr. Speaker, I will read the copy of a resolution adopted by the council of the parish of Ste. Genevieve of Berthier, strongly protesting against this conscription Bill, and which reads as follows:

At a general meeting of the municipal council of the parish of Sainte Geneviève de Berthier, held in the city of Berthier, at the council's regular meeting place, on Tuesday, the fifth day of June, 1917, at 8 o'clock a.m., in accordance with the provisions of the Quebec Municipal Code; at which were present: His Honour the Mayor, J. F. Fernet, and Councillors Charles Denis, Arthur Ducharme, Octavien Lavallée and Paul Savignac, forming a quorum of the said council, His Honour the Mayor chairman. Councillor Ducharme moved, seconded by Councillor Denis, and it was unanimously resolved:

Whereas, Sir Robert L. Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, has declared in the House of Commons that he will submit a Bill providing for a system of selective conscription for the overseas military service:

Whereas, the sending across the seas of Canadian troops has already seriously compromised the country's economic situation, and whereas it is in the interest, both of Canada and the Empire and its alies, that the Canadian population should turn all its energies to promoting agricultural and manufacturing industries;

Whereas, since the beginning of the war raging in Europe, Sir Robert L. Borden has declared in the House of Commons, at different times, and particularly on January 17, 1916, that the Government did not intend to adopt conscription;

Whereas, the cost of living is ever increasing, it would be more proper for the Canadian Government to take the necessary measures towards improving agricultural conditions;

Therefore, this Council, interpreting the unanimous feelings of the population of the parish of Sainte Geneviève de Berthier, strongly protests, both in its own name and on behalf of the said parish's entire population, against the imposition of conscription, without previously consulting the people, either by means of a referendum or through general elections, and that copies of the present resolution be sent to the Prime Minister of Canada, the Honourable Sir Robert L. Borden, to the leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to our representative at Ottawa, Mr, J. A. Barrette; and be it further resolved that the Dominion member be instructed to vote against any conscription proposal.

A true copy of the resolution passed by the municipal council of the parish of Sainte Geneviève de Berthier, taken from the book of proceedings, and in my custody, as secretary-treasurer.

(Signed) J. A. Lavallée,
Secretary-Treasurer.

To this resolution of protest, I have answered as follows:

To Mr. J. A. Lavallée, notary,
Secretary-Treasurer of the parish of Berthier,
Berthierville.

Dear Mr. Lavallée,

I have duly received copy of the resolution of the municipal council of the parish of Sainte Geneviève de Berthier.

I congratulate you upon your civic spirit, and I am convinced that it was through your enlightened patriotism that this resolution was unanimously passed, and that you have really at heart the interests of the French Canadian race.

I beg leave, Mr. Secretary, to repeat to you the statement I made last fall at a large meeting held at Berthierville, in the presence of 6,000 electors of the county, and from its vicinity, where I stated that I was completely opposed to conscription. This year, on the Sunday following the declaration made by the Prime Minister of Canada, I alike stated publicly in my own parish that I was altogether opposed to this Government measure. I then acted freely, knowing I was doing so in the best interest of my constituents.

I sincerely hope this declaration will rejoice the heart of all the true French Canadians of my county and of my province.

Please accept, my dear friend, the expression of my highest sentiments and believe me,

Yours most truly,

(Signed) J. A. Barrette.

Ottawa, June 6, 1917.

Similar requests from the parishes of Lavaltrie, Lonoraie, St. Gabriel de Brandon, St. Norbert and St. Barthelemi, have alike been addressed to me. To all these requests, I have made the same answer as I have just read to the members of this House. I have likewise sent to every municipal secretary of my county a copy of said letter. That must clearly show you that I have always been, by principle and in fact, against the conscription which it is desired to impose upon us to-day. I know that this bold and strong attitude of mine will probably be diversely interpreted by some political friends, as my county has been particularly favoured, as far as Public Works are concerned.

May I be allowed to tell the House that since 1911 until the present day my county

has been favoured with a good deal more public works of every kind than under all former administrations from Confederation up to the day when I was returned as the member for the county of Berthier.

I know that my frank determination may relax some friendships which I held dear, but when a principle was at stake I have never paused before breaking away from my party and silencing my heart so as to listen only to the voice of my conscience. How could it be held that I remain indifferent to so radical an innovation which will cause perturbation in the political annals of the country, seeing that in the past I have always been able to rise above partisanship.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to glance upon the past and to recall to the House that in 1912, when it was proposed to enlarge the territory of Manitoba by the annexation of Keewatin, the rights which the minority in the annexed part held under the constitution had to be safeguarded. In spite of the threats of a few narrow-minded politicians, I was not afraid to break away from my party and vote for the Mondou amendment. Allow me also to recall to your memory that during the session of 1916, when the rights of the minority had to be upheld in the province of Ontario, I voted again in favour of the Lapointe motion without caring for the hue and cry of my party.

It is not astonishing, Sir, to hear me say to-day that I am altogether against conscription. By referring to the Debates of the session of 1912-13, Vol. I, fol. 570, you will find that the hon. member from Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) submitted as an amendment to the speech from the Throne a motion which laid a principle totally different from that which says that "when England is at war, Canada is also at war." The motion of Mr. Mondou was in the following terms:

> Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following amendment to the Address:
>
> That this House is ready and willing to adopt, at any time, efficient measures for the defence of Canada, an autonomous colony under the British Crown; but that this House is nevertheless of opinion that the Canadian Parliament has no right to impose on the Canadian people responsibilities in regard to the general defence of the Empire, as long as under the present status of constitutional relations between Canada and the United Empire of Great Britain and Ireland, the Government of His Majesty, responsible to the people of the United Empire alone, will reserve for itself the exclusive management and control of Imperial and international questions.

While inviting the House to defeat the amendment moved by Mr. Mondou, the Prime Minister spoke as follows (See Hansard, 1912-13, Vol. I, fol. 579):

> The other considerations which have been alluded to will be held in regard in the future. I would go further than my right hon. friend in one respect. My right hon. friend says that the amendment has been proposed at an inopportune time, and he is not prepared to say what his attitude in regard to this amendment would be if it had been proposed at the proper time. Whether it properly came up in debate or not, I would vote against it, for the reason that it would prevent Canada from lifting her finger in the defence of the Empire if war were declared to-morrow.

I am pleased to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Achim, Mr. Lamarche, Mr. Mondou and your servant were the only members of the House who voted for that amendment.

Later on, during the same session, when the $35,000,000 Bill relating the construction of three Dreadnoughts in England was before the Canadian Parliament, I also voted against that measure because I wanted to fulfil the promises that had been made to the electors of my constituency at the time of the election in 1911. If my memory serves me right, during that campaign the Laurier navy scheme was decried everywhere and held as nefarious on every husting, and it was said that our children ought not to be sent to be disemboweled on the seas of China and everywhere else. The Borden tribute which was to amount to $20,000,000 was equally disapproved. In a fit of generosity the Prime Minister increased that tribute to $35,000,000. Was that increase from $20,000,000 to $35,000,000 a legitimate reason to uphold a measure which I had condemned? At the same session the hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) submitted an amendment to the Bill and said that the measure should not be passed until it was put before the people at a general eleciton.

I may remark, Sir, that I voted for the Turriff motion.

Having made all those statements, how could it be asserted that I did not oppose with all my might that unjust scheme of conscription.

Australians have had the opportunity of voicing their opinion by means of a referendum. Why should that privilege be denied to the people of Canada? Are we not entitled to that same liberty enjoyed by exclusively British colonies? I always beleved that England was a democratic country and that wherever waved the British flag, there could democratic institutions find security and protection. To-day we claim our right to freedom, and I place as much trust in the patriotism of the French Canadians as in the loyalty of my English-speaking countrymen. I much

prefer Henri Bourassa speaking his mind openly before the whole country to certain narrow-minded members on the Government side of the House who cannot find the courage to say openly what is in their mind or who even proclaim loudly what is not in their heart.

Mr. Lamarche, ex-member for Nicolet, whom I should like to see again in this House, speaking the other day at the Monument National, asked whether Canada in the present war should make a further effort, or call a halt. When the Prime Minister announced his conscription policy, he stirred up dormant consciences and gave the people of this country an opportunity of examining in the light of reason and facts whether Canada had done its duty. So long as our participation in the war was voluntary, I supported all measures to that end, but when it is intended to turn a free and generous gift into compulsion, I also hold without a moment's hesitation that we should call a halt, that further efforts on our part would drive the country to ruin and bankruptcy and that we shall have our hands full trying to meet our accumulated obligations.

At the meeting at the Monument National to which I referred, Mr. Montpetit demonstrated beyond possible doubt that by contributing further Canada would imperil its economic development. I think, Mr. Speaker, the people's welfare calls upon us to put a stop immediately to the sending of troops to the front. In so doing, we would allay a serious agitation and restore peace in the homes; mothers would regain their happiness when they see that their sons are kept to them to till the land, and, as explained by the distinguished economist whom I have just named, the Empire would derive more benefit from our sons' work on the farm. Otherwise the wound inflicted Canada will never heal.

I now state before the House that in future, I shall support any leader or any party who declares himself against compulsory service. The people through a referendum should have a say in the matter.

I shall for those reasons vote against the Military Service Bill and for any amendment that may have the effect of nullifying the bill.

I beg to give another reason for my vote. How can the Government, after its mandate has expired, justify the passing of such an extreme measure? I have always taken the real duty of a representative to be to carry out the people's wishes and ensure the people's welfare. Perhaps my stand against conscription will not have all

the effect desired, but at least will I be able to repeat in my heart the words of a noble mother, Admiral Bouvet's, in front of her son's coffin: "Open wide the doors, for never has so great an honour entered this house." There are defeats, Mr. Speaker, that carry with them more glory than victories, and as for me I never felt so honoured as when I take this opportunity of combatting a measure so baneful and unpatriotic.

Before I resume my seat, I beg to move in amendment to the amendment, seconded by my hon. friend Mr. Achim: that all the words of the said amendment after the word "following" be taken out and the following substituted therefor: "that this Bill be not now read a second time, but be read a second time this day six months."

Mr. SPEAKER: Sir Robert Borden moves:

That Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, be now read a second time.

To which Sir Wilfrid Laurier moves in amendment:

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."

To which Mr. Barrette moves, seconded by Mr. Achim, in amendment to the said amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "this Bill be not now read a second time, but it be read a second time this day six months."

On the motion of Mr. F. F. Pardee, the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Sévigny, the House adjourned at 10.47 p.m.

Thursday, June 21, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

PAPER PRESENTED.

List of points on National Transcontinental Railway, Eastern Division, from which rails were lifted for shipment overseas to France.—Mr. Cochrane.

EXPENSES OF PARLIAMENTARY SESSIONS.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings) presented the first report of the Select Committee appointed by this House to act with

a like committee of the Senate to consider the cost of each session of Parliament, as follows:

The Select Committee appointed by the House to act with a like committee of the Senate to consider the cost of each session of Parliament and of reducing the same, beg leave to present the following as their first report:

Your committee recommend that the quorum of the two committees when meeting together shall consist of seven members.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has any work been done by the committee?

Mr. NORTHRUP: This report is simply the first report after the two committees had met. We found that, owing to an adjournment of the Senate, it might be impossible to obtain a quorum, and so it was agreed to ask this House to reduce the number of the quorum to seven.

On motion of Mr. Northrup the report was concurred in.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 92, respecting a certain convention between His Majesty and the United States of America for the protection of migratory birds in Canada and the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. ROCHE: This Bill is the result of a treaty that was entered into between His Majesty and the United States Government a few months ago for the better protection of migratory birds. It was found that migratory birds, both game birds and insectivorous birds, that migrate from the United States to Canada and vice versa, have become very much reduced in numbers owing to the laxness and non-enforcement of game laws, and because some of the states as well as some of the provinces of Canada had not sufficiently effective game laws. It was therefore decided that the only possible way in which these birds could be properly protected was by a treaty between the two countries. Such a treaty was entered into which has been assented to by the various states that have jurisdiction over the game laws in the United States, and by the various provinces that have jurisdiction over the game laws in Canada. There is to-day a Bill before Congress giving effect to the treaty so far as the United States is concerned, and this Bill takes similar action with regard to Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

MILITIA DEPARTMENT MOTOR CARS.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many motor cars are used by the Militia Department at Halifax?
2. For what purpose are the said cars used?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Four.

2. These cars are used by the General Officer Commanding the District and the staff in connection with military duties.

ST. CHARLES RIVER DAM.

Mr. LACHANCE:

1. Since when was the work on the dam in the St. Charles river, Quebec, stopped, and upon whose order or request?
2. For what reason was it so stopped?
3. When will the work be again started?

Mr. REID:

1. Work on the St. Charles river works at Quebec has not been stopped.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. TOBIN:

What are the names, rank, pay, and nature and place of employment of all officers attached to headquarters at Halifax and the various departments of the military service or connected in any way with Military Division No. 6?

COST OF LIVING IN THE YUKON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: If I may be permitted, I would like to give the signature to the telegram which I read yesterday from the Yukon, because I find it does not appear in Hansard. The signature was that of Mrs. Geraldine Sharpe, of the Women's Protective League. I also received, under date of June 20, a confirmatory telegram from Mrs. Marie Fotheringham, of the Women's Progressive League.

LABOUR STRIKE IN WESTERN COAL MINES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: Would the Minister of Labour give the House such information as he can in regard to the present situation of the difficulties respecting the coal miners of Alberta?

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think I can add anything to the statement I made yesterday, which was to the effect that the

Government were taking action with the view to having the mines opened. We expect this will be done in a day or two.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): I have a couple of telegrams to-day from the unions in Alberta stating that the men had agreed to return to work on the terms agreed to by the Policy Committee and Mr. R. F. Green, M.P., and that their only objection was to the penalty clause, which the operators insisted upon. Is that the case or not?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think the information that my hon. friend has received is correct. The representatives of the miners and operators agreed on everything except the penalty clause.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I further suggest to the Minister of Labour that he take the earliest possible opportunity of placing before the House and the country the conclusions of the Government in regard to the production of coal in the West. The importance of this matter cannot be exaggerated, and I think it would be very, very much in order if the minister would inform the House and the country as to the situation at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. KNOWLES: Did the minister state that the Government would be operating the mines in a day or two, or simply that they would have an announcement to make then?

Mr. CROTHERS: We expect the mines to be in operation within the next two or three days.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING.

Consideration of the motion of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto, and on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barrette, resumed from Wednesday, June 20.

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 Canadians and not as party man to party man, for this is not an hour for partisan speeches.

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. Such was the wanton design of Germany. 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 civilization? 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?

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 as young patriots; they went to uphold the liberty that our fathers and forefathers have secured and handed down to us. 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 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.

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.

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.

Sir, this is not a time for party recrimination. 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.

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 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.

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 conscien-

tious 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 believe it yet 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.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): No one could be present during this debate, or, if not present, could look out with intelligent mind on the manifestations of sentiment everywhere appearing without being convinced that this discussion is of greater consequence than any that has ever before taken place in this Parliament. I say that, not because the issue is in doubt. Substantial unanimity, though not entire unanimity, on this side of the House would perhaps carry the Bill. But the courage of certain hon. gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber—courage in an hour of trial—has placed the issue beyond all doubt at all. However, it is not the mere passage of the measure that is of final consequence. It is the enforcement of the Bill that we must keep in mind. It is not so much the enactment of law as obedience to law that counts. That is why this Bill should be thoroughly considered, and why the debate should be conducted in such a spirit, and with such a purpose, as will afford an example to the people of Canada. The right and honourable thing must be done. The right and honourable thing will be done. The right and honourable thing is embodied in this Bill. But the important duty of members of Parliament is to see to it that we make plain to every reasonable man to the four corners of this Dominion, that we pass this Bill, and enforce it, only because it is the right thing to do—that we do so, far from any spirit of vindictiveness, or for any unworthy or insufficient reason, but because, in this crisis of the nation, it is the only right thing to do. It will become us, also, to demonstrate in this House—to be in this House a reflection of the overwhelming sentiment of this country, that the war in which we are engaged must be pressed on to victory by the only means in which it can be pressed.

I regard the forwarding of troops to the front as a necessity, as an all-essential, as something we cannot shirk. Does anybody dispute that? Whatever means are necessary to procure these men, they must be sent, and whatever action is necessary on our part to support our army at present in France, we must adopt. No one has seriously argued in this House—and I give every hon. gentleman the credit of saying no one seriously believes—that we can dispatch 350,000 men overseas, commissioned by us to stand between our country and destruction, and leave them to be decimated and destroyed. The obligation of honour is upon us, it is the plainest obligation that ever was placed on a nation. The obligation of honour is fortified by the primary obligation of all people to protect the security of the state. There is no other way in which either the honour or the security of the state can be preserved.

In the next place, we are able to send these men; we have the men to send. Does anybody dispute that? It is argued feebly by some that we require all our men for our industrial, commercial and agricultural pursuits. True, we can use them all here; there are opportunities in Canada to occupy them all. But surely a reasonable mind must agree that we need them far more sorely in France. It is true that we cannot send them without some inconvenience. The soldiers who represent France on that 350-mile battle line in Europe are not there without inconvenience to the people at home; neither are the soldiers who represent Great Britain. When the men are sent away, necessarily, more women will be employed in our factories, more old men will be employed on our street cars, more boys will be employed on farms during the summer instead of passing their time at lake resorts. There might even be a very small diminution of production in Canada. But all this we can afford infinitely better than we can afford to allow our lines in France to be decimated, weakened or destroyed. We can afford the men; we must send them; what other way is there of sending them?

Some have suggested that if we withdrew this Bill we could sustain our forces

at the front by a continuation of the voluntary system. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Pardee) and who has delivered an address which will long live in the records of this Parliament, has suggested that, at all events under the shadow of this Bill, more men may be secured. I do not doubt that that is true; possibly under the shadow of this Bill more men will enlist, under a sort of voluntary system. But that emphasizes, does not destroy, the necessity for the Bill. Who can contend, with justification, that the voluntary system has not been adequately tried in Canada, both as to vigour of effort and as to length of time? The member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), if I understood correctly an interruption that he made yesterday, feels that the voluntary system is now doing enough. Well, for twelve months it has produced an average of 6,000, or 7,000 men a month, while the wastage in Canada and in England amounts to a very substantial portion of that figure. In the two months through which we have just passed, the voluntary system yielded us not one man for four of those who were casualties among our armies in France. Add the casualties in France and the wastage in England to the wastage in Canada, and it is as plain as any rule of arithmetic that further reliance on the voluntary system will in time—perhaps in a very short time—so reduce our forces that we shall have no substantial representation in the war.

It has been suggested that everything has not been done that might have been done. Perhaps that is so, all I know is that we have done everything that we were able to devise, that the resources of the Administration were able to evolve, to make the voluntary system successful. Has there been during the whole course of this debate a suggestion of any practical step that might have been taken and which was not taken to make the voluntary system successful? I have not heard one. Was there not

4 p.m.

a sufficient number of recruiting officers? Were the recruiting officers not the proper men? In some cases, perhaps, they were not; no Government that ever existed could select in every particular case the proper man. There may have been an English recruiting officer in Montreal, but there were French recruiting officers as well in Montreal. One would think, listening to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) that the only man commissioned to recruit in Montreal was the Methodist minister of whom he complained. I obtained to-day from the Militia Department a list of recruiting officers in the province of Quebec and in the city of Montreal. When I got that list I thought they had sent me a list of French-Canadian recruits; the number was almost legion. I will not weary the House by reading the list; it is sufficient to say that there was no discrimination whatsoever. I am sure that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House know that to be the fact.

Was there not sufficient earnestness in the carrying on of the voluntary system? I do not think that the earnestness displayed by the adherents of this party excelled in any degree the earnestness of many adherents of the party represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. And I believe each was as generously manifested in every part of Canada as it was in Manitoba or Ontario. I know of no resource that was not adopted; the system became at last one which was a system of voluntary enlistment only in a very modified and attenuated sense. It became a system rather of conscription by cajolery—and not altogether too creditable to Canada. Consequently, speaking from the viewpoint, not only of the Government, but of the Dominion, there is no other way of getting men than by adopting this measure. The men must be had; we have them to send, and there is no other way of procuring them and sending them. The business of the country, therefore, is, by this system, to get the men and to send them overseas.

In objection to this course it is urged that, however essential it may be or whatever may be our physical power to accomplish it, we are restrained by constitutional limitations from performing this duty. I will not burden the discussion with a long, wire-drawn argument as to our powers. Every one who wants to face this issue rather than evade it will admit that if we have not the constitutional power, we had better get it; and there is nowhere to get it except in this House. Who, except ourselves, can legislate constitutional validity into what we desire to do? The Parliament of Great Britain is as powerless to do so as is the Parliament of France. The Parliament of Canada has full constitutional power. If the law is not right, surely it is our duty to put the law right with the least possible delay. But the law in principle is right. The law, as it stands at present is quite sufficient to enable us to act, except from this point of view: the Militia Act enables us to get men compulsorily by a system of hit and miss, of selection by lot. It does

not provide the machinery for the allocation or selection of men after they are got together by lot. It simply reaches the point of the enlistment, or, rather, the point of the reporting of the men; after that it is chaos. But the essential feature of compulsion, liability to service, is embedded in the Militia Act, even in more naked and pronounced form than it is in The Military Service Act.

Strenuous effort is being exerted to show that the intention of the Militia Act was to limit compulsion to defence within this country, or, at all events, within this continent. I listened with great interest to the argument of the member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) and I address these words in particular to my French Canadian friends. The Militia Act provides that all males between 18 and 60 shall be liable to service, and that liability may be exercised for the purpose of securing the defence of Canada within or beyond Canada. I have not given the precise words, but that is a clear interpretation of them. The militia, after it has been compulsorily recruited, may be sent anywhere "within or beyond Canada for the defence thereof." Those are the exact words. Consequently, it is essential that at the point to which and in the purpose for which the militia is sent, the defence of Canada must be involved. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe), who is an able gentleman, presents a concise, succinct argument, at all events, the best, I think, that could be presented from his point of view. But let us analyse it. He argues that because Sir Frederick Borden, in 1904, at one point of the debate—and remember that Sir Frederick Borden said something of an opposite nature at another point—stated that where the defence of the Empire was involved, soldiers compulsorily recruited could not be sent overseas on behalf of Canada, and he mentioned at that time the South African war. I do not know that very serious argument could be urged against Sir Frederick Borden's contention as so applied. It could be argued with great force that the security and defence even of Great Britain were not involved in the South African war. I do not know that the contrary could be argued. Certainly the defence of Canada was not involved directly in the South African war, if indeed it was involved indirectly. Sir Frederick Borden was not so far out in his answer to the question of Mr. Maclean in that regard. But the hon. member goes on to make this most astonishing statement:

> Until a few days ago, I do not think that anybody who has studied the constitutional history of Canada ever expressed the opinion that her militia could be sent overseas by virtue of that Act.

The speech of the hon. member is made for the purpose of distribution throughout the province of Quebec, and for the purpose of urging his compatriots in that province against the adoption of the Military Service Act. Is the statement I have quoted a fair one? I would feel justified in going further. Is that a true statement to send out to the people of Quebec—that until a few days ago no one who had ever studied the constitutional history of Canada ever expressed the opinion that the militia could be sent overseas by virtue of that Act? The hon. member repeats that statement in two other places. Now I affirm this, and I challenge contradiction right now or later. No hon. member can point me to a statement made by any constituted legal authority in Canada, at any time since the first Militia Act was passed in 1868 up to the present hour, who ever said anything else than that under the Militia Act our troops can be sent overseas. I go further. I am convinced it is safe to assert that until the outbreak of this war no lawyer in this country, whether a responsible official or not except a political agitator, ever ventured the opinion that we could not under the Militia Act send our troops overseas.

Will hon. gentlemen believe this? Even the arch-agitator on this issue himself (Mr. Bourassa) when the present Militia Act was passed, used language which clearly showed and admitted that soldiers enlisted under that Act could be sent overseas. Why does the hon. member for Kamouraska make the statements that he does? I repeat once more, and I challenge contradiction here and now, that from the date this law was enacted until this hour, no constituted legal authority either provincial or Dominion, in this country, ever questioned our power under the Militia Act to send our troops overseas. Does the hon. member quote any one in opposition to that statement? Does he quote any legal authority at all? He quotes a physician on the one hand and an editor on the other. Then he makes bold to say that no one who has studied constitutional history has ever doubted that we could not under the Militia Act send our troops overseas. Is the speech of the hon. member for Kamouraska a right or proper speech in this

our country to send to the people of Quebec or of any province? He quotes Sir Frederick Borden as a constitutional authority, but Sir Frederick Borden expressed opinions consistent with both positions. Sir Frederick Borden, however, was a physician. The hon. member quoted the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), but the hon. member for Victoria on a further study of the Act has stated in the plainest language that under the Militia Act our troops can certainly be sent overseas. Why does the hon. member for Kamouraska make such statements in the presence of the language of the Minister of Justice in the late Government—and the hon. member in his speech referred to the language of that gentleman—who, in words the plainest that man could possibly utter told the House when the Act was adopted that under that Act the troops of this country compulsorily enlisted could be sent overseas, even to India, if in the judgment of the Governor General in Council the defence of Canada was being fought overseas. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick stated at that time that the discretion belonged solely to the Governor General in Council until Parliament later on passed upon his decision. Yet, in the face of that assertion by the constituted legal authority of Canada when the Act was passed in 1904 and almost in the hearing of that distinguished man, the hon. member stated to this House that no one ever asserted such a thing until a few days ago.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the Solicitor General make a distinction between the power of the Government to send conscripted troops overseas and the power of the Government to send voluntarily enlisted troops overseas?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I make no distinction whatever. The Act makes no distinction; it says that you may enlist troops voluntarily or by conscription, and that after you have enlisted them, you can send them beyond Canada for the defence of Canada. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick said, as any one would have said, that it was a matter for the Government, in the exercise of its discretion, to decide, whether it believed that the war being fought overseas was a war involving the defence of Canada. Consequently, so far as compulsory law goes now, the power exists. It has indeed already passed through eleven general elections in this country and has been approved by the people of Canada.

[Mr. Meighen.]

We are told however, that, although we have power as a Government and certainly power as a Parliament to declare that our troops in this war shall go overseas beyond Canada for the defence of Canada, we should not exercise that power. Why? The leader of the Opposition tells us that he is not afraid of an invasion of Canada. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) is also brave; he is not afraid of an invasion of Canada either. These hon. gentlemen in their predictions—because at best they are only prophecies—are either right or wrong. If they are wrong, and if there is danger of an invasion of Canada, then we had better get ready as soon as we can and fortify ourselves at the vital point in Europe, against that invasion. They will admit that themselves. If on the contrary they are justified in expecting that there will not be an invasion of this country—that we as Canada are not in danger—I ask why are we not in danger? Why are they so brave? Why do they rest so comfortably? It is because the defence of Canada is being fought over there in France, If the defence of Canada is not made secure by success in France, then Canada is in danger of invasion. And if our defence is bound up with our success in France then it is our bounden duty under the Militia Act to send our troops there for our defence. Let us come to grips on this question. If there is any weakness in that argument I would like to know what it is. One or the other is true: Either we are in danger of invasion right now or later on, as the result of this war, or we are not in danger. If the first is true, then we should certainly send our troops to repel the invader, imminent or apprehended. If the second is true, then our defence is being fought out over there, and it is only by our success over there that we can possibly avoid invasion. It is because the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) believes that the troops of this Empire and of France and Italy will succeed on the western front and the troops of Russia succeed on the eastern front that he sits comfortably in his seat and feels that this country is not in danger of invasion. That means they are fighting out there the defence of Canada. If that is the case, how can he decline the duty that he must surely feel upon his heart of sending the troops of Canada to sustain the defence of Canada overseas?

The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) reads some ancient legislation of 1808 and 1839 to show that under that

legislation we might possibly send troops to a country conterminous with this country. But the phrases of those old acts are left out of the legislation of 1868 and they are left out of the legislation of 1904, showing that times had changed since 1808 and 1839, and that Parliament realized in 1868 that the defence of Canada might be fought out elsewhere than on this continent, and that they should take power to defend this country overseas. I put this to hon. gentlemen opposite: Is it not possible, is it not reasonable, that our ancestors in 1839 might have felt themselves in a very different position from what we feel ourselves in to-day? Those were the days of bows and arrows, of little ships and little armies. Is it not possible that the men of that day might have felt that only in this continent could we be assailed as Canada, while we to-day might see clearly that only overseas can we be effectually protected now?

I pass from that and proceed to take up certain of the contentions that have been advanced in support of the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. It had been a matter of great interest, and indeed of curiosity, to observe the wonderful collection of opinions that are massed behind this referendum amendment. The referendum amendment is really not an amendment at all. At all events it is not a policy: it is the negation of a policy. Why is it adopted? Merely as an expedient to avoid facing the issue, and to collect behind the Opposition leader all the support he can get. What are the opinions behind the amendment? It is seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who complains that we have already waited too long on this matter: that we should have taken this course and had a referendum started a year ago. It is moved by the leader of the Opposition, who complains that we have dashed the Bill upon them too suddenly and too soon. What is the ground of the leader of the Opposition? He argues that the Bill is going to bring about disunion in this country, and will be met with opposition, if not with resistance, on the part of French Canada. His amendment is seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton who wants a bill that will take all of these 100,000 men out of French Canada alone.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like my hon. friend to keep closer to the facts than that. Hansard is my record.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not have said so if it had not been on Hansard. The hon. gentleman's words are capable of that interpretation, and of no other interpretation. I know he did not use those words with the intention that that interpretation should be applied.

Mr. OLIVER: Thank you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He took the ground that this Bill would take men out of Alberta or of Edmonton constituency, from which enough men had already gone, his idea being to make the Bill unpopular in the constituency of Edmonton. What is the inevitable conclusion from his words? This is what he said, as reported in Unrevised Hansard, page 2520:

> We have been led to believe that a conscription measure would be fair to the country, and as we have done our duty, in a measure, so it would compel the people in other parts of the country to do their duty. Now, that is the kind of conscription measure I want to see, but that is not the kind of conscription measure my hon. friend has brought down.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He wants to compel those who have not done their duty to do it.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does he say on the previous page?

> Given a proper measure of universal military service, and there is equality in the distribution of the burden, an equality that does not exist in the case of voluntary service. . . . . If there is not equality of service under the compulsory principle, then, instead of it being a democratic method of meeting a great emergency, it becomes an instrument of tyranny and unfairness in every particular.

Those are his words: I want a conscription measure that provides for equality of service. And how? By taking those who have not enlisted voluntarily until you bring about an equality.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How are you going to get an equality in this country unless in addition to the 8,000 of French-Canadian extraction already enlisted in the province of Quebec we take 100,000 more?

Mr. OLIVER: If it requires 100,000 men from the province of Quebec for the province of Quebec to do its share, then certainly take the 100,000, but my hon. friend does not suggest that it does require that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would 108,000 from French Canada be any more proportionately than equal to the present contribution from Alberta, man for man, and how can you

get an equality unless the contributions are proportionately equal?

Mr. OLIVER: I could not say without a pencil and paper. When my hon. friend attempts to make it appear to this House that I said anything that could be construed as stating that all the further military requirements of Canada should be supplied from the province of Quebec he is using language which has absolutely no foundation, and which is absurd on the face of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will leave the House and the country to figure out for itself how an equality is going to be reached unless the contributions are proportionately equal.

Mr. OLIVER: Equality is what we want.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the inevitable conclusion from his words, and I do not intend that he shall escape that conclusion. He used the words only for the purpose of currying favour in his own province.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the hon. member be good enough not to impute motives to other hon. members of this House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will not impute dishonourable motives but I have a right to impute honourable motives. There is nothing dishonourable about that.

Mr. OLIVER: I rise to a point of order. My point of order is that the Solicitor General, or any other hon. member of this House, must take the statements of other hon. members as they are uttered and he has no right to impute any motives.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I took the statement as it was uttered. I do not want to change the statement but surely I have a right to argue from that statement what I believe to be its inevitable conclusion.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Solicitor General entirely ignores what my hon. friend from Edmonton says he said and alleges that my hon. friend from Edmonton made a statement in order to curry favour with the district of Edmonton. I understand that is what my hon. friend complains of?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that in order, Mr. Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. the Solicitor General has imputed motives or has said anything to which the attention of the Speaker should be called.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now, that is the character and the variety of the opinion that is behind this amendment. These are the conflicting views that are expressed for the purpose of urging the adoption of this amendment. What is the meaning of it? Here is an amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition who moved it because he himself is against conscription. It is seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton who seconds it because he is in favour of conscription. And its first sponsor is the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) who does not know whether he is in favour of conscription or against it. It will be clear to every one that the purpose of this amendment is to evade rather than to face a very great issue at this time. It is to avoid rather than to enforce the performance of a duty. It is a refuge of discord,—a haven of the disunited. It is not a declaration of faith, it is a declaration of scepticism.

We cannot win this war by referendums. Do the soldiers in France want a referendum?

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the object of the amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the hon. member knows very well that the soldiers in France cannot vote on a referendum and where did he or any one else ever express the purpose of asking the soldiers if they wanted a referendum? Will he be willing to leave that question to the soldiers in France? to say whether they want a referendum or not? Would anybody suppose that those who have taken upon themselves this burden, those who are war-weary and worn, whose strength is wasted, whose nerves and vitality are a thousand times exhausted, will say to the people of Canada: Do not send us help unless you ask the slackers at home whether they want to be forced to come? Does anybody suggest such a preposterous thing? A referendum is moved for these conflicting reasons by hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is supported by still more conflicting influences all over this country and all over the world. Do hon. gentlemen realize where they are when they support this proposal? Do they realize the company they are in? I make an appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite who, at other times, and under brighter skies, might have felt that there was a sound principle behind the referendum, to argue out for themselves whether that principle has any application at a time like this. Is the referendum peculiarly suited

for war? Is the referendum suited to a time when the best of our electorate, thirty-three per cent of the whole, are overseas and when only a mere fraction of their number might possibly be counted in the vote? Could you apply the principles that might ordinarily be argued with reference to the referendum system to the conditions at this hour? None of those principles apply at all.

The first function of the Government and the first duty of the nation is to secure the safety of the state. The Government or Parliament that fails in that duty commits the cardinal, the unpardonable sin. Surely we have the courage to give a lead to the people of this country. Surely we have the courage to take the step which the hon. member for Edmonton himself admits is the only effective step that can be taken. No man wants to see assistance given to our soldiers in France more than he does. No man has more reason to want to than he has. Why then delay or imperil for an hour the passage of a Bill which is the only means by which assistance can be given? He admits that we cannot get men under the voluntary system. It has been at a standstill for twelve months, he says.

Mr. OLIVER: If the hon. gentleman is alluding to me, would he be good enough to keep within the range of what I have said? I have not said that it would not be possible to get enough men by the voluntary system.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman supports conscription, is not that the best reason—

Mr. OLIVER: Not at all. I believe that the conscription system is the proper system of recruiting, whether we can get men by the voluntary system or not, if it is administered fairly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then we should have had conscription at first?

Mr. OLIVER: I have always said that I believed the conscription system was the fairer system, but I recognized the difficulties of putting it into force and I did not press it upon the Government, recognizing those difficulties.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I said was that the hon. gentleman stated that we could not get them by the voluntary system, and if he referred to the way in which the Government exercising its best judgment was endeavouring to get them, perhaps he will admit that I was correct. I at least admit that he is right that we have exhausted all our efforts in that direction. The results of the past twelve months have shown that recruits cannot be got by our methods at all events, which we believed to be the best at our command. Why, then, imperil the success of the only measure that will get them for the sake of any expediency whatsoever? Time will not wait; why then delay the only system that can be adopted by any evasion at all? What has the Toronto Globe said? I wish to say in all sincerity that I recognize the contribution that the Liberal press of this country has made towards enabling the Government under this Act to do something real and substantial to carry on the war. The Toronto Globe has said that the voluntary system is as dead as Julius Ceasar. Months ago the Liberal press of this country proclaimed that we could not get these troops under the voluntary system. Personally, I have been of that opinion for many a month gone by. We have waited only until we thought the public of Canada generally had realized that fact with such overmastering conviction as to mean the general consent of this country to the putting through of this Bill. Why imperil it? Do hon. gentlemen realize that the passing of this referendum amendment will bring joy to the friends of Germany in every part of the world? It will be welcomed at Potsdam. It would be supported, were he here, by the head of the German nation itself. It will be welcomed by every German newspaper on this and every other continent. It will be welcomed by every slacker all over Canada. That is the company that hon. gentleman are in who support this referendum. The passing of this amendment would be a subject of rejoicing to every pool-room loafer, to every movie veteran, to every sporting fan, to all who have shrunk from duty. But it would be a subject of resentment, regret and pain to the men who have nobly done their part to preserve the liberty, and uphold the honour of Canada.

What does this amendment really mean? What do its consequences entail? A referendum on the principle of the Bill!—what does that mean? Does it mean that "conscription" shall go to the country by way of referendum, that we shall put a question on the voting paper: "Are you in favour of conscription or not?" Why the whole country has passed on conscription as a principle at eleven general elections. There has never been a voice raised against the Militia Act as it stood, that I have heard, on this score, through all these

forty-nine years. Now would any body after those eleven verdicts suggest—let us come to grips again—would any body suggest that that question be put to the electorate, Are you in favour of conscription? That is not the way the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) surely would have the question put. Then how would it be put? Are you in favour of sending conscripted men overseas? Is that the way the hon. gentleman would suggest it be placed before this country? Would not the answer of scores of thousands immediately be: it all depends on what way you get them, it all depends on the terms of your Act. Consequently, we should have to expose the Bill itself to a vote. Indeed I never before heard of a referendum except on a Bill. Now, is it the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite that the Bill that embodies not only the principle, but embodies also the terms upon which the principle shall be carried out, shall go to the electorate for a yes or a no? Is that the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite? Why, the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) would have to vote against the Bill himself, because he says that within the four corners of this Bill there is not the first element of fairness. One has only to analyze this referendum plea to see how perilous it is, how impossible it is.

The Conscription Bill in its present form, while it may be improved on, is at least the best that some of us can produce. Yet I believe that if the Bill as it stands were submitted to the electorate, it would meet with the opposition of many a man who supports the principle of conscription itself; and any Bill, however drafted, would be confronted with opposition on the part of many who themselves believe in its principle. Do hon. gentlemen really suggest that this great measure, on the success of which depends the sustenance of our armies in France, depends the support of those who have appealed to us in language that we can never forget, appealed to us for months, yea for years, to add to their number, to reduce their burdens, if possible to limit their perils—that this Bill, on which so largely depends the honour and security of this country—should be exposed to such improper hazards, to such unfair opposition, as it would encounter under a conscription referendum? I appeal to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who may perhaps in other days have subscribed themselves as believers in a referendum principle, first of all to realize that on a referendum vote we shall get the vote of those who have failed to do their duty on a parity with the vote of those who have enlisted. We will get that vote to even a greater degree, because everyone who has ever been in France recognizes that at best and with the utmost thoroughness we could poll only a mere fraction of the vote of the soldiers there. I appeal to hon. gentlemen to realize also that, above all things in the carrying on of a war, we must avoid every possible cause or excuse for delay. Germany does not carry on this war by referendums—she will not wait while we hold a referendum. Ask your boys in France whether they are fighting Germany with referendums. They are fighting under the authority of the governing power—and there is no other way to carry on a war. Let us rise to the level of our duty, let us be not afraid to lead. We have been execrated from end to end of Canada for failure of leadership and all the rest. Many of those men who have lagged behind but who ought to have gone to the front have lampooned the leader of this Government because of alleged failure of leadership. Newspaper after newspaper has thundered that out. Well, here is some leadership. Here and now is a chance to follow. Let us as a Parliament get in front; let those who lagged behind and cried for leadership walk up now, close the gap, and stand behind the Prime Minister. The people of Canada we have oft been told, call to the Parliament of Canada for strong and fearless leadership. Are we going to answer that call with our hands up in the air and cry out to the people: "For Heaven's sake, lead us." Such is the amendment of the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

It is all very well to deliberate upon something that is left for us to decide, but we have already decided on the carrying on of this war, and on carrying it on with all our might. If there ever was a time for a referendum—which I deny—it was in August, 1914; it is not now. We have committed ourselves as a nation, we have signed the bond, it is for us now to discharge the obligation.

I want to say something else, and I do so with especial earnestness. It may be that in the heat of discussion I do not avoid animosities perhaps as carefully as I should; but I say this to those hon. gentlemen opposite whose position with regard to this Bill is surrounded by embarrassments much heavier than those that surround us, I say to them that this Bill is not designed and is not framed to be unjust to the province of Quebec or to any other section

of this country. I point to the provisions of the Bill. This is not the time to discuss it in detail, but a few words will, I think, make my meaning apparent to everybody. It is framed and it is advanced in no spirit of recrimination whatsoever, in no spirit of petty jealousy, because the real men of this country, from end to end, are not of that feeling and do not want that feeling expressed by this Bill. We of English-speaking Canada have the kindest feelings towards our French Canadian compatriots. We realize that there are certain considerations having to do with this subject of recruiting that apply to them that do not apply with the same force to us. I want to say to the members from Quebec that this Bill as drafted is not intended to, and will not, if I understand the Bill, work unfairly to that province. Rather, on the other hand, for just and good reasons—not because that province desires any favouritism and it gets no favouritism but for just and good reasons, this Bill in its results will work more lightly on the province of Quebec than on any other province in Canada. In what way will it work more lightly? In the first place, the province of Quebec is an agricultural province. A much larger proportion of its population is engaged in agriculture than is the case at least with any other of the older provinces of Canada. Agriculture is one of our essential industries, our greatest essential industry, necessarily employing much the largest proportion of our population. Consequently, under the terms of the Bill, the exemptions to agriculture will far outnumber the exemptions to other avocations of our people. Therefore, the exemption clauses, applied evenly and fairly all over this Dominion, as is the intent, will, for just and good and sound reasons, be of more value to the province of Quebec than to any other province of Canada.

Secondly, in the province of Quebec, the young men marry at an earlier age than in the English provinces. It is a custom that deserves commendation. How does that affect the operation of this Act? Under this Act, the first three classes to be called out embrace only unmarried men between the ages of 20 and 34. Under those three classes it is not impossible that the whole 100,000 may be secured, and, in that case, the Act will apply to a smaller proportion in the province of Quebec than in any other province. This, however, is the case not because the Bill makes favourites, but because the Bill is fair. It is in the general interests of the state. Consequently, this Bill, so far from being designed or framed to result in unfairness to the province of Quebec, will, on the contrary, in its practical effects, for good and sufficient reasons of state, fall more lightly on Quebec than on any other province.

We as a people have a right to deliberate, and to vote, to negative, if we so desire, any proposition which is still open and left for us to decide. But surely the prosecution of this war with the whole might of Canada is not a subject which is now left to us to decide. That question has been passed upon. Its prosecution is now a matter only of good faith: 300,000 living men and 20,000 dead are over there, the hostages of our good faith. All that is left to us now is a choice between fidelity and desertion, between courage and poltroonery, between honour and everlasting shame.

We are told this action will result in disunion. I see no reason why it should produce disunion. It is framed to avoid disunion. But let no man deceive himself. We do not avoid disunion by dropping back to where we were, any more than we avoid disunion by going ahead with this measure. I see no more peril in the one course than in the other. At all events, I see no more peril in honourably marching on. You might possibly have union by stepping back, and letting the voluntary system, dead as Julius Cæsar, continue in force. I do not think you would. But if you did it would be the concord of inertia and of lassitude—the concord of disgrace. There is no reason in this measure for disunion, and I do not think that result will come. I am as confident as I have ever been of anything in my life that if the members of this House, reading and studying this Bill, and hearing this debate, will go to their constituents and tell them the meaning, purpose and spirit of this Bill there will be no possibility whatever of discord or resistance. It is not the substance, but the name of the Bill that has become a bogey.

We are ready, on our part, to do much to avoid the danger of disunion. This Government has shown that spirit from the beginning of this crisis. We have been ready to pay a great price, to make a big sacrifice, if, by that price or sacrifice, we could avoid even the possibility of disunion in Canada. The leader of the Government has said to the great leader of the French Canadian race: "I will share with you the reins of power. Though elected here, as we have been, by the votes of the people, I

will divide with you, man for man, political power in this country. Not only that, but, in order that we may do our part in this war in this the only way it can be done, we are ready to discuss with you other matters, ready to meet you and adopt a course that is fair as between the ideals of both parties." The Prime Minister has repeated that assurance in this debate. The spirit that animated those negotiations still exists, and has not been exchanged for another. What more can we do? While we would do almost anything to avoid the disaster of disunion, we cannot purchase union at the price of national disgrace.

My only effort has been to lay before hon. gentlemen in this Chamber a statement of the spirit in which the Government has approached this matter, to lay before them our policy and, if I could to establish that policy as right and just, and to express our overpowering determination to do our duty, as we see it, in this grave and terrible crisis. Speaking on behalf of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, I pay my tribute to the clear vision and courage of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), and the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee). I say to them that they have, in a manner that we will long remember, discharged to their utmost their obligation to prevent discord and strife. The speeches they have made will place their names high in the roll of honour in Canada, to be seen and remembered for generations to come. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, and to hon. gentlemen around me, for party divisions as we once had them are not just the same to-day—I appeal to all hon. members to take the course which, in my belief, alone can command the respect of this House, of Canada, and of the world.

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 that slogan as the key-note of my criticism 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 young 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 claim 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 its 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.

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 this. 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, as it is 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; there-

5 p.m.

fore 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.

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 sufferance 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.

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"; "munitions 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?

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?

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?

[Mr. Murphy.]

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 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 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: 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 Government 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.

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.

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 unwisdom 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.

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.

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 Hibernianism, 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 overwhelming 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?

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.

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 conclusion 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.

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 its 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 or 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. 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 Government 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.

More than once during this debate we have heard it stated that criticism that is not constructive is not helpful. Mindful of that, and responding to the Prime Minister's request for suggestions, I desire on my own account, and speaking for myself, to submit a constructive war-time policy to the Government. In the order in which its features occurred to me, and from the point of view of necessity and the public good, I suggest that, instead of enacting this Bill, the Government should adopt the motion of which notice was given by my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) on the 13th of the present month, and pass the necessary legislation to give it immediate effect, so that every moral and material force available in the Dominion and not yet reached would make its contribution as man power as done. Stop horse-racing, stop the publication and sale of racing forms, stop all games and sports conducted merely for raising gate money, close all bar rooms, pool rooms, billiard rooms and moving picture shows. Under the existing law make a national survey, showing who are engaged at productive or other necessary work, and those who are not. Give those who are not so engaged, who are of military age, and who cannot satisfactorily account for not being at such work, the option of enlisting voluntarily, or of doing necessary work for which they are suited, and if all the men and means required are not procured in this way then take counsel with the leader of the Opposition, and with the Premiers of all the Provinces, as to what further should be done. This course will involve no delay or avoidable hardship. It will impress the whole country with the seriousness and the good faith of the Government, as well as the gravity of the work the Government has in hand. It will be a guarantee against unfair discrimination of any kind. It will appeal to the people's sense of fair play and equal sacrifice. It will evoke the spirit of nation-wide patriotism. It will stimulate generous rivalry instead of prejudice and passion. It will stop national waste of man power and resources. And, in my belief, the response will exceed that which the most sanguine can expect. In any event, Sir, I make the suggestion in all sincerity, and in order to avoid the dangers to which I believe the Government's present course is leading.

In conclusion, I have a last appealto make. On Parliament Hill there is a monument composed of two figures, those of Baldwin an 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 there 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.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. A. M. ARMSTRONG (North York): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations on the Bill now before the House, I am prompted, not by any desire to impede in any way the progress of the Bill, but by a desire to exercise my prerogative in order to place myself on record with regard to the principle of compulsory service, because many months ago, before conscription became a live issue around the corridors of this House, I advocated it publicly in the riding that I have the honour to represent. Those who know the political history of the part of the province from which I come, know that the riding of North York has long claimed to be the birthplace and cradle of reform; that it has given to the public life of Canada men like George Brown, William Lyon Mackenzie, Sir William Mulock, and Sir Allen Aylesworth, names that are closely interwoven with the history and principle of old-time Liberalism. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) mentioned, during the course of his remarks this afternoon the names of Lount and Matthews as two martyrs to the cause of liberty. I would like to supplement his remarks by informing the House that the chief lieutenants of William Lyon Mackenzie lived practically all their lives in the vicinity where I live to-day, and where my father and grandfather lived before me, and that there are living there to-day the descendants of those lieutenants of Mackenzie, the descendants of the men who, according to the hon. member for Russell, fought for liberty in the days gone by. I stand in this House, to a certain extent at least, by virtue of the support of those men. I am proud to say that those families are to-day well represented on the fields of France, and I think, therefore, I can claim, as much as any man in this House, to represent the two great political lines of thought in Ontario.

I stated a moment ago that I advocated conscription a year ago. I did so for these reasons: I knew that the people I represent were British to the core; I knew that, under the voluntary system that was then in force, we could not hope to secure the men that were required; I knew that we dare not longer turn a deaf ear to the cry from our brothers overseas. I, therefore advocated conscription, based upon a plan that would take every available fit man in his proper turn, having regard to industrial conditions and the need at home. For the same reasons, I stand ready to support the Military Service Bill now before the House. Subsequent events have tended only to strengthen my conviction that the course which the Government purpose taking under this Bill is the only course possible if Canada is to maintain her proper part in this great world-struggle. When the great republic to the south of us became involved in this war, notwithstanding the fact that she had not previously been

affected by the war, but rather had fattened and grown rich by reason of her commercial dealings with the then Allied nations—and one might have thought that under such conditions she would have hesitated before plunging the whole resources of the nation in men and money into the war—she did not hesitate nor equivocate, but she put through a Conscription Bill and called out her efficient man-power to the colours, thereby laying down the principle that every citizen of the State is a servant of the State, and that he who accepts and enjoys the benefits of citizenship must be prepared and willing to accept the responsibilities which that citizenship entails, the proof of which willingness is to stand for and fight for the welfare of the State. This cannot be done by agitating any narrow or provincial policy; it cannot be done by pandering to any local class or race, in particular in this country of ours. I have ever claimed that selfishness is and always has been the curse of humanity. I do not say this with any acrimony or any desire to be unduly offensive in this House; I give it as my candid opinion that selfishness is the mainspring behind the opposition to conscription, not only in this House but throughout this country.

At the outbreak of war nearly three years ago, the whole of Canada was pledged by her representatives assembled in Parliament, to the full extent of her resources in men and money. We heard no word at that time of a referendum. Was the voice of the leader of the Opposition heard at that time asking that the people's voice should be heard with regard to our participation in the war? It was not, and I am glad, and I am ready and willing to say that every true Canadian was proud to see the leader of the Opposition stand shoulder to shoulder with the Prime Minister, pledging himself and his followers to stand behind the Government to the full extent of Canada's resources in men and money until victory was achieved. I leave it to the judgment of the House and of the people of Canada how the leader of the Opposition has fulfilled that pledge.

Some men have had the temerity to say that Canada has done enough in this war. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) implied that in his speech yesterday, and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) indirectly implied it in his speech this afternoon. Canada has not done enough until this war is won, and it cannot be won without men. Canada has not done enough until that great military machine, conceived and perfected by Germany during the last fifty years, that machine which since the outbreak of hostilities has violated every law of God and man, is smashed beyond repair, and it cannot be smashed without men. Canada has not done enough until the power of the houses of the Hapsburgs and the Hohenzollerns is a thing of the past, and that cannot be achieved without men. Until we are assured beyond the peradventure of a doubt that liberty, justice, truth and national honour shall not perish from the earth, Canada has not done enough; and we cannot achieve that end until victory is won on the field of battle, and we cannot achieve that victory without men. Four hundred thousand of Canada's sons have, up to to-day answered the call of the motherland. Thousands and thousands of our homes are to-day under the shadow of death and bereavement. Thousands of Canada's mothers, wives, sisters and sweethearts will go down to their graves with their heads bowed in sorrow and their hearts torn with anguish, mourning "for the touch of a vanished hand and the sound of a voice that is still." With thousands of our homes thrown into mourning, with the cry of our boys ringing across the waters calling for help, with the very life of the nation hanging in the balance, shall we stop in our fight for liberty, justice and humanity because, forsooth, certain elements in this country say: We do not like the idea of being forced to do our duty?

Why is conscription necessary at this time? I do not wish to be offensive, and as far as possible I shall avoid any acrimonious remarks, but I believe in calling a spade a spade, and in justice to the rest of Canada, I must say that the reason why conscription faces us to-day is because French Canada has failed to do its duty. I am not going into all the reasons why enlistment has been apparently so dilatory in that province, but in my humble judgment if the province of Quebec had come up to the same standard set by the other parts of Canada, conscription would not have been heard of about the corridors of this House for many months to come.

A great deal has been said by speakers who have preceded me as to whether or not Canada had the right to send her troops beyond her borders under the old Militia Act. I have listened to both sides of that argument, and while I am forced to say in all honesty that I am convinced the leader of the Government has made his case clear,

and doubly so since I have listened to the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) this afternoon, I personally do not care two straws whether it is constitutional or not. Personally I would puncture the constitution a dozen times, if it was necessary, in order to stand by the boys at the front and to uphold Canada's honour in this struggle. The Prime Minister has presented to Parliament a Bill the object of which is to implement Canada's pledge to the boys who have gone overseas. The leader of the Opposition offers a referendum. The call is for men, and he offers a vote. The Minister of Labour yesterday made the statement that the referendum was an insult to the people of Canada, and I believe he was not far wrong, and I will give my reasons. No fair-minded man will deny that we need men at the front, and no fair-minded man will deny that the voluntary system has fallen down. Therefore it follows as the night follows day that the only way to get men is by compulsory service. As we have promised to support the men at the front, the duty therefore devolves upon the Canadian people of getting the men by enforcing conscription. The right hon. leader of the Opposition proposes that we should say to the people of Canada: We want you to answer Yea or Nay to this question, "Are you ready to do your duty?" Personally I entirely agree with the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) as to the whole policy of the referendum; I do not believe in a referendum. If I were to vote for a referendum on such a question as this I should feel that I was evading my personal responsibilities in this House in a very cowardly way; however, that is only the personal opinion of a very humble and obscure back-bencher, and I utter it solely for the purpose of putting it on Hansard, and not in the expectation that it will carry any weight in this House.

The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) said this afternoon that this was the saddest day of his life, when he was breaking away from the leader he had followed for years. I can thoroughly enter into his feelings, although I have never been, and hope I never shall be, in that unfortunate position. But I can tell him that that is not the only sad thing about the condition that exists in this House to-day. One of the saddest sights this country ever saw or ever will see was when the leader of the Opposition stood up in his place in this House and opposed this Bill. He, the acknowledged leader of French Canada and the chief of a great party in this country, should have been reminded by that flag beneath whose broad folds he stood of all the privileges and liberties which his French compatriots enjoy, and which have been guaranteed by the nation for which that flag stands. It should have reminded him of the great men in days gone by who have lived and died for the nation it represents, and of the boys who at that very hour were fighting and bleeding and dying on the fields and in the trenches of France and Flanders for the liberties of which we boast so proudly in this House.

I throw aside the constitutional arguments in discussing this question, as they do not affect me one way or the other. There is too much at stake and the people of this country have not the time to discuss the constitution at this hour. I say it is time the boys at the front had a rest, and it is up to us to see that they get a rest. I claim that every boy who left this country for overseas held a moral mortgage on the available manhood of Canada who remained at home, and I claim that we have heard their call from three thousand miles away to those in authority in Canada that that mortgage be foreclosed and the debt paid. I claim it is high time we got busy and paid that debt, high time to implement the pledge given long before the first man left our shores.

What are the arguments against this Bill? Or rather against the principle of this Bill, because if there is any argument at all it is against the principle of conscription. Almost every hon. member who has spoken has attacked the volunteer system as it was in operation under the Conservative party. I do not wish to be unfair to any hon. member, and I would not refer to these things at all if they had not been hurled at us across the floor of the House by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) the other night. He prefaced his remarks by saying that he would be very moderate though firm, but before he got through he indulged in some of the most extreme and violent language heard in this House since the debate started. He claimed that the reason why recruiting had fallen down in the province of Quebec was that it had never been given a fair trial. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) also claimed the same thing, as did the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), who says he has followed his right hon. leader for thirty years, and we must take his word for anything he says. Let me read what the hon. member for Rouville says. He was replying

to a question by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy):

> If the hon. gentleman thinks that there can be a wave of enthusiasm in the province of Quebec in favour of recruiting with the means that have been employed, he is sadly mistaken. I will give my hon. friend the reason why at once. A few days ago my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best) rose from his seat in this House and read a statement which had been published by the Orange Sentinel to the effect that the soldiers passing through the province of Quebec had been insulted, and that some of them had even been stoned at Rivière du Loup.

This has also been referred to by my hon. friend from Russell. In fairness to my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best) I should like to point out that he did not read that statement from the Orange Sentinel at all, but from a Toronto daily newspaper. I should also like to point out the fact that the hon. member for Rouville seems to have entirely overlooked the fact that we have been at war for nearly three years. This incident took place this session, and yet he points to it as a reason why recruiting has fallen down in the province of Quebec during the two and a half years previous. I might go further. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) has the same peculiar ideas about recruiting in his native province. He said:

> Only a few days ago two great Toronto newspapers were engaged in an acrimonious controversy as to which of the two had written the more violent, bitter articles against Quebec and her inhabitants.

But the hon. member for Kamouraska has apparently overlooked the fact that we have been at war for nearly three years. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has another very unique argument. He says that the people of Montreal would not enlist because a Methodist minister was put in charge of recruiting. That opens up the whole question of the volunteer system. I do not take any stock in any of these excuses. I believe in rendering unto Caesar the things which are Caesars, and I believe in giving credit where credit is due. I will give credit to the late Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) for the energy and spirit that he put into the work when he was at it. I will give credit to every member of this Government and to every member of this House for the magnificent effort they have made to stimulate recruiting throughout Canada, but after all the credit is due to the boys themselves who came forward voluntarily—I speak for the Anglo-Saxon parts of Canada—to the recruiting stations early in the game by hundreds of thousands, from the east, west, north and south, and who did not care two cents whether the man they found behind the recruiting desk was black or white, Jew or Gentile, an evangelist or a Jesuit priest. The credit is entirely due to these boys. Yet, the hon. member for Rouville says that the reason they did not enlist in Montreal was because a Methodist minister was placed in charge of recruiting.

Just one word in passing, about my own opinion of the volunteer system. This war has changed many ideas; it has changed nearly all our ideas. At the outbreak of the war I thought the volunteer system was the only thing, but my mind has changed and I am convinced that while it is a beautiful thing, while it is a grand thing while it calls out all that is best in a man, yet, if you are engaged in a war of the magnitude of this war, it is the most unfair, unjust, unbusinesslike way of waging warfare that was ever conceived by the mind of man.

The hon. member for Kamouraska spoke last night about the equality of sacrifice. I challenge any one in this House or in the Dominion to show me a greater example of inequality of sacrifice than that which obtains to-day in Canada under the volunteer system. Hon. gentlemen opposite, including the leader of the Opposition, have referred more or less to what has been termed the Nationalist-Conservative alliance. I am not going to say here whether that alliance ever existed or whether it did not. Personally, I do not believe, at this serious time in the nation's history in digging into old records in order to throw a slur across the floor of this House. If I did I might point out to my hon. friends that they should go back to the day when the seed was sown and follow it up to the day when it brought forth fruit in the shape of the Nationalist party. They will find that some hon. gentlemen on their own side of the House were responsible for the sowing of that seed. But this is not the time to refer to that. I want to be fair to the leader of the Opposition, but I want to point out to him that when he raised his voice in opposition to this Bill, he, unwittingly no doubt, formed an alliance that he cannot separate himself from in all the years that are to come. He formed an alliance with Tancrede Marsil for one, and he had long ago formed an alliance with Lucien Cannon in Dorchester. He has formed an alliance with Tancrede Marsil, the reactionary, who has been shouting from the plat-

form in the large centres of Quebec that we owe nothing to England, that we will meet force with force, and I think the other day he even threatened to march on Ottawa if this Bill should become law. I repeat I do not want to be unfair to the leader of the Opposition, but he knows as well as I do that in the next campaign in this country, when the Government goes to the people, as it must in the course of time, he will at least receive the benefit of the efforts of these men during that campaign and he cannot break away from the result. I also want to give the leader of the Opposition an opportunity of correcting an impression that might be left by the perusal of an article that I happened to read in one of the Montreal papers the other day. I think I am not misstating the position of the hon. gentleman when I say that his reason for refusing coalition was the fact that conscription had been decided upon by the leader of the Government. In reading the issue of the Montreal Gazette, dated June 19, I find the following statement:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier's statement in Parliament that Canada was not in danger was the dominant note. Tancrede Marsil used the Liberal chieftain's argument, and also quoted other sections of Sir Wilfrid's speech in support of the campaign which he and his friends have been waging, taking great comfort from the speech, but saying that it did not mean that the battle against conscription was definitely gained, and also pointing out that the aim of the agitation had still another end, that of forcing general elections. The fact that there is no coalition nor unionist government was due to the agitation that had been raised, and this same agitation he believed had given Sir Wilfrid the necessary backing to fight the battle in Parliament against conscription.

I simply place that on record to show that the leader of the Opposition, in taking the stand that he has taken, has placed himself in a very peculiar position.

I appeal to my compatriots from the province of Quebec: Is it right, is it just, is it human, that our boys who are now in the trenches should fight on, fight on by themselves without any help, when their cries are ringing in our ears continuously? Very often these cries escape from their dying lips. Is that fair? Some hon. gentlemen say that if you force this Bill through the House you will have civil war. I listened to the eloquent speech of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), and the burden of it from beginning to end was that the French people were a peace-loving, law-abiding people. I much prefer to think that than to think that the French Canadian people would raise any trouble in this country, or that we should be led to believe that they contemplate civil war. I think too much of the French Canadian people, and I believe that they think too much of themselves, to entertain any such idea, and I believe that when this Bill goes on the statute book, it will be accepted by the people of French Canada in the same spirit as it will be accepted by the people of Anglo-Saxon Canada.

Has the position that this country would be in if this Bill did not go through ever occurred to the members of this House? In such a case, look ahead into the years that are to come, when you and I and all the rest have passed away; I can see our children and our children's children turning the pages of history and reading the record of the nation's shame. After all the sacrifices we have made, after all the blood that has been shed, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, I ask every member of this House and I ask the people of Canada: Do we want to hand down to our children this record of shame and humiliation? Shall we ask posterity—shall we force posterity—to wear that crown of thorns? Would it not be immeasurably preferable, no matter what the sacrifice may be, no matter how much our ideas may differ, that we should have the satisfaction of knowing that those who come after us can turn to the pages of history, can read of battles fought, of battles won, of a nation saved by brave deeds, and know that the Canadians of this day measured up to the standard of their forefathers, and that from the beginning to the end of this war, they kept ever before them as their watchword the immortal words of Nelson: "England expects every man this day will do his duty."

It is said that this is too great a sacrifice to ask. They tell us that it is not fair to ask the mothers of Canada to give up their boys. Let me point out to this House that the boys who have gone were just as dear to their mothers as the boys who remain at home, that the sacrifice that the mothers of those boys who have gone made is just as great as that which the mothers of those who remain at home will be asked to make. We all know that the sacrifice will be great. We know it must be great, unfortunately so. But we also know that no great good ever came to anybody or to any nation without sacrifice. We know that the greatest boon to humanity was bought and paid for by blood on the hill of Calvary. We are aware that the human mind cannot conceive, nor the human

tongue frame, words that will take the tear from the eye or the ache from the heart of the mother whose boy is gone. But we do know that, while she may go down through life with her heart torn with sorrow and anguish, she has the satisfaction of knowing that when she passes to the great beyond, she can stand before the God that gave her life and say: I gave part of myself, my own flesh and blood, in order that the principles that Thou has laid down for the guidance of humanity, principles that were engraven upon the tablets of stone in the days of Moses, may continue to prevail through all the ages amongst the children of men, and in order that liberty and justice and the principles of Christianity may be the heritage of all men to all generations.

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, although we have been told from the other side of the House that members on this side when they were making speeches were losing time, that time was not for speeches, but for deeds, I think it is my duty, in a debate of this kind, to go on record, because I want to discuss this situation as it is, and I want to appeal to the good sense of my fellow members, expecting that at least there may be some to-day in this House who may listen to the language of reason. We all agree that war is a necessity, we all agree that to fight war you must have men; but we all agree, too, that the sacrifices of every country must be made, not according to the principles of hysteria, but in accordance with the principles of sound judgment and good administration.

I have made a synopsis of the remarks I wish to place on Hansard. There are six questions that I wish to discuss, but I wish to tell you immediately that the number of questions will not give you an indication of the length of my address, because I do not want to detain the House too long. I want to discuss: first, what are the propositions before the House, second, what is the actual available man-power in Canada; third, what is the man-power necessary for our economic life; fourth, what motive has actuated the amendment to the amendment; fifth, what is the purport of the Bill; and sixth, why I favour the amendment of my leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

The right hon. the Prime Minister claims that, according to the Militia Act, the Government is empowered to levy the militia of this country, and Canada, on account of the war, having to face an emergency, this Government is entitled and empowered to send militia beyond the borders of Canada, and that our first line of defence is in France. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) asks of the House that the Bill be submitted to the people, and that it shall not become law unless it has been endorsed by the majority of our population. The amendment to the amendment, moved by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette), seconded by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Achim), proposes the six months' hoist. What, according to the census figures, is the available man-power of Canada? At page 42 of the Canada Year Book of 1914, we find that in 1911 the whole population of Canada was 7,206,643, divided, as stated at page 43 of the same book, into, male population, 3,821,995, and, female population, 3,384,648. At page 70 of the same book, we find that out of this male population of 3,821,995, you must take the following who are unfit or exempted on account of age. (I must say, before giving these figures to the House, that I have calculated the number of men over fourteen years of age, because, the census having taken place in 1911, these boys are now twenty years of age, and so fall under the proposed law. And I have figured down to the male population aged forty years, because, with the same calculation, these men have now attained the age of forty-six years and they are exempted.) Under one year, there were 93,513; from one to four years, 354,106; from five to nine years, 395,045; from ten to fourteen years, 354,911; from forty to forty-four, 213,018; from forty-five to forty-nine, 178,715; from fifty to fifty-four, 152,718; from fifty-five to fifty-nine, 112,952; from sixty to sixty-four, 94,318; sixty-five and over, 159,605;—making a grand total unfit or exempted on account of age of 2,119,501 men. Thus our available man-power at that time, deducting those that were unfit or exempted according to the census figures given us, was 1,702,494. At page 15 of volume 2 of the census of 1911 we find that the number of defectives in the male population was 15,530, leaving a balance of 1,686,964. We have enlisted, some say 400,000, others says 411,000, others say 430,000 men. Let us figure it at 405,000. So that we have, in this country, an available actual man power of 1,281,964. I must admit that to this amount should be added the male immigrants of military age who have come to Canada since 1911. We have no official figures as to the number. It is true, the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence

(Sir Sam Hughes) has given us 500,000 as the approximate number. But coming from that source I should figure that the real number of male immigrants since 1911 is about half, because in every statement by the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence you must figure on at least 50 per cent of bombast. So that you would have an actual available man power of 1,331,964.

The next question, Sir, is, what is, according to the 1911 census, the man-power required to secure the expansion and the development of our economic life in this country. It is all right enough to say: "We hear the clamour of the boys at the front, they cry for help and want us to send more men." This afternoon I heard the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) state that we had signed the bond and we had to pay it. That would be all right if we had the means to do it. I contend, Sir, taking the figures of the census and the available man-power necessary for our economic life, that we are unable to supply the number of men that are asked for without paralyzing our economic life. In the sixth volume of the census of 1911 we find figures giving the male population interested in the development of trade, transportation and economic life. The numbers are as follows:—

Agriculture	917,848
Building trades	245,990
Domestic and personal service	75,134
Civil and municipal government	72,531
Fishing and hunting	34,547
Forestry	42,901
Manufacture	392,781
Mining	62,707
Commerce	240,903
Transportation	210,602
Making a grand total of	2,296,022

Out of this, we have supplied more than 400,000 men. Is it possible that a Government situated as this Government is, with the responsibility which I am pointing out, will not listen to argument, and that the language of reason will not appeal to them? Hon. gentlemen speaking in this House in favour of the Bill are making comparisons between European countries and Canada. I believe, Sir, that the comparison cannot stand. The European countries are thickly settled, having every year an overflow of population, and they must seek an outlet for that overflow. Canada is a new country, thinly settled, having immense resources, requiring, outside of our available supply of man-power, the constant overflow of population from the European countries. We are unable to develop the resources of this country, as they should be developed, with our own supply of men, and it is unfair to make a comparison between Canada and the European countries. Canada needs more man-power, and that is the reason we have spent millions of dollars to bring immigrants to this country to assist development. Since the beginning of the war, we have made sacrifices, we have appealed to young people, to women and to old men, to assist in our trade, our agriculture, our factories and in all the branches of our economical development to take the place of the boys who have gone to the front. There is a shortage of man-power. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) proved that the Government had appealed to the United States for 50,000 farm labourers. Is it not a fact that the Imperial Munitions Board is complaining constantly of the scarcity of wage earners and man-power, and that half of the big corporations in this country have asked the Government to stop enlistments because there is a scarcity of man-power? The ex-Minister of Militia and Defence, told the House and the country that the Government, at the request of the munition workers, had retarded enlistment. Yet, in the face of all this, the Government asks us to pass a Bill which will send 100,000 more men to the front. I know the responsibility that rests on my shoulders. I have listened to the address of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. J. A. M. Armstrong). I am not afraid of threats, and I am not going to be stampeded or forced to support a measure which I do not wish to support.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GAUTHIER: The fact that I belong to the minority, and that I come from the province of Quebec, will not prevent me from uttering sentences I think I should utter in the defence of the cause for which I stand here. I do not say that the 100,000 should not be sent. I do not say we have done too much. I do not say we should do no more. But, before sending 100,000 of our young men to the front, causing us to run the risk of endangering our economic life, it is the duty of the Government to go to the people and ask them if they are ready to make the sacrifice of paralyzing the development of this country for all years to come. If the people are satisfied to make the sacrifice, we pledge ourselves that we will bow to the will of the majority of the population. What more can you ask?

We claim that the Government has no mandate from the people in respect to this measure. We may be wrong, but we may be right, I do not wish to discuss the legal aspect of the question; I want to discuss

it simply from a business standpoint and with due regard to the feelings of the people whom I represent. The legal aspects of this question are numerous. Some say that the Government is empowered to take this course; others say that it is not. I shall not discuss that; it is sufficient for me to say that the Government have enough responsibilities; that they should not shoulder any additional responsibilities that they are not compelled to assume.

I was amazed at the amendment to the amendment introduced by the member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette) and seconded by the member for Labelle (Mr. Achim). These two gentlemen belonged to the 54th battalion of Sherbrooke; they were appointed lieutenants on March 6, 1915. This can be proved by referring to page 362 of the quarterly Militia List, edition of May 30, 1917. But after having enlisted they decided, one to propose and the other to second the motion that this Bill be given the six months' hoist. I suppose, although they had enlisted, they decided that they did not want to fight.

We are engaged in a very serious debate, but permit me to say that I consider this amendment to the amendment to be a farce. It has been engineered not by the mover and the seconder of the motion, but by the Government itself. It is all very well to ask that opinions be sacrificed; it is all very well to plead the magnitude of the task which confronts us; when the Government appeal to the good-will of the Opposition, they should, in my humble judgment, play the game fairly. They have played the game; they have laid on the table of the House their trump card —the little joker from Berthier.

It was very interesting indeed to listen to the speech of the hon. member for Berthier. He spoke of his conscience, of his profound love for his race and for his province, and of the disinterestedness of the sentiments which he entertained for the welfare of the whole community. But he intermingled his references to the future of Canada and the aspirations of the different races in this country with remarks concerning public works in his riding. He told us that since he had been elected, more public works had been carried on in the county that he represented than had been the case since Confederation. He seeks to have us believe that in taking the courageous stand that he has taken, he is liable to be deprived of patronage. Let the hon. gentleman be at peace. I ask him, for the sake of our individual peace on this side of the House, not to trouble us with such laments, because we know that in this matter he is hand in hand with the Government. His amendment, being a negative one, would have been ruled out of order if it had not been introduced with the consent of the Government.

9 p.m. As it stands in order. the hon. member need not feel uneasy; he is all right. My opinion is that after this debate is over the hon. member will keep on going to the shrine of the golden calf, under the benevolent eye of his master. He deserves a reward from his master, but he deserves also a punishment from his electors. I hope that he will get his reward, because I am sure that he will get his punishment. On the altar of partisanship he has sacrificed more than his life; he has slaughtered without mercy the shattered remnant of his honour. He is entitled to the reward, and I hope he will get it.

I come now to an examination of the Bill itself. It is a wonderful Bill. One of the peculiar aspects of it is that everybody wants to conscript the other fellow. Hon. gentlemen from the West who favour the Bill do so on the condition that the measure will conscript Ontario; those members from Ontario who favour the Bill do so upon the understanding that Quebec will be conscripted. In order that everybody should be satisfied, the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) this afternoon, in his most suave manner, assured the people of Quebec not to worry, because the Bill would bear more lightly upon Quebec than upon the other provinces. The Government wants to raise 100,000 men—but imagine, Sir, somebody in each province explaining that the operations of the proposed Act will not reach that province! Where are they going to get the men, if nobody is conscripted?

The Bill is drafted in such a way, however, that it appeals to every part of the country except Quebec. Although I am only a back bencher, I am going to have the audacity—not in the name of my province, from which I hold no mandate, but on my own behalf—to answer some of the remarks of the Solicitor General.

He says that the Bill will bear more lightly on Quebec than on the other provinces. I protest against that sentiment. We resent the insult whether direct or indirect. Thank Heaven we do not belong to a race of cowards. We are willing to do our share to the bitter end, and no man in this House nor

in this country can tell us that if we vote for the Bill we shall be exempted. We do not want to be put in reserve. Our forefathers discovered this country; we have no other country in the world. This country is ours; we want to fight to the limit for it, because we have the protection of the state I will not allow any hon. gentleman to cast a slur upon us. I am not a minister of the Crown in this Government, thank Heaven!

I would like, en passant, to say a few words in answer to one of our former friends, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). Let me prove how profound our distrust is of this Bill. Here is a gentleman who has seen fit to leave his party and his chief. His argument is this: He wants to secure farm labour for his riding, contending that in supporting this Bill, he will get the farm help he requires. Here is a Bill drafted to enlist 100,000 men and send them overseas. There is a scarcity of labour, and when the 100,000 men will have gone away, the hon. member will get his farm help. That is why he supports the Bill. I am not surprised because I have heard the hon. member stating recently that the war has compelled us to act illogically, and he is living up to his statement. To convince his colleagues and the other members that he was in the right upon this question, he was obliged to resort to a new mandate. He is called in this House as a representative of South Wellington. Does he represent his constituents on this question? I say: no, because, if he did, he would not refuse to submit the question to them. Does he represent labour? No, organized labour in this country is against the Bill. Does he represent the British-born who have come to this country since the beginning of the war? No, they are against the Bill; they left their country so as not to be called upon to perform military service. Does he represent the country? No, he tells us that if the Bill is submitted to the people, it will be defeated. What then does he represent? He represents the honour of Canada. I will not make any comment. Here is an hon. gentleman, who stated in his address the other day that nine out of ten of the voters of this country would poll their votes against this measure, pretending to impose upon the people a measure that they would not stand for. If that is not Toryism of the best brand, I do not know what Toryism is.

The supporters of the Bill claim that the Canadian Expeditionary Force requires

100,000 men, and that this Bill is designed to supply that number. The Prime Minister has pledged the word of Canada, and, to use the very language of the Solicitor General this afternoon, the Government have signed the bond and we have to pay it. Was the pledge made for the assistance of the Empire or for the asistance of Canada? I would like to answer these questions. The Empire requires good-will and unity from the Dominions overseas. This Bill means animosity between the races and the cessation of a united and combined effort. Is that going to help the Empire? Not at all. The Empire requires food and ammunition. This Bill will deprive the Mother Country of the necessary flow of our productions, both agricultural and mechanical. Is the pledge going to help Canada? No. Canada cannot progress without peace, harmony and mutual understanding. Under this Bill, we shall get just the contrary. More than that, the splendid contributions of Canada, already freely given to Great Britain will be in vain. Unless you supply everything you have promised, unless you redeem in their entirety the pledges and the promises, your effort will be in vain.

For the proof that the pledge was made without consulting any one and without regard to the capacity or the resources of the country, we have only to look at the Bill. To supplement the promise and to redeem the pledge, the Government is compelled to have recourse to compulsion, and with compulsion you are going to have disruption. Will that save or help the Empire? I say: no. Why then was the pledge made? If it was not for the aid of the Empire nor for the aid of Canada, was it made to win the war and save the Empire? I know that the British authorities have sent here an officer who, after taking into consideration our resources in man-power and the necessity for Canada to supply food and ammunition, has made a report to the Government asking Canada to supply fifty per cent of the number of men we have so far furnished. The Government must be aware of this report, because I have been told by a gentleman who has seen and read that report, that such a report exists. Why make such a pledge? My belief is that the pledge was made to secure a new lease of power for the Administration. I have no hesitation in stating that the purport of the Bill is iniquitous and nefarious.

I come now to the amendment. We have a democratic Government and the people

should rule. Why should the Government refuse to appeal to the people? They want a united effort on the part of all our citizens. Let them appeal to the people then, and get rid of all disunion. I say that the Government has set a bad example. Distrust breeds distrust, and confidence engenders confidence. We have been told in the House that one member of the cabinet exchanged letters not so long ago with the Prime Minister, making certain charges against the conduct of a certain department by one of his colleagues, and the colleague concerned was not cognizant of this charge. If ministers cannot agree amongst themselves, if they distrust each other, it is not to be wondered at if they distrust the people. Why should not the Government appeal to the people? Let them state their case before the country, and if the people are made aware of the pledge that has been given and of the necessity as it exists in the mind of the Government, I am confident that we can trust them. Do you think, Sir, that for political purposes one part of the country would refuse to acknowledge the signature, the bond, the promise, the pledge which had been given in good faith by the Government of this country? No, Sir.

Before resuming my seat I shall be very frank with the House. I want to make a few remarks in the name of my people. This is one of the most solemn hours of my life. It may be the last opportunity I shall have of addressing the House of Commons and my country. I say to the Government: If you press this measure through, my people, declaring that this Government has no mandate, will use the very Bill itself to fight the matter out. We acknowledge that in this fight there will be pain and suffering. We may have to go to the direst consequences. My people are willing to go to the limit if you impose upon them such a piece of legislation; I believe they are right, and I will do as they intend to do.

Mr. JOHN H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I followed the speaker who has just sat down (Mr. Gauthier) with considerable interest until he reached his climax, his threat, which has so frightened me that I hardly think I shall be able to continue. I will do my best, however, and I promise not to detain the House very long. This amendment refers in a few words to a referendum, for which it calls. If there is to be an appeal to the people both the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) have made it quite clear that they prefer an election. In his negotiations with the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the Prime Minister, in answer to the request of the leader of the Opposition, freely offered to hold a general election if a coalition government were formed and the Conscription Bill put through. There has, therefore, been a declaration by this Government, bearing in mind what the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce have said, that they are willing to consult the people by general election, but not by referendum. The wisdom of that course I do not presume for one moment to question. Rightly or wrongly, our Government have given the Opposition the idea that with a very little urging they can get this Government to consult the country by means of a general election at least. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said:—

> I would not be willing to go to the people with a referendum under these conditions, without giving first my lead in the representative position I have.

That is, he would be willing to go if he had first given the people a lead. He also said:—

> What we propose is to do, in the light of the experience and knowledge that we have, our plain duty, and let the people pass their verdict as they choose later, or by history.

The Government therefore have clearly offered to procure a mandate from the people. The question then resolves itself into a general election or a referendum. A six months' hoist is before the House, but it is beneath my contempt; I decline to discuss it. The referendum I will discuss, because it purports to refer to the will of the people. But that other abortion proposes to deny the propriety of going to the people, and is more Germanesque than the Germans ever were. It denies the right of the people to pronounce upon this policy, and sweeps that right aside whilst proclaiming its passion for liberty in this House. What we have got tied up to in this House God only knows, and it is time there was some sort of demonstration in the country to wipe it out of existence. Where it came from I do not understand, but where it is going I have a pretty good idea.

If a general election were held the leaders of the various parties would be required to announce their policy. It does not follow that there would be only two leaders and only two policies; there might be a dozen. When the election was over the Governor

General would have the right and the discretion to call upon the man whom he thought most likely to form a stable government, and he would do so. In the event of a referendum being taken if the people said yea we should be in the same position we are in now. But if the people said nay, where would we be? We would be nowhere. The Governor General could not appeal to the present leader of the Opposition, for he would have expressed no opinion. The only people who would have expressed an opinion would be the Nationalists. Would he send for them?

The referendum would lead us into a technical and political calamity. It would be an absolute impossibility. There can be no excuse for it in the face of this great conflict or for debate upon the form of going to the people. It is too absurd. If we go to the people and get the people's verdict let it be, as my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) said, in a manly, responsible way. Let us stand sponsor for our opinions, let us go and tell the people what we think, and abide by the consequences and not on Dick Swiveller or Artful Dodger principles. Let us not reduce ourselves to the vulgarity of being mere politicians; let us at least rise to the height of those splendid men who have given us such a glorious lead in France and Flanders, let us show that we are worthy of being related to them by taking the action which must be taken, without delay.

There can be no question but that the justification for the Government's course in going to the people is plain. The people are the basis of democratic Government. We are here as the representatives of the people and only as representatives of the people. The people indeed are doing the fighting, they supply the sinews of war, they pay the taxes, they furnish by their franchise, the moral and political power; the people are all in all. We are but a few trustees who have been entrusted with the task of carrying out their mighty wishes. As Mr. Balfour has so well said: "If democracy fails us now we are indeed undone."

It must be expected that we will have some weaklings amongst us, that some—perhaps many—will fail to rise to the height of this great conflict. That is but natural. But if we are to fight as a united, powerful people, worthy of our place amongst the nations it must be as a fairly, fully and justly organized people. Every man must do his duty and we must remember that just as there may be the shirker or slacker amongst us, so there will be the financial slacker, the man who declines to come forward and place his resources at the disposal of the country. I myself know men whose resources consist of money. The cost of their living is but little more than that of the humblest amongst us. They have no children; they have no hostages to fortune. They do not even come within the purview of the Finance Minister's tax on sugar for "they do not take sugar." The fact is that they give to this great conflict just exactly what suits them, which is often not very much. When I am confronted by the statement of a class of people who say: We understand conscription of men but we cannot consent to the conscription of wealth because, while we understand the conscription of men, we cannot comprehend the conscription of wealth. I am at a loss to understand it and I cannot but suspect the motives of the men who make it. Is that right? When they find out what direct taxation in its multitudinous forms means—and how prone some people of all political parties are to side-step direct responsibility—although they do not recognize the positive principle, they are quite able to say promptly what the negative is and they are sure, after looking at it from all aspects, that they do not understand it. Well, all you have to do to show that you do understand a thing is to show absolutely that you do not understand it, because there is no getting away from a proposition which you are able to deny from all angles and all points. The shirking of such men will soon, I understand and hope, come to an end.

It will not please the people, and they will not stand for it. It must be remembered that there are two sorts of people who do not want a general election. One is the man who is unduly optimistic, and the other is the man who hopes that you will not get a mandate and that thus you will break up the whole support of Canada in the war and, that it will end in disaster and confusion. They are the two extremes. These things must be remembered.

Conscription is spoken of as a terrible thing as if it were a form of compulsion that had emanated from the Evil One. Cannot we realize that conscription, when passed upon by the people becomes not conscription or compulsion but the will of the people? The man who rejects it rejects not compulsion or conscription but the will of the people. He is not a protester; he is a rebel. He belongs then to the minority, and instead of complaining of the tyranny

of the majority he should at least be circumspect enough to view the conduct of the minority not only with suspicion but with a just regard to punishment by the country. The minority cannot rule the majority; the people in the majority will not permit it.

I was very much pleased to hear the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Gauthier) admit, as indeed the leader of the Opposition has admitted, that once the people have given their mandate all Canada must obey. But the question then arises: Can Canada give a mandate? I say most distinctly it can. There is not a man at the front who does not write regularly to his relatives or to some one. Let him indite, not ordinary epistles of affection, but what he thinks on the clear-cut issue of conscription or no conscription. The correspondence system, and the delivery of letters at the front is marvellous, it is up to date and to say that it is impossible to take the votes of the men at the front in face of the fact that they receive and give letters, parcels, all sorts of things, materials of every description, by post, with the exception of a few who may be wounded who are carried to hospitals and who are for a time unable to use their hands, is to take a position that the situation does not warrant. All, with the exception of the badly wounded, could mark their ballots. No man is on the fighting line for more than ten days at a time, many of them much less. I am within the mark in saying that in the most extreme cases no man is on the fighting line, or the immediate relief line, for longer than fifteen days, and then he goes back to his battalion, which will not be very far away, for rest, recuperation and training.

Thus in the course of fifteen days every man in the army who could make his mark at all could vote, and if to-night it was decided to have an election, all that would be necessary would be to flash the tidings across the water, hand the ballots to the responsible parties, see that the colonels of the battalions were apprised of the fact. Furnished with the ballots, they, with their magnificent organization, could see to it, by means of a muster parade or any other kind of parade you like, or through their subordinate officers, that every man was furnished with an opportunity for marking his ballot, and you would have a vote from the men at the front far larger in proportion than ever you would have if they were here in Canada, because the average vote is never more than sixty per cent, and you may rest assured that, wounded or not wounded, you would get ninety-five per cent of the vote at the front. It is easy. I cannot understand the difficulty of it. I asked time and time again, before I returned from the Old Country, why it was that there was such an objection, and the answer I received was not that there would be difficulty in taking the vote, but that it was not considered wise to inflame the minds of the men with a multitude of issues. Avoid the multitude of issues and you have it. The men are discussing from day to day the question of conscription and support. Let them say what they think on that one issue, and I will venture the assertion that you will have the vote of the men at the front satisfactorily taken, counted in London, and the tidings here, weeks before you have the vote taken in Canada. We must be just in regard to this matter, and I must say that to any utterance of Sir Joseph Flavelle, a gentleman whom I know well—I used to sit near him in school; unfortunately I did not acquire his ability, I just acquired his acquaintance—we must attach great weight. In discussing his caution to Canada about her man-power, he says:

> 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—

Not diminution, but impairment.

> —of the present factory working forces in Canada.

Quite clearly when the head of the Munitions Board—and he has proven himself to be a faultless, a flawless manager of munition producing in Canada; so much so that he stands extremely high in Imperial confidence—utters this warning at this time, he is wise enough to know what it means, and that is that we must be duly and properly organized. The point I wish to make in connection with this is that this statement of the head of the Munitions Board has given a reasonable cause or subject of protest to those who demand the mandate of an election. When he has thrown doubt upon the ability of Canada to furnish, without great care, more man power for the front, he has handed material for the very protest these gentlemen are making, and, like those other men high in authority who have stated that they have no objection to an election, he has placed us in that very position that we must give due regard to the necessity or

the opportunity of a mandate and to the fact of there being danger of decreasing the man-power in the country. The stability of a nation depends upon the fairness, the force, the vigour and the strength, the convincing manner, in which its affairs are administered. To quote the Munitions Board once again, there is not a murmur except from the politicians who have been unable to exercise any influence with the Munitions Board, and the reason they complain is, not because they wished to do anything improper, but because sundry of their constituents kept shoving them and urging them over and over again, asking them to exercise their influence, and they have found that it could not be done. In that way Sir Joseph Flavelle has established the confidence of the people, and also has shown conclusively that, as an organizer in that most difficult and nebulous part of our industry, namely the making of munitions, a thing we never did before, he is a past-master.

Let some man, then, be put in charge of agriculture; let another man be put in charge of food; let another man be put in charge of man-power; let another man be put in charge of a fair distribution of taxes, throwing all the resources of the country into the general pot, and not asking the working classes to hand over the men and the taxes both and do all the work—which they certainly will not do, and we in fairness should not expect them to do—and when we have organized, and when we have obtained, by moving rapidly, the mandate of the people, then, when we are conscious of our strength, the minority must give way. Then the Nationalists and all the other kickers will have to subside, and we shall hear no more of them. This course will not only have the effect of enabling us to assist in the war, but it will also have a splendid effect upon Canada for all time to come.

Mr. GEORGE McCRANEY (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, after a number of leading members of this House have dealt with this question, we have the experience which always occurs, that those who follow up repeat many of the arguments that have been used, and their contribution very often is only that they have given expression to views which have already been pronounced. I do not know that I can present to the House at this hour anything that is striking, but the fact that I have views on the question that is before us is the apology which I make for taking up the time of the House.

What are the responsibilities which we owe to 300,000 men who are now in England, France and Flanders, in the King's uniform, under authority of this Parliament? We shall answer the question pretty much in the views we hold as to the relation which the citizen bears to the state. Some of us hold the view that the relations are reciprocal, that the citizen who is damaged in his person, in his right, or in his property, has a right to the protection of the state, and also that when the state is in danger, the state has a right to call upon the citizen for his property and for his person in its defence. There is another point of view which is put forward. It is that the state must protect individuals and minorities, in their persons, their rights and properties, but that when the state is in jeopardy it is optional on the part of the citizen whether he shall serve it or not.

In this latter view military necessity plays no part. The only contingency under which the state might call upon the citizen is that our country should be invaded and all the horrors of an alien army be in our midst. To our forces in France and Flanders it denies all help except voluntary aid. If that view prevails, with the failure of recruiting efforts our men at the front are left to dwindle in numbers, to be discouraged in spirit, with companies growing smaller, and with final abandonment by our people. There are those who hold against conscription on principle. They have held that view for a number of years. If the last three years, with all its events, and the changes in opinion which the events have brought, have made no change in their point of view on such a principle as this, there is no tragedy which can happen between now and the end of the war that would change their minds.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCRANEY: No disaster could disturb principles so firmly set. There are few of us who do not abhor the idea of war at all, and the necessity for any compulsion of the citizens, and it is only under the most urgent necessity that we would consider such a thing. All of us had hoped that the war would have been concluded long before this, and that there would have been no occasion for legislation of the character that is now before the House. It is because of the question of time involved in the submarine menace, and also because of the practical withdrawal of Russia, that the seriousness of the situation has come

before us, and that we are obliged now to consider methods of reinforcing our men on the battle line. My hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) quoted the census returns to prove that we had not any men to spare to send to the front. I have never gone through the census reports, and I do not propose to. I have passed in front of the entrance to a number of picture shows in our cities, and I obtained all the information I wanted. I have no doubt there are other places we could go, to see young men in numbers shouting "Down with conscription," and we can easily make up our minds as to whether there is a surplus population that would be better otherwise employed. As to the necessities of the case, we have the assurance of the Prime Minister, who takes the responsibility of saying more men are required. We have figures given to us, showing that our losses are much in excess of the recruiting that is going on. We have the words of the men who come back to us, who tell us that more are needed. We are under obligations, as a Parliament, to fill up the ranks. We have sent those young men forward with all the assurances that this Parliament can give, and without any reserve as to whether further reinforcements would be by voluntary system or by conscription. Those of us who have been able to do so have made eloquent speeches bidding them farewell, which speeches become only empty platitudes unless we propose to make them good. We find that the wounded in battle, are obliged, after recovering, to go back into the trenches. Notwithstanding the testimony which my gallant friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) gives that men are only ten days in the front trenches, I am told that for seven and eight months they are never away from the battlefront, although not exposed to actual danger. Men are being sent home now not wounded, but because they are medically unfit to stay there longer. When these conditions prevail, I say that no man who has been wounded should be obliged to go back into the battleline. No man should be obliged to stay in France, either on the battleline or in the near reserve, without having sufficient rest. There are plenty of young men in our country to take their places, and I think we ought to see to it, so far as we have power, that their places are filled by these young men. It is said we need do nothing, because there are 100,000 men in England in reserve. If the Government meet some of the returned soldiers they will find that one of the sorest points is that there are so many senior officers in England who are unwilling to go over to France as lieutenants. I hope the Government will institute an inquiry, and have everybody sent home who is not of use there. I am not speaking from the standpoint alone of the military requirements at the front, but I should think an investigation of that character would relieve the sense of injustice that is felt, which we hear of every time we meet returned soldiers. I do not suppose they tell their troubles to members of the Government. I know they tell them to other individuals. I have seen it stated unofficially that the reserves in England are good for only about five months. The months pass quickly, and we have to make our decision and adopt our measures. I would like to believe that further recruiting would make up the reinforcements required. If that were so, I would urge the Government to withdraw the Bill and try recruiting first, but I would say that, if that attempt failed, the men's places must be filled, and, if the recruits cannot be obtained under the voluntary system they must be obtained anyway, and that there must be compulsion. But I know that those who hold against compulsion on principle would not agree to that, even as an ultimate resort, and it is useless to talk to them about it.

The Government has presented the Bill. The Bill is subject to any amendment that will tend to further its objects. It meets the present need, because its purpose is to supply men.

An amendment to the Bill has been moved by the leader of the Opposition. That amendment recognizes no need, suggests no remedy, applies no alternative; it proposes only that there shall be a referendum. The number of votes available from our soldiers in France, Flanders, England and Canada is about 300,000. It has been stated in the House—almost as a matter of generosity—that that vote would be taken. But I do not know why the trenches, hospitals and camps should be invaded with ballot boxes in order that we may find out whether the soldiers want reinforcements. In Scripture, the example of the unnatural father is the man who, when his son asked for bread, gave him a stone. The object of this amendment is, in answer to the request of the men for reinforcements, to give them a referendum. If the House declares itself in favour of a referendum, we shall go down to history as

being in the position of the unnatural father who gave his son a stone when he asked for bread. Let us give bread, not a stone; let us give reinforcements, not a referendum.

The male population of military age in Canada may be roughly divided into two classes: those who can go but will not, and those who would go but cannot. I do not see how any assistance could be given to the men in France by giving these people an opportunity of expressing their opinion through a referendum. The only thing accomplished by a referendum is the providing of a line of retreat.

We have never appreciated the fact that the sacrifice made by the soldier is for the benefit of the community. We who are at home should bear burdens commensurate with our immunity from the conditions of the battlefield. Perhaps the present apathy towards recruiting and the attitude of a large part of the public in regard to this Bill are due to the fact that many of us have profited rather than suffered as a result of the war. Manufacturers have flourished; wages have greatly increased; mercantile businesses have multiplied their volume of trade; higher prices have come for agricultural products. In a material sense, only those who receive salaries or large incomes are bearing greater financial burdens than before the war. Our war finance has been carried on largely by borrowed money. We have raised comparatively little more than ordinary expenditure; only about $100,000,000 has been applied on a war expenditure of $700,000,000. I should like to see a stronger war policy in financial matters, the taxation of incomes and wealth, and an endeavour to even up the burdens borne by those who suffer and those who are able to save by the sacrifices of the soldiers. I welcome the announcement of the Finance Minister that a measure for the imposing of an income tax will be introduced. I hope that he will not stop there; that he will, by fixed and equitable principles, get larger contributions from those who receive the greatest—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did the minister make that announcement?

Mr. McCRANEY: The announcement was made in the public press.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the newspapers. That is a different matter.

Mr. McCRANEY: By a unanimous vote we passed a resolution last session asking the Imperial authorities to extend the life of this Parliament. Since then we have assumed all the responsibilities and all the duties which pertain to members of this Assembly. One of our duties is public leadership. The public expect that from the members of Parliament, but a referendum would at once deny them that leadership. The people are entitled to the judgment of this House in respect to the desirability of enforcing a measure of compulsory service. Having regard to the feeling which is abroad, I have come to the conclusion, since the bringing down of this measure was announced, that compulsory military service should not be enforced under the authority of this Parliament. This is a moribund Parliament; we would do better to have an election. My suggestion is that before this Bill is passed, the Government amend the section which relates to the coming of the Act into operation so as to provide that the Order in Council making it effective should not be passed until after a general election. Some people, I know, feel that a general election would fan certain smouldering sparks into a great conflagration. I have a more hopeful outlook than that—at least I did have when I came into the Chamber to-night, but it has been somewhat dissipated by the remarks of the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier). I hope that the hon. gentleman will reconsider his position. He has always had the reputation of being fair and reasonable; and some parts of his speech did bear out that reputation. The character of an election depends upon the members of this House—if they do not abdicate their leadership. Up to this evening the character of this debate was most moderate. Perhaps the member for St. Hyacinthe was tempted to take the attitude that he did by the remarks of the member for North York (Mr. J. A. Armstrong); those who follow may take warning. I believe that this debate can be conducted reasonably and without passion, just as other debates have been which have dealt with serious and important questions. My hope is that a general election will cause, not a great conflagration, but the dying away of the smoking embers. We have confidence that the leadership of this country, even though it may disagree with the principle of the Bill, will use its best efforts after a general election to secure the obedience of the people to the law.

10 p.m.

Those are the assurances of men in this House, and I take them at their word. It

may be said that the holding of a general election would cause a delay in bringing this measure into operation. I can imagine nothing more disastrous than the passage of this Bill and an attempt by this Parliament to apply it to some portions of this country. I do not think there would be any gain of time in that way; I believe time would be lost, and sometimes the longest way round is the shortest way there. My advice to the Government is to let it be known to the public that this Bill will not be enforced until after a general election. The public will understand the matter well; the passage of the Bill will be facilitated; many objections which are now made to the Bill will be removed, and I believe in the end the result will be more satisfactory than if any other course is pursued.

In this House we are overwhelmed by suspicion of each other; we suspect each other of playing a political game. I do not want to say that such a thing does not exist in this House, but I believe that if in this Parliament the prospect of a general election were four or five years distant, the temptation of that thing would be far removed, and we would get the best results under new conditions and with new men.

In saying what I have said to-night, I have spoken at variance with the views which have been expressed by my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With the Chief Whip of the party (Mr. Pardee). I feel that, having followed our leader for quite a number of years, it is with regret that I take the course I do. But I wish to say of my leader and his course upon this measure, notwithstanding the strictures that have been passed by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. J. A. M. Armstrong), that I believe the attitude of the leader of the Opposition is dictated by considerations which appeal to him as being his highest patriotic duty.

In this year we celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation. In the years since Confederation we have never previously had before us a question so full of national danger and requiring higher statesmanship. Perhaps I have been too optimistic in hoping that an election contest would be carried on with moderation and good sense, but I prefer to have that optimism. I hope the events of the next few months will do credit to the members of this Parliament and full justice to the 300,000 men on the other side of the water who are looking to us for reinforcements, and will justify the Confederation of which our forefathers laid the foundation half a century ago.

Mr. JOS. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville) (Translation): As the debate which is now engrossing the attention of Parliament and of the country is of greater consequence than any that have ever taken place in this House, it stands to reason that many hon. gentlemen should deem it their duty to give expression to their views and feelings.

I do not rise, Sir, to participate at any length in the debate that is now in progress, as I have no idea that I shall be able to add very much, if anything, to the exhaustive statements of those who have spoken before me; for, as my hon. friend (Mr. McCraney) has remarked, at this stage of the debate, those who follow up contribute very few new arguments and their speeches vary only in the shape given to the expression of their views.

Without any further delay, I enter upon the subject.

If the right hon. the Prime Minister is to be believed, no new principle is involved in the Bill which he is now presenting to the consideration of the House, and which it is but an amendment to the existing Militia Acts, with the addition of a few clauses and the elimination of a few others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if such should be the case, the right hon. leader of the House, with this Bill, could certainly not compass the object he has in view, and he could certainly not provide for the compulsory enlistment of 100,000 men for overseas service; because, if the principle embodied in our existing Militia Act is to be maintained in the Bill under consideration, the Government could not put our militia on active service in Europe, without violating the policy and the letter of our Militia Act.

I submit, Sir, that the words in the Militia Act "beyond Canada for the defence thereof" merely convey the meaning that our militia may be called out beyond our frontiers to repel the invader.

From the day our first Militia Act was passed, in 1868, down to our own times, our lawgivers never contemplated or had anything in view besides the defence of Canada in North America.

Up to 1868, their were to be found in our Statute book formal enactments which never gave rise to ambiguity. In 1868, the Act of 1863 was superseded, and although the framers of the Act did not express any intention of changing the policy of the law, however as some exception was taken to

the change made in the Act, the lawgiver, in 1868, formally affirmed the fundamental principle laid down in the orginal Acts, as concerns the placing of the militia on active service abroad, by the addition of the words "for the defence of Canada" and by explaining the meaning of those words.

When the construction to be placed on any clause of a statute is called in question, no better authority can be invoked than that of the framer of the Bill which has passed into law.

In looking up the Debates of 1904, I find that Sir Frederick Borden, the sponsor of the Bill, then said, as reported at page 6491 of Hansard:

> Sir Frederick Borden: There has been no change in policy. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) will take the trouble to look at former Militia Acts and the discussion on Militia Bills he will find that the intention always has been whether expressed or not—in some of the Acts it has been distinctly expressed and in far more stringent terms than in the Bill now before the Committee—that the Militia of Canada or of the old provinces before the Dominion existed, should be only called upon to serve within the territory of those provinces or of the Dominion.

And further on:

> That is the intention.

Further on:

> That is the idea in the organization of any milita force. . . .it is a home force for home service. . .

Further on:

> It seems to me that we have made clear in this section exactly what is undestood as the object of a militia force in every country.

Pages 8087-8088:

> Sir Frederick Borden: I do not think the hon. gentleman himself would seriously contemplate a proposition by which the Government would have authority to order the militia to serve a thousand miles away from Canada.
>
> Mr. Gourley: Why not? What are we here for?
>
> Sir Frederick Borden: It is for the hon. gentleman to explain that. I do not think that any thoughtful man looking at the condition of things in this young country would seriously propose to enact a statute which would place in the hands of any government the power of ordering out the militia to serve in distant parts of the world—
>
> Mr. Barker: That is the old Act—
>
> Sir Frederick Borden: It is not the old Act—I have taken the trouble to go to the statute of old Canada and of the various provinces in this Dominion and there I have found that not one of them contains a provision by which the Militia can be sent outside of the province iself. That being the case it seems to me that we may just as well understand where we are and I accept, fully, absolutely and entirely myself the responsibility for the proposition which is contained in this clause.

[Mr. Demers.]

Could we place a different construction upon the wording of the statute? Could we give a different interpretation to the language of our statutes, by the light of our history and of our traditions? I submit as a sound legal proposition that a different construction cannot be placed upon the Act. And is it not evident that, when the war broke out, the Government themselves gave that very same interpretation to the Act, by sending our soldiers abroad, not as a part of the Canadian militia, or under the authority of our Militia Act, but to serve as an auxiliary to and in fact to form part of the Imperial army? Is it not evident that when the war started the Canadian Government placed the same interpretation upon the Act, in their communications with the British authorities, as to the status of our soldiers in Europe?

And yet, if ever there existed danger for Canada, it was indeed at the inception of the war, when Germany, after making a most intense preparation for forty-four years, almost succeeded in rapidly winning the war, without seriously impairing her forces and energies, and came near being enabled to dictate peace conditions which would have decided and determined the future of our country. Yet, in spite of this impending danger, the Canadian Government made no enactment for placing the Active Militia of Canada on actual service beyond Canada, because they realized that they had no such power. And if they lacked such power in those times of stress and emergency, on what ground can they now claim the power of taking such action, when Canada is no longer in danger of invasion or of conquest? Is there an hon. gentleman in this House who believes that there is any cause for Canada to fear invasion or conquest by the German nation, now utterly exhausted or at least seriously weakened and almost tottering to her ruin? Let us not shift the question. It is not enough to say: We must fill up the ranks, as they become depleted. We must certainly maintain our lines, if we wish to keep our plighted faith to our soldiers, but not by placing upon the Act such wrong interpretation as placed upon it by the Prime Minister and by those who favour conscription. A question of sentiment would be no adequate ground for authorizing the Governor in Council to send Canadian forces across the sea. There should exist a real or apprehended danger of invasion of Canada, a statement which no thinking man to-day would subscribe to, and in the absence of such danger, the Governor in Council could not, even under the interpretation placed

upon the statute by the Prime Minister, force the citizens of this country to enlist for overseas service.

To sum up my first argument, if the principle involved in this Bill does not change the policy or intention of the existing Act, the Governor in Council cannot call out the people for service across the ocean, first because our Militia Act does not authorize it and moreover because, even under the Act as construed by the Prime Minister, there exists no real or apprehended danger.

But, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the interpretation of our law, by the Prime Minister, seems to me much more of a subterfuge to excuse the enormity of his act than the expression of a conviction.

This Bill, according to him, does not contain any new principle? Are we to be persuaded that chalk is cheese? Then why pass a new law? Would it be, perchance, because it is intended to suppress the equality of the ballot in order to replace it by the supreme injustice of selective conscription? No, Mr. Speaker, the reason why a new Bill is submitted, is that here is a Bill where we find these words "Canadian Expeditionary Force," and we find also these words, "Preservation of the Empire and of human liberty." The reason why another Bill is brought down, is that this is not the case of a mere innovation, but that of a complete revolution in our legislation. Besides, that is how this Bill has been interpreted all over the country. The whole press has announced it under the heading of " the Conscription Law." Has our present Militia Act ever been designated under that appellation? Moreover, as I have just stated, there is no better authority for the interpretation of a law than the explanations given, at the time of its making, by the author of the Bill and, as the Prime Minister has told us, very plainly and without any ambiguity, that the sole object of the Bill he proposed, was to permit the sending of our soldiers to Europe for the defence of the Empire and human liberty, then this Bill is essentially different from our present Militia Act where, most naturally, there is no other question but that of the defence of Canada—Home Defence. This Bill therefore indicates a political tendency entirely different from the one we have heretofore followed, and that is why I submit, as a second proposition, the following: The proposed law, should it be adopted, will be unconstitutional. And, in support of my thesis, I will have but to repeat my previous argument as to the meaning of the words: " outside of Canada for the defence of Canada," in the case of actual or apprehended danger, merely adding to it this: According to the British North American Act, the Federal Parliament, by section 91, paragraph 13, has the power to make laws for " the militia, the naval service and the defence of the country."

If we attentively read over the debate which took place about the proposal of Confederation, we must necessarily come to the conclusion that the Fathers of Confederation had in view solely the defence of Canada in North America; that they never had the intention to try and organize in the country a militia for the protection of the Empire and of human liberty throughout the world. The only question was the defence of Canada, and that defence presupposed an attack against the Canadian territory. Besides, at the time of Confederation, we had a Militia Act which continued in existence until 1868, and that law did not provide for the sending of our militia beyond the limits of our territory, except to repel an attack, when it did authorize entering into a foreign territory, but into a territory contiguous to or adjoining our own. Not one of those who participated in the debate upon the Confederation proposal has expressed any intention other than this one. Such is, therefore, the meaning to be given to the words " for the country's defence," in the Confederation Act; that is to say, that the principle which presided over the making of the first Militia Act has never been altered by any subsequent legislation.

This is for the legal and constitutional side which is of capital importance, which is of such importance, that by itself alone, it necessitates a referendum in order to have the people's view concerning the constitutional changes that are meant to be made by the measure now submitted to us.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to consider all the viewpoints from which the conscription question might be examined, but I will not, however, take my seat without insisting upon a certain feature of the Bill.

We are told that our greatest concern for the time being should be " to win the war," and that is why conscription should be proposed.

Have you faith in the usefulness of the method adopted by the Government? For my part, I have not. I desire to express forthwith my own opinion, with all sincerity and I do say I am satisfied that had anyone wished to completely paralyze Canada's effort in this war, he could not have found

worse or better than the move made by the Government.

Has the Prime Minister satisfied himself, for a single moment, that his measure would make for union among the citizens of this country? Has the Prime Minister satisfied himself for a single moment, that his measure would promote greater unity of action? I do not grant him such ingenousness. He must have known that the contrary would happen; he should have known that the first and only sure result, would be to intensify the race conflict going on in Canada, more particularly since the outbreak of the war.

A few moments of reflection should have made him foresee the national disaster toward which he is heading us, and as I cannot suppose that the Prime Minister has not foreseen that fatality I hold him responsible for having deliberately done so. And by creating that condition in the country could the Prime Minister think he would stimulate the Canadian effort in the prosecution of the war? On the contrary, he should have reflected that he would paralyze it, as he does paralyze it, he will cause us to lose abroad the benefit of all the sacrifices we have imposed ourselves until now.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we had drawn, we had provoked rather, the wonder and the admiration of the allied nations by the generosity and the spontaneity of our participation, and now the arbitrary and despotic action of the Government shall give rise to protests and to more than protests, which will certainly have the effect to create in the Allies' minds a confusion as to the appreciation of the sentiments and of the motives which have inspired our former participation.

To desire to establish conscription in our country; to wish to establish conscription here, when we have so nobly and so generously answered every call, is not only a poor appreciation of the sacrifices made, it is a crime, and the future will say whether I am using too strong an expression to qualify the Government's action.

All these considerations, Mr. Speaker, awaken within me some suspicions as to the motives which have inspired the Government, and I am asking myself whether the " win the war " has had as much a decisive influence as did party considerations, and I would be greatly surprised if the Government, after the adoption of their measure, if it be adopted, ever attempt to apply it.

The Prime Minister knows under what conditions the Parliament is called upon to

legislate upon a question of this importance. We are no longer the representatives of the people, and we would have the impudence of doing away with the liberty of the people. But is not the absurdity of such a pretension most evident, and, more especially, the danger of seeing it materialize?

But, it is said, our parliamentary existence has been continued by the Imperial Parliament. That does not make of us representatives of the people, but Imperial deputies, and since when has the Imperial Parliament the right to decide of the life of the citizens of Canada? They will laugh at us, unless the Government's action be considered as a provocation; then, they will revolt. We have no authority in the matter, and it would be daring the people, should we have the audacity and the insolence to try and dispose of its liberties. The people will have nothing but contempt for an arbitrary measure adopted by an irresponsible body and I say: Woe be to those who would provoke them. We are living in a democratic country and our people will not readily accept the return to autocracy and despotism.

While it is not yet too late, I ask the Prime Minister to reconsider his decision, to withdraw his Bill. I ask it of him on behalf of Canada's future; I ask it on behalf of the necessary union of the races in this country; for the success of the war inasmuch as Canada's participation is concerned.

The Prime Minister stated that we should fear the wrath and indignation of our soldiers on their return, if we did not provide to fill the gaps and to send reinforcements. I think the Prime Minister was very ill-inspired in making such a statement. No one will believe that the heroes who have fought freely and voluntarily for the triumph of civilization, of liberty and of equality, would demand the application to their fellow-citizens of methods different from those that were applied to them. I have a higher conception of the mentality of the heroes of Vimy, of Courcelette, of Saint Julien, of Festubert and of Ypres, and I entertain the hope that, fighting over there for universal peace against barbarity and the despotism of the military castes, they would not return here to establish the German methods and the reign of terror. Otherwise, there would be reason to bitterly regret our intervention in this war. And then, have we deserved this threat from the Prime Minister? No, assuredly not.

Let us see. Do they absolutely mean that we have done nothing in this war or

do they not realize the gigantic effort we have accomplished? According to the Prime Minister, we ought to hide ourselves in shame, for our apathy and our indifference.

Well! this language shocks me and offends me, and far from being ashamed at our share in this war, as a Canadian I am proud of it, and I concede to no one the right to diminish the glory, the honour and the credit which must therefrom reflect upon our country.

We are told: what will they think of us if we do not fill up the gaps? What will be thought is this, that we have done our share and that our resources do not permit us to do any more, inasmuch as our contribution in men is concerned. What did people think of France when she abandoned a part of her front line of defence to entrust it to British soldiers? It is not absolutely necessary that the front, now occupied by the Canadians, be always held by Canadians. The important point is that it be maintained by allied troops, whether they be English, French, Australian, American or Canadian soldiers. When the French soldier could not hold his entire line, he was replaced by the British soldier and there was no cause for humiliation in that, just as there would be no reason for uneasiness and for shame if a portion of our line were maintained by the Americans who have just entered the war and who should now contribute a share at least equal to ours.

Let us suppose that we do go to the extreme limit, that we send all our men fit to carry arms, and that the war should last two or three years longer, should we then be obliged to send over our women, our children and our old men, so that we still might pride ourselves in saying that the Canadian lines are entirely held by Canadians? We have at present 420,000 men enlisted, perhaps more, out of a population of 7,000,000 souls, and although I do not desire to recriminate for, after all, such a levy has been voluntary, and although I have no objection against voluntary enlistment, I may truly say nevertheless that we have exceeded our capacity, and I find myself in excellent company when I make such a claim. The sending over of 200,000 men would have been more in conformity with our needs, with the needs of the Allies, with our resources and our interest, 200,000 men at the front would have been considered as evidence of a boundless generosity, and devotion. Never had the Allies expected or imagined such a contribution from Canada, because they knew the extent of our territory, our relative population, and because they realized that our degree of interest was not the same as that of the sovereign nations; and they would not entertain any feeling of contempt, did they know that, before imposing upon ourselves the supreme effort, we desire at least to be convinced that we are not doing it in the place of those who are primarily obliged to do so. My intimate conviction is that 100,000 more men, in this mass of 25 or 30 millions of combatants, could have no more influence upon the result of the war than a grain of sand cast in the sea would affect its level, and, therefore, I am the more convinced that it is merely a matter of saving 100,000 men from elsewhere by sacrificing our own. These 100,000 lives, we need them at home; they mean little or nothing as far as the war is concerned, but what a capital for a young and vast country as ours, which, to lay its foundations, has been obliged until quite recently to pay people to cross over and to spend fabulous amounts towards encouraging immigration.

If, after the gigantic effort made by us, the Allies are still in need of soldiers, let us not forget that the United States are at war, that they have a population of 112,000,000 inhabitants, that they have entered this war for questions purely of national interest and that, comparatively, to equal our effort, they must raise an army of six or seven million men. Let them first draw from this abundant and inexhaustible source before thinking of draining this country of its men before thinking of rooting out the very elements required for the carrying on of its activities.

After the splendid but lavish effort we have made, I am shocked at finding that it is proposed to take steps towards forcibly enlisting even the last men, by means of a conscription Bill. And under what circumstances? After the Premier and his colleagues have absolutely pledged themselves not to do so; after a minister of the Crown, just a few months ago, had himself elected upon a policy absolutely contrary to that which is born to us to-day; with an incomplete representation and when, as a matter of fact, some way or other, some thirty counties are deprived of all representation; when there is no longer in this House any representative of the people and that neither the Government nor this Parliament have the constitutional right of enacting conscription.

Resolutions have been known to spring from measures less arbitrary. What are we in our relations to the people? Plain individuals, without mandate or authority, existing as a body in consequence of an Imperial

Act, but we are no longer the representatives of the people. I have no right to speak here in the name of the people, neither upon this question nor upon any other, and I am too proud of my country's autonomy to speak in the name of the Imperial Government. I am too fond of the democratic liberal ideas to play the dictator; the people of Canada are alone master of their destinies, alone have they the right to decide. They have delegated their powers to no one and, indeed, I cannot believe that, in this land of liberty, we could have the spectacle of a majority in an assembly of two hundred individuals, that would thus enforce its own views upon 7,000,000 free citizens. Let us beware!

The Allies' cause is noble and holy, we have realized that from the start, we made all manner of sacrifice; we made them generously and willingly; we are ready to make more, but to come and attempt to coerce us after the remarkable voluntary effort we have just made, that is an insult which has been spared the people in certain portions of the Empire, such as Australia where though determined to contribute their all they nevertheless resolved to affirm their freedom. Let us consult the people. A large section of the country is opposed to conscription, it may or may not form the majority; a plebiscite alone can show. Will the majority declare in favour of it? If so, the minority will submit, for we have a population deeply imbued with sound democratic ideas.

Without a plebiscite, who can tell us that the people shall respect a measure arbitrarily passed by a power without responsibility or authority? Have we the right to create in the country such a situation? Have we the right to risk the consequences of an arbitrary and despotic act when, by a referendum, the question would be settled, without friction and without danger, within a few weeks?

Would a negative verdict be feared? Who are those who fear public opinion? Shall public opinion be respected, yes or no? Are we living in a constitutional country? Well, then, what is this public opinion? There is nothing but a popular consultation that can let us know, at this hour, for there are no longer any representatives of the people.

Of course, I am aware that in certain centres the opinion is current that anti-conscriptionists are to be found in Quebec only; let us have a plebiscite and we will thus obtain two equally important results: first, we shall know the popular will as regards enlistment, and, in the second place, we may perhaps put an end to the prejudices that are fostered against Quebec in certain outlying and beclouded communities.

The hon. Solicitor General thought fit, the day before yesterday, to put a question, not to me, but to the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). I would have been glad if someone had put me the same question, and I shall do as if that had actually happened. He asked what was our opinion upon conscription.

Should the Government withdraw its Bill and grant us a plebiscite, I would go before the electors of my county and engage them with all the energy in my power to vote against conscription. As a citizen, I would vote against conscription most decidedly; but if the majority declared in favour of conscription, then I would submit, and I would ask all my electors and all my fellow-citizens to likewise submit. I would go before my electors and I would tell them this in order to induce them to vote against conscription. I would say to them: According to me, the only way in which we can at present really assist in bringing about the final victory of the Allies is by developing agriculture, it is by doing intensive culture, it is by setting ourselves to the building of ships, it is by turning out more munitions.

I have a long time since been deeply impressed with that idea, and never was I more convinced of it than when I heard, in this House, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who spoke as follows—

Sir HERBERT AMES (translation): Will the hon. member allow me to put him one question?

Mr. DEMERS (translation): Certainly.

Sir HERBERT AMES (translation): The hon. member stated, if I rightly caught his meaning, that he would do all in his power to induce his electors to vote against conscription?

Mr. DEMERS (translation): Certainly.

Sir HERBERT AMES (translation): But if the vote of the Dominion of Canada be in favour of conscription, that he would do his possible to induce his electors to accept that measure. If there is a general election, would he be disposed to do anything after?

Mr. DEMERS (translation): If there is a general election before the passing of this law or after the passing of this law? If we had a general election immediately?

Sir HERBERT AMES (translation): Yes.

Mr. DEMERS (translation): If we had a general election immediately, I would tell my electors that the question of conscription would be submitted to them by plebiscite unless the Government agreed to have a plebiscite at the time the election was being held.

Sir HERBERT AMES (translation): I do not exactly understand; if you will allow me, from your point of view, is there a difference between a referendum pure and simple and a general election?

Mr. DEMERS (translation): Certainly, if, in a general election, the question were not separately put, the voters' opinion, as to this special question, would perhaps not be known—and I believe the question should be put in a most special manner, so that the voter may give a distinct answer, and I do think the only way out of the difficulty would be to submit the question through a plebiscite, either at the time of the election or subsequently, if the Liberal party came into power and the movement in favour of conscription should be continued.

I was just about to quote the words spoken by the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when I was interrupted—and, indeed, it has afforded me pleasure—by the hon. member for St. Antoine. I shall now quote from the statement made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce:

> The great question in the war at the present time is feeding the Allies, feeding the Allies for the rest of the war, and more especially for the next six months. A submarine can sink a 6,000 ton vessel in two minutes, but it takes months to build one. The critical time is between now and the end of 1917, and whatever goods we can have in that period is our bounden duty to save.

To further confirm my views, I just read this morning, in a Montreal paper, an interview given by Lord Rhondda, food controller in England, an interview which took place on the 19th of the present month. Here is what he says:

> In this war, and especially at this stage, food-power is co-equal with man-power," said Lord Rhondda, the new food controller in an interview to-day. "The problem of Great Britain's food primarily depends upon the supply, and in the main the solution of the problem of supply lies in America. I am sure they will not let us down."

And further:

> For this we depend to a vital degree upon the United States and Canada. No one recognizes that more fully than I do.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I will say that our duty just now in this country, considering the assistance we can give the Allies and the very future of our country, is first, to practice the strictest economy, and then to apply ourselves to promoting the interests of agriculture and production generally, and we must also think of preserving in this country at least the germ of life which shall be necessary to us in order to face and to solve the after-the-war problems of which we have been given so gloomy and dismaying representations.

On motion of Mr. Hazen the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Friday, June 22, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

MR. SPEAKER REFERS TO LANGUAGE USED BY MR. GAUTHIER.

Mr. SPEAKER: My attention has been directed to language used during the debate last evening by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe at a time when I happened to be out of the Chamber. The hon. member (Mr. Gauthier) is reported in Hansard to have said:

> His amendment (Mr. Barrette's), being a negative one, would have been ruled out of order if it had not been introduced with the consent of the Government.

It seems to me that the implication contained in these words is unmistakable, and one which if allowed to go unchallenged would seriously impair my usefulness as Speaker of this House. I need hardly say that the use of such language by an hon. member of the House is not in conformity with the usual practice in such cases, and is not in keeping with the spirit of proper decorum in debate. When the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe is in his place I purpose to ask him to withdraw this language.

CRIMINAL COURT AMENDMENT.

NUMBER OF JURORS IN PANEL.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 97, to amend the criminal code.

Mr. GRAHAM: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: Our attention has been called to the fact that by recent legislation in the province of Manitoba, as well as by legislation which has been in force for some

time in some of the other provinces, there is no fixed number of jurors to be summoned as constituting the panel, power being given to the judge to summon any number of jurors that he may deem desirable for the purposes of the business to be brought before the court. Under this legislation the panel may be of a very large number, and the Crown in any trial has the right to stand aside any number of jurors as they are called, without assigning any reason. Wherever under the law the panel is fixed at a definite number, this right of stand aside is of course limited to the number fixed for the panel, and, the panel once exhausted, these jurors may be called again and, unless there is ground for challenge, will be entitled to sit. It was considered not desirable that the Crown should have this right to stand aside extending to such an indefinite number, or rather, that it should not have that right without its being subject to the same control which is confided to the judge as to the determination of the number of the panel. This Bill therefore proposes to amend that section of the Criminal Code by limiting the right of stand aside to the number of forty-eight, which is the fixed number of the panel in many of the provinces, was such in Manitoba, until the recent legislation, unless the judge for special cause permits the right to be exercised as regards a larger number. In other words, the purpose is simply to subject the right of stand aside to the same control on the part of the judge as under the provincial legislation referred to he has over the number of the panel.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 98, to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: This Bill contains two clauses. The purpose of the first is to make provision for the liability for costs on the part of litigants with the Crown where the case on the part of the Crown is conducted by the department. In those cases the lawyers in the department are not entitled to collect fees or costs for themselves, they being paid by their salaries. It is thought desirable, notwithstanding that fact, that litigants who bring unfounded claims against the Crown should be liable for costs the same as any other litigant. The purpose of this first clause is therefore to provide that in such cases the costs to which the litigants may be condemned shall be payable to the Crown simply, the Crown paying its own costs through the salaries of its officers.

The other provision of the Bill is to achieve a purpose which was also the purpose of a Bill introduced earlier in the session by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), if my memory serves me right. The matter dealt with by that proposed Bill of his had already been brought to our attention before his Bill was introduced, and we had come to the conclusion that an amendment such as he sought to make by his Bill should be made to the Exchequer Court Act. The clause of the Exchequer Court Act sought to be amended by this Bill and by the Bill of the hon. member for Kamouraska is the clause giving jurisdiction to the court to adjudicate upon any claim of damages against the Crown resulting from death or injury to person or property caused by the negligence of any servant of the Crown upon a public work. The Supreme Court has interpreted the section as it now stands as limiting the liability to cases where the injury is actually sustained upon the public work; that is to say, where the person suffering is actually on the public work or where it is a question of damage to property which property itself is actually upon the public work. This created a situation in which, though a man might be injured by the negligence of an employee of the Crown in the course of his employment, and where the whole cause of the injury took place upon the public work, yet if the victim himself was not actually on the public work he had no recourse.

While there is no reason to criticise the interpretation put by the Supreme Court upon the section as it stands, I do not think it was intended when the legislation was originally enacted to make that distinction, namely, to make the liability depend upon the locality in which the individual or the property injured happened to be.

The purpose of this legislation is simply so to amend the section that the Crown will be liable—as I certainly believe was intended—for damage or injury resulting from the negligence of an employee of the Crown within the scope of his employment upon a public work. It simply does away with the requirement which the present sec-

tion has been interpreted as containing, namely, that the individual or property injured should at the moment be actually on the public work.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 99, to amend the Interest Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: The purpose of this Bill is to make the rate of interest payable upon judgments in the province of Manitoba similar to that payable in the province of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and I think in almost all the other provinces. The necessity for this legislation arises because of the fact that it has recently been decided that the interest upon judgments in the province of Manitoba runs at but 4 per cent, which I understand was the rate fixed by English statute at the time the English law became applicable to the province of Manitoba.

The courts appear to have held that it was not within the jurisdiction of a provincial legislature to legislate on the subject of interest, even interest running upon a judgment, and that consequently any modification of the law in that regard attempted by the provincial legislature was ineffective. From many sources in Manitoba have come requests that the interest rate there should be made the same as that provided for by statute for the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, which is the ordinary rate of interest, five per cent provided in cases where neither by law nor by agreement is the rate of interest fixed. There have been requests from Manitoba also that the interest rate should be made higher than this. While it did not appear to us that there should be a higher rate of interest in Manitoba than in other provinces, it did appear desirable that there should be an equal rate. This Bill, therefore, simply brings the province of Manitoba under the provisions made applicable to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, under which interest runs upon a judgment at the rate of five per cent.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the rate of interest, under such circumstances, in Ontario?

Mr. DOHERTY: My impression is that it is five per cent. I know that it is five per cent in the province of Quebec. I think that in one or more of the Maritime Provinces it is six per cent.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 100, Respecting Game in the Northwest Territories of Canada.—Mr. Roche.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 93, to incorporate the Kenora and English River Railway Company.—Mr. Carrick.

Bill No. 94, to authorize the issue of a patent to James Wallace Tygard.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 95, to incorporate the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and the Children of the Empire (Junior Branch).—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 96, to incorporate Dominion Good Roads Association.—Mr. Achim.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SATURDAY SITTINGS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That on and after Saturday next, the twenty-third instant, and on Saturdays until the end of the present session, the House shall meet at three o'clock in the afternoon; and the Order of Precedence on Saturdays shall be the same as on Fridays.

He said: While I present this motion in the form in which it stands in my name, yet it has been represented to me by hon. members on both sides of the House that it is rather short notice to take to-morrow, and also that the following Saturday will precede a public holiday. I am willing to be guided by the feeling of the House in the matter. If it is preferred that Saturday sittings should begin two weeks from to-morrow I am willing to propose the motion in that form. On the other hand, if it is the feeling of the House that we might take to-morrow, and then make any necessary arrangements about next Saturday I am prepared to take that course. Has my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) anything to suggest?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think the sense of the House is that it would be quite impossible to sit to-morrow—I suppose my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) agrees to that. I would say the same about the following Saturday. If the Saturday

sittings were to begin with the first Saturday in July I should have no objection.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Then we will let the motion pass amended accordingly—it will not include to-morrow or the following Saturday.

Motion as amended agreed to.

SPEECH OF MR. L. J. GAUTHIER.

THE PRIME MINISTER DENIES STATEMENTS MADE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed just now to a statement made yesterday by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. L. J. Gauthier), to which Your Honour has alluded. I observe, also, in the speech of the hon. member another statement of somewhat the same character. The first statement to which I wish to allude is this:

> We are engaged in a very serious debate, but permit me to say that I consider this amendment to the amendment to be a farce. It has been engineered, not by the mover and seconder of the motion, but by the Government itself.

Further on he says, referring to the same amendment proposed by the hon. member for Berthier:

> His amendment, being a negative one, would have been ruled out of order if it had not been introduced with the consent of the Government.

I desire to give these statements the most unqualified denial. I neither heard, nor knew anything of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Berthier until I saw it the following morning in the newspapers. Any intention to propose such an amendment was never communicated to me; nor, in so far as I am aware, to any of my colleagues. The Government, from first to last, had absolutely nothing to do with the proposed amendment, and we will oppose it in the most unqualified manner.

PRIVILEGE.

STATEMENT BY MR. BARRETTE.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. BARRETTE (Berthier), (translation): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I found in Hansard, this morning that the honourable member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) had stated yesterday before this House that the Government had inspired the amendment to the amendment which I did propose to the conscription Bill.

I emphatically deny the honourable Prime Minister or any of his colleagues or followers having had anything to do either directly or indirectly with this amendment to the amendment. I am even ready to resign my seat in this House to prove my statement.

I make this denial, not because I am in the least afraid of what may be stated by my honourable friend from St. Hyacinthe, whose speech has stirred up general indignation throughout the country, but because I wish to set the facts in their proper light. I alone stand responsible for this matter. Had the Government wished to play their last card in order to pass their Bill, they would have had a better hand than the honourable members of the Opposition who, for want of something better, did play their white card, on Thursday night, when they called upon my honourable friend from St. Hyacinthe to take part in the debate.

LABOUR STRIKE IN WESTERN COAL MINES.

DIRECTOR OF MINING OPERATIONS TO BE APPOINTED.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): Has the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) any further information to give the House about the coal strike situation in Western Canada?

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): A recommendation has been made by Council for the appointment of a director of coal mining operations in Southern Alberta and the southern part of British Columbia. It has not yet received the approval of His Excellency the Governor General, and until it receives his approval it would not be proper for me to say anything further about it.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): Has the hon. minister any statement that he can bring down? A great deal must have happened in the past of which we do not know anything. We are very much uninformed as to what has happened. If an Order in Council has been passed dealing with the matter it should be brought down. We have such fragmentary information that I think the minister without taking a day to make a debate of it might give us all the data he has or make a consecutive statement in regard to the matter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Order in Council can be brought down if it is desired. That is not the recommendation to His Excellency which was mentioned just now. In addition to what my colleague (Mr. Crothers) has said, I might add that a gentleman has been selected to fill the position of director of coal operations within that district, but as the recommendation for

his appointment has not yet received the approval of His Excellency, nothing more can be said at the moment. If the House should sit to-morrow, I might possibly be able to make an announcement, but I certainly shall be able to do so on Monday.

Mr. KNOWLES: Has any report been made by the hon. gentleman who was commissioner in the matter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He made an oral report to the Minister of Labour and to me.

Mr. KNOWLES: Might we have a resumé of that report communicated to us?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the result is pretty well set forth in the Order in Council which will be brought down. Anything that is desired in addition can be stated. I may say that very considerable progress was made in bringing the operators and employees together and that eventually there was simply one difficulty remaining, which did not seem to be of a very important character. Nevertheless, it was a matter in respect to which neither side would give way and for that reason it became necessary to take the action which will be communicated to the House on Monday in case it should receive the approval of His Excellency the Governor General.

COST OF LIVING IN THE YUKON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. THOMPSON (Yukon): For the information of the House and the Government I would like to read a telegram which I received this morining from Dawson. It is as follows:

Dawson, Y.T., June 21, 1917.
Lt.-Col. Alfred Thompson, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Business men of Dawson met this afternoon; your telegram submitted to them. They request me to send following: "No desperate situation exists here; workmen in Yukon gold thawing plants petitioned for increase of wages or company to supply them provisions at cost for next winter, and many have quit work pending adjustment, but no disorder exists." The facts are that the increased price of living in the case of single men who are in the majority, falls upon the company as men are hired upon the basis of giving wages and board. Excepting the recent advances in flour which seemed necessary to meet local conditions, there has been no advance in price of provisions from last season's prices except as new goods have arrived, prices in such cases being advanced in the ordinary ratio to landed cost. Retail prices of flour, lard, beans, hams, bacon, butter, potatoes and rice as established last year and prevailing here all winter, have been as low, and in some cases lower, than those prevailing in Vancouver this spring. Allegations of Williams' complicity with dealers, absolutely unfounded. Complete stenographic proceedings of meeting at which this propaganda originated are being forwarded by mail.

(Sgd.) J. E. Lilly and Co.
Klondike Thawing Machine Co.
Northern Commercial Co.
Scougale Mercantile Co.
John N. Spence.
E. Schink.
Chas. Jeanneret.
Pacific Cold Storage Co.
British Yukon Navigation Co.
Dawson Hardware Co.
G. N. Williams, Administrator.

This is in answer to the telegram which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) placed before the House.

STATEMENT BY LE CANADA.

HON. T. W. CROTHERS MAKES CORRECTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS: Referring to the speech I made in this House on Wednesday of this week, Le Canada newspaper, published in Montreal, in its issue of yesterday, had this to say:

Hon. Mr. Crothers says that the French Canadians are degenerate and fallen men. It is with this insult to our race that the Minister of Labour ended his speech last night in favour of conscription.

There is no truth in that statement whatever, and nothing I said on that occasion warrants it.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Consideration of the motion of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto, and on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barrette, resumed from Thursday, June 21.

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 ideal, having the same object, 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 people of different origin in this country, we will add to the gratification of our enemies and detract from the comfort of our friends.

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 might 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.

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.

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.

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 should 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.

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 the 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 purpose, 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.

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.

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.

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 to greatly 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.

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 appointed 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.

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 standpoint 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
4 p.m. 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. Further than that, when this war broke out, the Government of Canada had not a French speaking member in it who cared 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 the war to securing recruits in the province of Quebec. After that, Mr. Casgrain was brought into the Government and he was the only one 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?

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 myself 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.

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 Quebec, for they would have had their full quota in the ranks to-day.

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.

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 I have embodied in this motion.

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.

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.

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 declining 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.

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 into 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.

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 propose 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 they have 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 and 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 with 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 predecessor 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 to bring that about.

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 necessaries. 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 was a big surplus of some other commodity.

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 the 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.

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.

With reference to the question of reducing the cost of living, the Government has appointed a fuel controller and a food 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 a Tory member of the Dominion Parliament, to settle a strike and the appointment of an ex-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 ask you, if you are living in a country that sent two men that were Liberals, would you think that was the way to inspire voluntary enlistment? 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 agent of the Standard Oil Company in Canada is the best man he could select to deal with his fellow trust men throughout the Dominion?

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 unwieldly, 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.

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.

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 is 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 will have the effect, directly or indirectly, of assisting in the prosecution of the great struggle in which we are engaged.

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 indication 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 of a referendum and in favour of the Bill.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I trust that my remarks upon this momentous occasion will be, both in tone and in character, in accord with the moderation which has marked the speeches of most of those who have preceded me, and will be in keeping with the importance of the measure now before the House and with the extreme gravity of the conditions which have brought it forth.

This is one of the greatest debates that have ever taken place in this House. Great issues bring forth great speeches, and great speeches are founded upon conviction. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House have during this debate spoken from full hearts the words of sincerity and truth. I think I can understand the wrench that it gives a man to sever the ties of his allegiance to a party with which he has been connected for many years. But we on this side of the House realize that hon. gentlemen opposite, and those on this side who differ from their leaders, are actuated by conviction, and, so far as we are concerned, there is no ignoble satisfaction at seeing hon. gentlemen opposite detach themselves, on an issue such as this, from the ranks of that party to which for so many years they have been connected. While, as I say, I shall emulate the moderation of most of those who have spoken in this debate, I shall not follow the example of my hon. friend (Mr. Graham). He commenced by pointing out the futility of recrimination, and, possibly unconsciously to himself, because he is a politician who has for many years fought the battles of party, he indulged in not a little of that recrimination which he deprecated at the beginning of his remarks. He referred to the contest of 1911, and the action of Nationalist members upon the platform in Quebec. Is argument of that kind likely to advance the issue in this House? Should I add to the information of this House or gain any weight in the persuasiveness of my remarks if I harked back to an earlier date and quoted the leader of the Opposition upon many occasions on which he uttered sentiments to which he subscribed then, but to which he might or might not subscribe now, but which, I sub-

mit, would not be relevant to the consideration of this issue?

I purpose, therefore, confining myself to the question, namely, the Military Service Bill, which is now before the House. I shall touch lightly upon some of the matters referred to by my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) with regard to the organization and mobilization of the resources of this country; but it seems to me that those matters, while I admit they are somewhat, though remotely, relevant to this discussion, might be better dealt with on another and different occasion when some subject other than this Bill, which has evoked so much feeling, which is of so much importance, is before the House for consideration.

We are considering the necessity and the principle of compulsory military service in Canada. Hitherto the effort of Canada has been put forward under the voluntary system of enlistment. The effort which Canada has put forth under that system has been wonderful; it has been such as to command the admiration of the world, and I believe it will for all time stand to the credit, the renown, the honour and the glory of Canada, that by voluntary effort she has been able to do what she has done. I do not regard the effort which Canada has put forth under the voluntary system as having been a failure; I say, on the contrary, that that effort was a magnificent success. Unfair and unjust it was, as enlistment under the voluntary system always is unjust and unfair, because the burden is cast upon the most patriotic in the community; but unsuccessful, it was not; it was a wonderful success. My hon. friend has criticised the Government for not organizing the country better in the carrying out of the voluntary system; he says that recruiting has been carried on principally by civilians. Does that detract in any way from the glory of the achievement? The Government takes the initiative in matters of this kind, and to the extent that it can secure the assistance and sympathy of citizens, to that extent will the effort the more succeed; and I desire to pay this tribute to the ex-Minister of Militia.

5 p.m.

The energy which he put forth and the enthusiasm which he displayed at the outset of the war had much to do with the magnificent results accomplished by Canada under the voluntary enlistment system. It has been found in all States, no matter how patriotic they may be, that there comes a time, if they are engaged in a life and death struggle, when the voluntary system fails, and when the State must, by compulsory service, enlist the manhood of the country if the State is to be saved. That happened in England, the Mother Country of individual and constitutional freedom? The voluntary system broke down there, and in order that the nation might be saved, resort was had to the compulsory system. Great-hearted Abraham Lincoln, as my right hon. friend who is a great admirer of his character knows, had to resort to the draft in order that the Union might be saved in the War of Secession, and to-day the United States, the greatest of the republican communities of the world, after having the benefit of the experience of other nations during the past three years, has resorted to the selective draft, and no less than 10,000,000 of her sons have come forward and enrolled. That is the position.

Canada's effort under the voluntary enlistment plan was a wonderful success, but voluntary enlistment has run its course, and we are now considering a system of compulsory military service which will organize and mobilize selectively the manhood of this country in order that we may continue to play our part in the prosecution of this war. The fact is that the world and its civilization cannot be saved, in this great crisis, by the voluntary system as against Germany organized under the Prussian military system. Compulsory military service has been adopted in France, the United States, Great Britain, and New Zealand, and I believe it will in time be adopted in Australia. We have reached the stage in Canada to-day when, if we are to continue to play our part in this war, if we are to continue to take our share in the national defence, and above all, if we are to observe our obligations of honour to the men who have gone and who represent us at the front, we must resort to compulsory military service; we must adopt this Bill.

This war is not like other wars in history. In the vastness of its scale, in its issues the most vital to humanity, in its menace the most dread to civilization, this war is different from all other wars, and so far as we can judge it is not near its conclusion. We have not even reached the crisis of this war. Three years of war behind us! How many years of war before us? The situation is of the gravest kind and the question before us is: Shall Canada's efforts slacken; shall we continue to put forth our utmost strength, or shall we quit? From men of the blood of both races in

this House I think there can only be one answer. Canada must continue to put forth the utmost of her effort. And for how long? Until this war is determined in our favour, until the Hohenzollerns are utterly vanquished. It is more than a war of nations, it is a war of conflicting ideals, and it will go on until one set of ideals is firmly established and the other utterly uprooted and overthrown. There can be no truce, there can be no peace, until the issue is victory for the Allies, and for Canada as one of the Allies. The war must go on; I think that is common ground for both sides of the House.

Let us not think this war is nearly won. Opposed to us is the greatest foe that ever confronted humanity, Germany, with her 70,000,000 of people; Austria with 50,000,000, Turkey with 30,000,000, occupying together a compact territory with interior lines of communication. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister said upon his return from Great Britain that the Central Empires had 1,000,000 more men in the field this spring than they had last spring. Their line still extends from the North Sea to the confines of Switzerland; there is still a line of a thousand miles between the Central Empires and Russia. We read of great battles in which tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of men fall; we gain a mile or two miles or three miles, but the fact remains that the line on the Western front and the line on the Eastern front are substantially where they were a year ago. I say substantially, but I am the first to say that great progress has been made considering the conditions of modern warfare, for modern warfare is a warfare of attrition. It is a wearing-down process; the killing of more men on one side than on the other; the breaking down of morale and the exhausting of resources; that is modern warfare. But we have still before us the greatest enemy that ever confronted mankind, organized in every department of its national life, grim, determined that no effort shall be spared, that all power shall be put forth in order that they may impose their will upon humanity, that they may Germanize the world. There is as much need, nay, there is more need for great effort to-day than there was at the outset, or at any time since the war began. From that German menace no nation, I care not how remote it may be, is free. The smallest nation or colony separated from Europe by thousands of leagues of sea is subject to the menace of German agression.

[Sir Thomas White.]

It has been put forward in this House that Canada is in no danger of an invasion. If that is so, to what is it due? Is it not due to the British fleet and to those men of French and British blood, who, month in and month out, have withstood the hosts of Germany in France and Flanders? Is it not due to the Canadians and New Zealanders and the others of our Allies who have met the enemy in the gates? If there is no danger of invasion, if there has been no such danger to Canada, it is only because we have been protected by the British fleet and by our Allies and our own heroes who have withstood the Hun on the battlefields of Europe.

Let me ask another question, and I am discussing this phase of the matter because it has been put forward that Canada should not send her forces outside this country unless to repel apprehended invasion. Supposing the Germans had taken Paris in their first rush, as they intended; supposing the British fleet had been defeated—if one can imagine such a thing—and that the Germans had reached London. Supposing they had been in a position to compel capitulation on the part of France and Great Britain. What would have happened to this country? Without landing a man upon these shores, the enemy could have compelled the cession of Canada. I say that it is within the plans of the German autocracy, within the world plans of German militarism, if not now, at a later date, to break up the British Empire and enter into and possess it. All their actions for years past have been in accordance with that view. If, as they hoped, they had struck down Great Britain, taken London, and compelled the payment of an enormous indemnity, why should they not seek to compel the cession of the different parts of the British Empire? It is the plainest and most obvious fact that Canada, fighting in France and Flanders, is fighting absolutely for the safety of Canada herself. No danger of invasion to Canada in a world war cataclysm such as this? Shall we take the position that we should not send our troops out of Canada, but allow the British fleet and our Allies to save us? Shall we take the position that we should not send our forces to help them, because constitutionally our forces should not be sent outside the Dominion unless to repel threatened invasion?

Could this country take that position? The defence of Canada! Where should that defence be conducted? That depends upon

circumstances; it might in some wars be strategically advantageous to defend Canada at the border, it might in others be strategically advantageous to defend Canada thousands of miles away, as we are doing it to-day. That is so plain, so obvious, to me that I marvel that any one should suggest that Canada's forces while fighting abroad are not fighting against the invasion of the sovereignty and autonomy of Canada.

The question has been raised whether it is constitutional for Canada to send forth her forces to defend herself in a place where she can best be defended—which, I say, is in France and Flanders. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is the first law of nations that they should protect themselves; it is the first duty of a government to its people to take any steps that may be necessary in defence of that people. But, it is said, we are widening the compulsion of the Militia Act. I agree entirely with those who have argued that we are not adopting any degree of compulsion that is not provided for in the legislation now on the statute-book. But it would not trouble me in the least degree if we were widening that compulsion. The first duty of this Government is to save the nation, to take such military steps as may be necessary to put the nation beyond danger from invasion in the war which threatens Canada and threatens the Empire. And I am confident that I speak for most of the members of this House when I say that the people of this country attach some importance to the British Empire and their connection with it—we are not only fighting for Canada, but fighting to maintain the integrity of the Empire which is threatened by German aggression. So that so far as the Militia Act is concerned, it does not concern me, and I believe it should not concern this House, whether it is narrower in its provisions than this Bill or not; the question before us is, from the standpoint of national safety, are we going to continue the war? I believe that the people of this country are determined to continue this war. For how long? Until, as I have said, it is won, and the Hohenzollern is overthrown.

It is said, or at least implied, that enough has been done, that the situation is such that further help on the part of Canada is not necessary. I wish I could say that that is true. I have pointed out that but little progress has been made upon that Western front, notwithstanding the outpouring of blood and of munitions. To-day, we are confronted with as serious a situation as at any time since the outbreak of the war, except that, I believe, the Allies have now the offensive in the sense which we have not had it before. But we must remember, as pointed out by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) that the effort of Russia has slackened. I hope that this condition will not continue. I believe that the welfare of Russia lies with the Allies, and that the people of Russia, if properly led, will continue the great effort which they made from the outbreak of the war. I hope and pray that that may be so. But the fact is that the Russian offensive has slackened and that the German troops which are engaged upon that Eastern front are to-day in action on the Western front. And so the cry goes up for men, and more men.

That brings me to another point which has been dwelt upon in this House and which cannot be dwelt upon too much—the duty that we owe to those noble sons of Canada who have gone forward and are at the front to-day. Mr. Speaker, could Canada, or could any of Canada's citizens, consider seriously for a moment the desertion or abandonment of those men at the front? We have four divisions there; I visited them last November. I talked with officers going into their dugouts for the night. It was at a time when there had been great wastage in the ranks. There were men of ours in England whose training was not complete, and every effort was being made to hurry them forward to repair the casualties at the front. Officer after officer said to me: I am going into the trenches to-night with seven hundred men where I ought to have a thousand men. I talked to both officers and men, and let me tell this House that if there is one thing which more than any other annoys the men at the front it is to read the headings in Canadian newspapers that are sent them that the war is going so well that it may soon be over. I tell this House that these men look back earnestly to this country for more and more reinforcements of their ranks. These men are daily walking hand in hand with death; the most earnest, the most noble band of men I have ever seen. I came away with a lump in my throat and with a great sense of my own unworthiness. I wish that every man in this House, French or English, could go to that front and see what these men are doing there. If that could be, I believe there would be no doubt as to how every man would vote upon this Bill. Canada, for her own honour and apart from

the question of her own safety and the safety of the British Empire, must not desert these men at the front. We are on the eve of the greatest battles in the history of the world. Every effort will be put forth by the great nations engaged in this war to bring about a decision. Why? Because the wastage is so great. It will be the strategy of commanders to press the war. This is why I say that we are on the eve of the greatest battles in the history of the world. There will be casualties, unfortunately, among the Canadians. How are we going to fill the gaps; how are we going to reinforce the ranks? The voluntary system has broken down; we must do what other nations have done, we must resort to compulsory military service. I believe that the people of Canada will say that if we desert these men at the front, God will desert this country. What do I mean by that? I mean that our moral fibre would deteriorate, that our national character would be broken, that in the eyes of the world and in the eyes of ourselves, we should appear as not having the manhood essential to a great nation.

Mr. Speaker, in what I have to say I would not wound the feelings of any man or woman in this country. I had hoped that there might be unity respecting this Bill and I still hope that when this Bill is passed and becomes law, there will be unity on both sides of this House in urging this country and all parts of it to respect that law. We talk about the necessity for food, for munitions, for supplies, and all these things are necessary; but if the people of Great Britain, of the United States and Canada devoted themselves to the production of food, munitions and supplies, who would hold the battle line at the front? The German is there, the German infantry, the German artillery and they can only be defeated by human valour, by the men behind the lines who launch the fire of the artillery and the men in the trenches who scale the parapet, charge with bayonet and hand grenade and take the trenches of the Hun. You cannot win this war by encouraging agriculture, although that is necessary; you cannot win this war by mobilizing your railways, although that is necessary; the decision is to be got by human valour at the front and in no other way, although these other things are ancillary.

I will say just one more word about the volunteer system because the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) passed some strictures upon the Government in connection with its organization. The volunteer system was not only unjust but it was illogical and in many ways it impeded the nation in putting forth its best effort in carrying on the war. Reference was made to myself and to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister as retarding recruiting. I do not believe that the members of this House; I do not believe that the people of this country, realize the burdens which devolve upon the ministers of the Government in time of war. Day and night, Sunday and Saturday, practically every week, there is the burden and the responsibility of the war. I mention that, not because we deserve any sympathy because our sacrifices and toil are as nothing compared with the sacrifices by the men who have gone to the front, and by the fathers, mothers and wives who have sent them forth. But notwithstanding the duties which have devolved upon us, notwithstanding the responsibilities with which we have been burdened, the members of this Government have done what they could within the limits of their physical powers to promote recruiting. The Prime Minister went from the Atlantic to the Pacific upon his return last fall appealing to large audiences throughout this country in a last effort to stimulate recruiting. For myself, I have spoken upon scores of platforms in Ontario, at Montreal, and at Halifax, in the interests of recruiting. Everything was done that could have been by the Government. All aid was afforded that was asked for by the Government and no nobler work was ever done by the devoted band of men and women who gave their time, thought and energy to the promotion of recruiting. I had hoped for the sake of unity, because I knew that this question would create division, that Canada, by the voluntary system, would have been able to carry on the war to the end which we all desire—victory. But it became apparent that the voluntary system was no longer effective. That was admitted by those men and women in this country who had devoted themselves to the work. It has been referred to by hon. members on both sides of this House who have given themselves day and night in aiding recruiting in their constituencies and elsewhere. The recruiting system broke down. The Government, for the safety of Canada and the Empire, and also for the honour of Canada, and in recognition of its obligation towards those men who have gone forward, brought down this Bill providing for compulsory military service. We all learn as this war progresses. War is a terrible realist; it brings you face to face with reality. It is a great discloser, a great revealer; it reveals much

even to men who have been closest to the prosecution of this war. I believe that the bringing down of this compulsory military service Bill will do more to stimulate the national activities of Canada in all departments of life towards the prosecution of the war than anything that has happened before in the history of the war. Take the debates in this House; I have never heard such debates. I do not think that any man in this House has ever heard such speeches —speeches from the heart, sincere, a debate in which every man stands up and expresses his conviction to his fellow members in the desire to reach a right solution of this question and to determine what is the duty of Canada at this great crisis in our affairs. I respect the views that any of my fellow members put forward in this House. This is no time for partisanship; it is no time for antagonism. Sincerely and seriously we must consider the most important measure that, I think, was ever laid before this House and the effort on the part of the Government to meet a great national crisis. I have no fault to find with those who differ from me

But I have spoken because I desire, as others have done, to express my thoughts and convictions upon this question. I say that this country is in honour bound—no other course is open to us—to take such measures as will insure the continued and necessary reinforcement of our men at the front, and I believe that this debate will have great weight, in all parts of this community, in persuading people to that view. This is one of the great functions of Parliament. A debate of a week on a subject of this kind will do more to educate, enlighten and clarify public opinion than all the action that could be taken by individual members of the Government for a year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps my hon. friend's object will be obtained in that way, and he may not want to pass a Bill.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I desire to say that this Bill must be passed by this Parliament. I believe that that is the will of the people of Canada. I believe that this Government can take no other course than that which we are now taking, if, in the words of one of the greatest orators of the world, we are to have any regard for our past, or for our glory, or for the days that are to come.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not leave it as it is?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will come to that in a moment. This Bill will do more, not only to give us reinforcements for the men at the front, which is its immediate object, but to stir the moral enthusiasm of this people, to mobilize, and to organize the people of this country for war, than anything that has yet happened. I say the speeches in this House are not like the speeches delivered when we were discussing worn-out political formulas a little time ago. Men are speaking words of sincerity and truth from their hearts. That is one good result this debate has had. Let us rid this discussion of old worn-out issues, which are dead and gone. The thought of this world will never be the same,—the structure of society will never be the same again. This measure will not only give needed reinforcements, it will stimulate the people of this country, it will educate them on the great issues of the war, in a way they have never been educated before. No democracy, Mr. Speaker, ever puts forth its greatest effort until the religious sentiment of democracy is enlisted. My hon. friend smiles. Take the war of the Secession in the United States. Let my hon. friend read the second inaugural of Abraham Lincoln. Let him read Julia Ward Howe's "Battle Hymn of the Republic"—

> Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord. He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored.

The literature and poetry of that period breathes with religious fervour. You never get the strength of a democracy until, in addition to its material effort, there is put forth its spiritual effort. There must be self-sacrifice. There must be self-denial. There must be the mobilization of the spiritual energies of the nation. This Bill will do much to bring that about, because, if you are going to say to one man: You must offer up your life, men will realize, as never before, what sacrifice means, and will be prepared to support the Government in such action as may be necessary to bring the whole power of the nation to bear upon the problem of the prosecution of the war. This Bill will accomplish all these things.

Referring to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), I am sorry I have to deal with matters which are only remotely relevant to the Bill, but which were put forward by him and seem to require some answer on my part. But my answer will be brief. I am

glad the hon. gentleman from South Renfrew made it clear this afternoon, with regard to the expression "conscription of wealth," which has been used a good deal by the newspapers of this country, since his bringing forward of the resolution which he read that he had not in mind conscription of capital. I may say to the House, and I would like to say to the press, but not for publication, that the use of the phrase "conscription of wealth" is leading to certain disturbing conditions in some parts of the community. I think it would be well, not to make use of a phrase which is not understood in its literal sense in this House, but to which some people outside may attach a meaning it is not intended to bear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Make it "contribution by wealth."

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) talked about equality of sacrifice, and I am glad he made it clear that there is no equality of sacrifice, and there can be no equality of sacrifice between the case of a man who gives his son and a man who writes a cheque for taxes. The two subjects should not be dealt with at the same time. They are separate and distinct. Mobilization of man-power, in order to reinforce our troops at the front, is one thing. Taxation for the purpose of finding funds for the prosecution of the war is another, and very different matter. It is perfectly proper for any member of this House to say to me on a proper occasion, say on the Budget debate, or in Supply, "you are not raising sufficient money by taxation; you are raising too much by loan." That is a fair argument, when we are dealing with the subject of finance, but it is not a pertinent argument, I submit, in this debate. It is not relevant, because you are comparing things which are essentially different, when you say that, if there is conscription of man-power, there must be also conscription of wealth. I think, however, that, when the people of the community are in the condition that they are in to-day, under strain, stress and affliction, a good effect is produced if they realize that others, who may not be sending sons or husbands to the front, at all events are contributing, or are made to contribute, of their substance to the prosecution of the war. I ask this House to bear this also in mind: besides giving due attention to the providing of money by loans and by taxation for the prosecution of the war, the Minister of Finance must not lose sight of the fact that if he attempts too much, he will defeat his own purpose. In other words, taxation must be wisely imposed. Men who are reputed to be wealthy may have no ready cash. Let us say that they are engaged in a great industry which employs thousands of men; shall the state seize any portion of the capital invested in that industry? The state cannot pay its debts in kind; it must pay in cash. The financing of a war must be carried on by drawing from the liquid funds of the nation—from that and the new wealth, so to speak, created during the war; otherwise essential industry is likely to suffer. The Minister of Finance, therefore must be sagacious in his imposition of taxation, or he may defeat the very purpose, laudable though it may be, that he has in view.

The member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) said that what he really had in mind was an income tax. There is a good deal to be said for an income tax. It is a fair form of taxation, because it does not take away from a man what he really needs. But it must be borne in mind that if you have too severe an income tax, you do impair the liquid capital of the community which is available for loans and for the purposes of banking and commerce. Canada has never lacked money since this war began. We speak of the man behind the gun, but, so far as Canada is concerned, the dollar has always been behind the man—and that is the position to-day. There has been abundance of money to send our men forward and to maintain them at the front, and to finance Great Britain in her purchase of needed munitions and supplies in Canada. All those moneys have been found by the Government. It is open to hon. gentlemen opposite to say to me: you have not raised as much as you should by taxation; you should have raised more by taxation and less by loans. That would be a fair and pertinent argument to put forward—though I would controvert it—but not in connection with this Bill. Can you weigh the imponderable? Can you put a human life on one scale and a million dollars on the other? The measure of taxation which I brought down to this House, and which was objected to by the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) as being too severe, was one of the stiffest measures of taxation ever brought down in any country. The member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) the other night put on Hansard some figures as to the amount contributed by the largest taxpayers. I stated that if the war went on we should prob-

bably have an income tax. I will not spare the people from taxation, if taxation is necessary in order to win the war. At the outset I taxed the financial institutions; I imposed special war taxation. By the end of this fiscal year we shall have raised nearly $200,000,000 by special war taxation. But in our direct taxation I have resorted chiefly to those who have derived advantage from the war. We said to them: if you have made abnormal profits through war conditions, you must give a large proportion of them to the State. I submit that that was an absolutely sound course. Such taxation is much fairer than an income tax, especially in Canada, for this reason: in Ontario, let us say, you may have a tax upon incomes by the municipality, a tax upon incomes by the province and a similar tax imposed by the Federal authorities. Another thing that I have always tried to keep in mind is this: the war will be over some day. This country has been inviting people to come into it from all parts of the world—from the United States and from Europe. When men are invited to come into a country they naturally ask, what are the conditions in that country? Any Minister of Finance who is considering a taxation scheme in Canada must have regard also to taxation in the United States. If your taxation is too severe, it will have the effect of driving some men out of the country and preventing others from coming in. That argument was submitted to me in connection with the excess business profits tax and there is something to be said for it. It is true that in war time it may be necessary to raise money to meet the needs of the war, even though immigration or capital may temporarily cease to flow into the country. I am not rejecting an income tax. This war has gone on much longer than any of us ever thought. We have taken, step by step, measures necessary to find money with which to back the men at the front. We will continue to take those steps, to issue loans, to impose taxation, as severe as may be necessary in order that our troops may have financial backing and support. This Government may be depended upon to bring in such measures of taxation as may be necessary to accomplish that end. An hon. gentleman suggested the other day that I was not taxing wealth sufficiently, and that there was a motive behind my action in that regard. I can tell that hon. gentleman that I have made many enemies, through no fault of my own, on account of the severe taxation which has been imposed. But that is absolutely of no consequence. We will take whatever measures are necessary, whether by income tax, succession duty tax, a tax upon real estate, or otherwise, in order that we may win this war. But I qualify that to this extent: taxation should not be imposed for the purpose of punishing anybody. Taxation should be wisely imposed, and only to the extent necessary. Good judgment is required as to the taxation which a nation should be asked to stand during war time. Having regard to the high cost of living in Canada and other places, you must be very careful in coming to a decision concerning the imposition of an income tax upon people of moderate incomes.

Let me tell the House what has brought about the agitation with regard to the so-called conscription of wealth. The record of this country since the beginning of the war has been wonderful, not only in respect of the number of men who have gone forward, offering their lives, if necessary, for their country; but in respect also of the amounts of money liberally subscribed to the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross and other funds. One of the glories of this country will be its voluntary effort in support of those funds. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) said the other day that $40,000,000 had been raised or pledged in connection with those funds. Let us not overlook that; but unfortunately, in every community, there are one or two or three or more men who are rich and who are close and who have not contributed to those funds, and the people of this country feel that they should be made to contribute. If I can make them contribute, I will do so. I am not sure that it would not be well, in connection with an income tax, if we bring one down, to provide that a man should be exempted to the extent that he has contributed to the Patriotic and the Red Cross Funds, because, if you impose too severe taxation, you will tend to stop—I do not say you will stop—the voluntary flow of funds for those great purposes, and it is not only the money that is valuable, but the good will. The heart that is behind the offering to those funds is of priceless advantage to the people of Canada in the prosecution of this war.

I shall not speak upon the referendum —the expedient put forward by the leader of the Opposition, except to say that I agree with the arguments which have been put forth by those on his own side against the course which he has suggested. I will not

say a referendum is unconstitutional, but I do not believe that the abstract question—are you or are you not in favour of conscription?—will get a fair decision on the part of the people of this country on this most momentous question. The public, as has been said by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) requires leadership. You could not get the people of this country properly to pronounce upon that question if submitted by referendum unless you have practically the equivalent of a general election in which men would discuss the issue and speak out of their hearts to the hearts of the people. There would have to be the tumult and excitement of a general election which is greatly to be deprecated at this time. There is one rule for individuals, one rule for Governments, and the Government that adopts that rule, like the individual that adopts that rule, will always be on safe ground. What is the rule? To do the right thing, the noble thing, the patriotic thing. What is the right thing, and the noble thing and the patriotic thing at this time? To take such measures as may be necessary to prosecute this war to a victorious conclusion, and to support those gallant men of ours, our noblest and our best, who to-day are fighting for you and for me on the battlefields of Europe. They are fighting just as much in the defence of Canada as if they were fighting on the shores of Nova Scotia or along the banks of the St. Lawrence.

I realize that there is a sharp cleavage of opinion upon this question, and I have endeavoured to discuss it in such a fashion as to wound no man's feelings. I am sure the House will give me credit when I say that we members respect each other's convictions. While we differ sharply upon questions of national importance, we yet respect each other and we speak what we have to say without heat, without hostility, without enmity. Looking at this matter from the standpoint of the statesman, I ask: What of the future? It has been pointed out and emphasized here that there is a cleavage of opinion in this country. My opinion is that this debate in this House may go a long way towards assisting the carrying out of this measure, because I believe one of the functions of Parliament, in debating great questions like this, is to inform the public, to persuade them of the expediency of a certain course. This Bill will pass into law. In my administrative position, and in any debates in which I have taken part in this House, I have treated all members on both sides of the House, no matter of what nationality, only as Canadians; I do not know them as French or English; they are my fellow-Canadians. For 200 years or more ourselves and our fathers and our forefathers have lived together in this country. There have been differences of opinion; sometimes there has been discord; once there was civil war, rebellion; but on the whole we have got on fairly well together. We have been engaged in the great work of reducing half a continent to the use of civilization. We respect each other in this House, and I believe the different sections of this country respect each other, although they have their differences. I believe the right thing to do is to pass this Bill. I believe compulsory military service is necessary in this country. How can we secure practical union in support of this measure? We shall not get it by taunting each other, by political recrimination, by reviving old differences of opinion; but if hon. members on both sides of the House, the leaders, the front-benchers and all other members, after the debate is over, would join in asking the people of this country to respect the obligation of this measure and to assist the Government in putting it into effect and carrying it out, that would make for unity in this country, and I believe that could be done. This Bill must be enacted into law because it is necessary for the national safety and honour that it should be enacted into law. Let us all, French and English, in this House and in this country, accept this Bill as being a necessary measure, having regard to the grave national conditions which beset us, and in that way let us have unity; let us present the appearance of unity to the world. I do not believe insuperable difficulties would present themselves if we all address ourselves to the matter, and I leave that thought for the consideration of this House.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THE TORONTO, HAMILTON & BUFFALO RAILWAY.

House in Committee—Mr. Blain in the Chair—on Bill No. 39, respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway.—Mr. T. J. Stewart.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: I beg to move that clauses 1 and 2 be struck out of the Bill,

and that the Bill be then reported and given its third reading.

Mr. MURPHY: Explain.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: This Bill has reference to an agreement made between the town of Dundas and the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway Company in regard to the handling of freight by the electric road. Dundas is situated in a valley and as the steam roads do not go in there, the Hamilton & Dundas Street Railway Company entered into an agreement with the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company to handle the freight over the electric road. There was a clause in the agreement that if the town of Dundas saw fit to pass a bylaw extending the charter for 29 years, making a total of 50 years, and ratification sought from the Ontario Legislature. The town of Dundas passed the bylaw and got special legislation by the Ontario Legislature ratifying the agreement. The ratification could not apply to the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company as they were under Dominion charter. The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Company are now asking the Dominion Government to place them in the same position as the town of Dundas. The town of Dundas say "No, we are not going to allow that." They take the ground that the freight cars were allowed to remain in front of the people's doors on the streets of Dundas, which is most unfair; but the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Company has no control whatever over the streets. Wishing to be fair, however, we agreed to spend $15,000 on a new switching, ground and freight lines. Then they took the objection that the smoke was a nuisance, and that we would have to handle the freight by electric power. That meant buying two motors at a cost of $80,000. The interest on that would be $4,800 and the total earnings of the road are only $5,400 a year. The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Company therefore could not see their way to handling the freight by electric power at that enormous cost. We do not think a little town like Dundas with only 5,000 people had any right to ask for something no other place in the Dominion had got. We agreed, however, to having legislation put through placing us under the Dominion Railway Board. That apparently did not satisfy them. The Railway Committee amended the Bill to read 5 years instead of 29. To my mind the committee could do only one of two things: either grant the 29 years, or say: No, they had no right whatever to make the agreement without all parties being represented at the meeting. We have made up our minds that if the town of Dundas will not grant us what we think we are entitled to, we will withdraw these two clauses and let the town handle the freight as it sees fit.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: This Bill was thoroughly discussed before the Railway Committee, representatives being present from the town of Dundas and the surrounding district. I am sorry the hon. member for Wentworth, who is particularly interested in this Bill, is not present. I am sure he would take serious objection to the Bill being amended in this way. Many of us who were present at the meetings of the Railway Committee are strongly opposed to the wishes of the railway representatives, who are simply trying to get their charter, which has now only one year to run, extended for 29 years. Has the hon. member for Hamilton given notice of this amendment?

Mr. T. J. STEWART: I am acting on the advice of the Law Clerk of the House. I am given to understand that the committee had no right to amend the Bill for five years; they should either have made it 29 years or refused. We certainly do not intend to accept the Bill as amended. Therefore, why should there be any objection to allowing us to withdraw these two clauses? We have some rights in the matter. I think we have been treated most unfairly. We are simply asking for what the town of Dundas took for themselves, and I think we should get it. I have stated the facts exactly as they are, and I now ask the committee to allow me to withdraw clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill. That will only leave in the Bill clauses 5 and 6. Clause 5 refers to freight arrangements with the Michigan Central Railroad Company, the Canada Southern Railway Company, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Clause 6 empowers the company to hold stock in a steamboat company. These two clauses have already been passed by the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM: Probably we should make better progress if we allowed the Bill to stand until the hon. member for Wentworth was present.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: He knows I am proposing to withdraw these two clauses; we have talked it over.

Mr. GRAHAM: But he is not here.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: Is it not customary, Mr. Chairman, that notice be given of an amendment of this kind?

The CHAIRMAN: As the hon. member has appealed to me, notice will have to be given, as this amendment is a very important one.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill No. 86, respecting the Western Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Schaffner.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 85, to incorporate the Canadian Council of the Girl Guides Association.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 87, respecting the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 90, respecting the Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Sir Robert Borden for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and of the amendments thereto, resumed.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Bill before the House, I think I fully appreciate the importance of the departure we are proposing to take in reference to the enlistment of soldiers. My hon. friend (Mr. Graham), who preceded me, declared that he was not going to recriminate or criticise. For my part, I am going to take the liberty of offering some criticism, and if that is called recrimination, then I am going to recriminate.

In the first place, I do not think that the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), in introducing this Bill gave us as ample information as he might have given. For instance, he might have told us whether Great Britain had required of this country men rather than more production. We have seen a great deal in the newspapers on the subject of production, and the other day we had the report from the recently-appointed food controller of England that it was absolutely necessary to have production from this country and from the United States to supply Great Britain. Had the Prime Minister told us how much production on our part Great Britain needed, we should have had a better idea of how many men could be spared from this country. I quite understand that it would not have been possible for Great Britain to tell us how many men they would like us to send, for the reason that, I suppose, this will depend entirely upon the progress of the war. On that point I doubt that the Prime Minister could have given us much more information than he did. But the right hon. gentleman can easily see that the quantity of food that can be produced in this country for use in Great Britain will depend very largely on how many men we send to the front. It must be borne in mind that we are a very sparse population. I do not agree with those who say that voluntary enlistment has failed. It may have fallen short of the number of men required, but in my judgment it has certainly not failed. According to the last return there have been 421,767 enlistments in this country. To enlist this number in a country with a population of about 7,500,000, spread over an area about 3,000 miles long and perhaps 1,000 miles broad, besides keeping up agriculture and other industries, as well as the professions of the country, I think is doing wonderfully well; it says a great deal for the patriotism of the people of Canada.

Now, so far as the voluntary enlistment can be said to have failed, I cannot but blame the Government very greatly for that state of affairs. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) pointed out some of the mistakes that had been made by the Government. He referred to the discussion reported in the press as having taken place between the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) and the other members of the Government on the necessity or otherwise of continuing enlistment, and pointed out that this had had a bad effect. But that which had the worst effect in Ontario, at any rate in my judgment, was that the press was full of rumours of over expenditure, graft and corruption. There were the charges made here in the House and the investigations that followed. There was a feeling abroad, which was reflected in the newspapers, that the Government was spending quite unnecessarily enormous sums of money.

In some sections of the country the Government enlisted men and kept them for months in this country after which they were discharged as medically unfit. A great many others were taken over to England and there discharged as medically unfit. The ordinary man, the farmer and the working man, understands the expense that is incurred in a proceeding of that kind. The people got discouraged with the general condition of the country resulting largely from the fact that the Government

was practically doing nothing. There is no doubt that my hon. friend from South Renfrew was correct when he said that the Government did not take an active part in the enlistment campaign that was going on throughout the country. In a great many instances they sent big, husky fellows, captains, majors or something of that kind, drawing anywhere from $6 to $10 a day, around telling the boys in the towns and the country that they should enlist and go to the front.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Were not these men who were taking part in recruiting, men who had returned wounded from the front? I could give the hon. gentleman several names of recruiting officers who had been wounded at the front.

Mr. NESBITT: I was just coming to that if my hon. friend had not got impatient. There were many men who never went to the front, who never saw the front and who never intended going to the front, big, husky fellows drawing large salaries, and these very officers are trying to enlist men at the present time. Would not a wounded returned soldier be the right man to go around and address recruiting meetings? A man standing on the platform who had been at the front and had been wounded could say: Go and do as I have done. I am sure he would have a great deal more influence on the audience than the fellow who has never been at the front, who is within the age, who is perfectly capable of going to the front, who is drawing a salary as captain or major, dictating to the men down below him in the audience and telling them that they should go to the front? Naturally, they say: "Why does he not go instead of telling us to go?" In many other ways this Government discouraged voluntary enlistment. But the main discouragement was the appearance in the press of reports of the enormous and unnecessary expenditures which have been carried on in connection with the war and enlistment. The people, I confess, thoughout Ontario at any rate, were very patriotic and loyal; they subscribed an enormous amount of money for carrying on the war. Another thing that, in my judgment, influenced voluntary enlistment was that there was a campaign carried on for munition workers. A great many men said that it was just as necessary to have munition workers as it was to have men at the front. I know that the papers were filled with that sort of talk. Was there ever anything more preposterous, more absolutely absurd, than to put it abroad that it was just as necessary to have men making munitions in this country as it was to have men going to the front to fight our battles? Munition workers got from $2.50 to $8 a day, while a man for going to the front was paid $1.10, with a certain amount for field allowances, clothes and his separation allowance. You cannot possibly figure that up to be more than $2.25 a day, and he was expected to risk his life. Yet the munition worker was getting anywhere from $2.50 to $8 a day, and a great many people said that it was just as patriotic to make munitions as it was to go to the front. I leave it to any man here to say if that was not an absurd statement to be put through the length and breadth of this country and to be uttered from public platforms. There was an advertising campaign carried on in the principal newspapers in Toronto for munition workers as if the men making munitions could not advertise for their men and could not get men just as well as any Government official that the Lord ever produced.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does he produce them?

Mr. NESBITT: Were they not just as capable of getting their own men as were the Government? I understand that $60,000 was paid in connection with this munition workers' campaign. I know that in making that statement I am speaking within the mark, because I know something about it. That also hurt voluntary enlistment, because people became disgusted with the way in which the money of this country was being spent for so-called assistance in the war when it was not for assistance in the war.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Has the hon. gentleman ever asked a question in this House, or has a minister ever made the statement that the hon. gentleman has just made, that $60,000 of the Dominion's money had been spent in advertising for workers for munition factories? That is the statement that the hon. gentleman made, and I challenge the truth or correctness of it.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not care what my hon. friend challenges. I am telling him the truth. I imagine I can get as many people to believe me as the hon. gentleman can get to believe him.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: I asked the hon. gentleman if he had ever asked the question in this House, or has it ever been asked? As a test of the bona fides and good faith

of the hon. gentleman, let him ask the question now and see what truth there is in the statement.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend beside me says there is a return to that effect, but I do not care a cent whether there is or not; I know. I do not care whether they bring down a return or not, and it is not necessary to ask the question in the House, because I know it myself.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: That was for your own friend, the Ross rifle.

Mr. NESBITT: I have nothing to do with the Ross rifle. My hon. friend cannot chuck the Ross rifle at me, because I had nothing to do with it. I have given some of the reasons why voluntary enlistment has stopped to a certain extent. But, last month there were over 7,200 men enlisted, and if you will take the return which was brought down in this House very recently you will notice that for the last three months more men enlisted than there was wastage at the front.

Mr. ARTHURS: Has the hon. gentleman any information as to how many of those men who enlisted last month were for the infantry, or the fighting line?

Mr. NESBITT: No, but I might tell my hon. friend that when they do enlist for one branch they are sometimes sent to another branch when they get to England, so that it will be pretty hard to tell what they are in now. I know men who enlisted in the artillery, and who, when they got to England, were put into the infantry, in spite of a very strong protest from their families at home. That brings me to the question of enlistment from Quebec. My hon. friend finds fault with that enlistment. I am sorry to say that it is a case, to a large extent, of chickens coming home to roost. It is said that if you sow with the wind, you will reap with the whirlwind. My earnest hope is that my hon. friends will not do the reaping according to that adage. The first time the so-called Nationalist movement in Quebec was brought to my attention was in the Drummond-Arthabaska by-election. It has been frequently stated on the floor of this House, and not denied by my Conservative friends, that they were at the bottom of the movement and endorsed the Nationalist candidate in that election. They were behind the extremists in Quebec, when they told the people that they owed nothing to Great Britain. In that election, my Conservative friends were accused, time and again, of endorsing the man who made these speeches. It is certainly true that they endorsed the Nationalists in the election of 1911.

Mr. LALOR: Will the hon. members kindly explain the difference to-day in the platform of Bourassa and the Nationalists, and the platform of my hon. friend's leader in this House?

Mr. NESBITT: If the hon. gentleman will read this evening's paper, which contains a statement from Bourassa, one of his friends, he will see exactly what the difference is. I cannot carry it in mind, but one of his own papers—what do you call this thing here in Ottawa—I think the Journal-Press —contains a statement of the matter. The hon. member can read Bourassa's statement of the difference. My honoured chieftain in that campaign was forced by the attitude of the Conservative party and their partners, so-called Nationalists, properly provincialists, to state to the people of the province of Quebec that he did not mean conscription, that he was opposed to conscription and would not vote for conscription. The campaign carried on in 1911 on the Laurier Naval Bill forced my leader and his supporters from Quebec to make the same statement, and I say, without fear of contradiction, that it is absolutely impossible for any man of honour and truth, after being forced to take the position he did at that time in the province of Quebec, to do otherwise than he is doing to-day. In my judgment, not only the safety of the province of Quebec, but the safety of the nation, or the unity of the Dominion at large, are safeguarded by my honoured chieftain taking the position he has announced on this Bill, because if he took another position, he would drive the province of Quebec into the hands of the extremists.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Where are they now?

Mr. NESBITT: Where they have always been. My comrades from Quebec are absolutely as honest in their views to-night as my hon. friend who has interrupted me. After all, though we differ on this occasion, it is not necessary to say a man is dishonest in his view.

Mr. WILCOX: Will the hon. gentleman deny that the Nationalists are now on the same side as himself and his honoured leader?

Mr. GRAHAM: Wait till the first vote is taken on your partner's motion.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend from Renfrew has answered the hon. gentleman, but personally I absolutely deny that there is any collusion between my hon. leader and his supporters from Quebec or the supporters of my hon. friend on that side from that province. But in that election there was the usual collusion of my honourable friends in sharp practices. Both in politics and in business such collusion will come to naught. My view has always been since I was a boy, that there is only one way to do business or politics, and that is to be absolutely honest. You may succeed by chicanery for a little while, but it meets with poor success, and the chicanery of my hon. friends in the Drummond-Arthabaska election, and in the election of 1911, did more harm to this country than they can imagine, and now it is reacting on them. Perhaps it was smart practice at the time, but honesty is the best policy in politics and in business. My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) gave the Bill credit for the organization of labour. I asked him the question where he found it, and he told me he thought it was there. The only language that could be construed in that way at all would be the last section of the interpretation clause, which reads:

> And whereas, by reason of the large number of men who have already left agricultural and industrial pursuits in Canada to join such Expeditionary Force as volunteers, and of the necessity of sustaining under such conditions the productivity of the Dominion, it is expedient to secure the men still required, not by ballot as provided in the Militia Act, but by selective draft.

No, there is nothing in that to show there is any intention to organize labour in this country. The Bill expresses the intention of selecting men for military purposes, but nothing to show there is any intention for the organization of labour—at least, I say so.

That brings me to the question of voluntary enlistment versus conscription. The one great benefit of voluntary enlistment, in my view, is that, after all, the man, whoever he may be, voluntarily goes to the front and voluntarily risks his life. Against that, for compulsory conscription, there is the basic theory that it is the duty of every man to defend his country. If you start on that basis, I am free to confess that the only logical conclusion you can come to is conscription, whether it be selective or otherwise, whether it be according to the Militia Act or according to the proposed Bill No. 75. But, after all, the difficulty with me is that I dislike to say that anybody else shall do something if I will not do it myself. I confess that I shrink from saying to any man or woman that his or her son shall go to the front and expose his life in war when I am not going myself. Hon. gentlemen know that under this Bill I would not be selected for military service, because I am too old, by many years. That made me hesitate; it took me a long time to make up my mind—because I do not try to be generous at the expense of my wife's relations. I rather felt that, as a representative of the people, I was putting myself in a position of dictatorship. Although I am represented in the military service by the only member of my family who could possibly volunteer, I myself am not at the front, and I hesitated to say that any other man's son should go, especially when he might never come back. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that that is a serious position for me to take. But, as I have said, every man is required to defend his country when the time comes. There seems to be only one way of ensuring the proper defence of the country at this time, and that is by means of conscription. But any measure of compulsory service must be fairly and properly carried out. A great many people—not especially the people whom I represent—but people to whom I have talked on and off the trains, have asserted that ever since the war started the business connected with the war has been carried on by the Government in a most partisan manner. That has hurt recruiting in Ontario worse than anything else. In my constituency—or, rather, in the constituency that I am supposed to represent—a good many more Liberals than Conservatives volunteered.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Does the hon. member mean Liberal officers?

Mr. NESBITT: No, I mean men. My hon. friend knows that there would not be more Liberal officers. I have no complaints of that kind to make. To do the Government and the Department of Militia justice, I may say that the department has freely done everything in reason that I have asked it to do since the war started. I must give them that credit.

Mr. LALOR: Why, then, do you say that there was partisanship in your county?

Mr. NESBITT: I did not say that there was partisanship in my county. My hon.

friend is very clever to-night; what is the matter with him? In the first place, I do not own a county. In the next place, I did not say that partisanship was evidenced in the district that I represent. So far as I know, it certainly was not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NESBITT: But I did say that the feeling was abroad in the country that partisanship had been exercised by the Government ever since the war started. For instance, have any Liberals been given positions on the numerous and innumerable commissions that have been appointed?

Mr. DAVIDSON: The Pensions Commission.

Mr. NESBITT: Not that I know of.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: One of the officers now on the Pensions Commission was one of the most intolerable and intolerant Grits in my town. If every hon. gentleman will frankly admit what he himself knows, then the public will get the truth.

Mr. NESBITT: Who is this intolerable Grit to whom my hon. friend refers? I suppose he was intolerable to my hon. friend because my hon. friend was intolerable to him.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: A man named McKeaud.

Mr. NESBITT: On the Pensions Commission?

Mr. BENNETT: On the Pensions Commission—a good office.

Mr. NESBITT: There is no such man on the Pensions Commission that I know of.

Mr. BENNETT: You do not know everything.

Mr. NESBITT: I understand that the Pensions Commission consists of Mr. Ross, Mr. Todd and Mr. Labatt.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that he was one of the commissioners; I said that he was on the Pensions Commission.

Mr. NESBITT: Oh, he got into a clerkship, I suppose. You should never have allowed him to get that clerkship; you had better dismiss him.

Mr. LALOR: It surely was not partisanship that induced the Government to send Colonel Andrew Thompson, of Ottawa, into my county to take charge of a battalion that had already been recruited.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

An hon. MEMBER: Why should he not go?

Mr. LALOR: I say that he was not sent there because of partisanship.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend is quite willing that Colonel Andrew Thompson should go overseas and risk his life at the front. I do not know if there is anything—

Mr. SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that there are entirely too many interjections? Hon. members ought to extend to the House the courtesy of rising if they wish to make remarks.

Mr. NESBITT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I was not getting into trouble. I never noticed that my hon. friends were desirous of stopping any Liberals from going to the front. They have always been perfectly willing that Liberals should go to the firing line, and I suppose they will continue to be.

Mr. WILCOX: Nonsense.

Mr. NESBITT: As my hon. friend says, why not?

Mr. WILCOX: Oh, no; I said "nonsense."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. NESBITT: In introducing this Bill the Prime Minister said that the Militia Act, which has been on the statute book for many years, did not provide for the proper selection of men for military service. I refer hon. gentlemen to section 27 of the Militia Act, which is as follows:—

> When men are required to organize or complete a corps at any time, either for training or for an emergency, and enough men do not volunteer to complete the quota required, the men liable to serve shall be drafted by ballot; but at no time shall more than one son belonging to the same family residing in the same house, if there are more than one inscribed on the Militia roll, be drawn, unless the number of names so inscribed is insufficient to complete the required proportion of service men.

Nothing in this Bill, so far as I know, provides for such selection as is provided for in that section of the Militia Act. Nothing in this Bill allows selection, except according to the discretion of the tribunal appointed for the purpose. Without desiring to throw out any reflection, I may say that this tribunal will be appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is nothing in the Bill to indicate how the selections shall be made; there is nothing in it which provides for any organization of labour.

I have pointed out that the militia workers, for whom advertisements were floated

about in the newspapers, were paid from $2.50 to $8 a day, whereas the man who went to fight was paid $1.10 a day, besides being maintained and furnished with equipment. It is the duty of this country to pay the man who has actually to go to the front better than he has been paid. There is absolutely no comparison between the duties a man working in a militia factory performs and in the duties a man going to the front performs, and why men should be asked to go to the front for $1.10 a day, including equipment and maintenance, when a man working in a militia factory received from $2.50 to $8 a day, is more than I can comprehend and is absolutely unfair. The Minister of Finance said this afternoon that there was plenty of money for the support of the men at the front. The Government, therefore, should take steps now to pay our fighting men more than they are receiving at present.

Mr. EDWARDS: Can the hon. member fix any amount of pay per day which he thinks would be commensurate with the sacrifices incurred and the risks taken by the men at the front?

Mr. NESBITT: Certainly not, but does that prevent us from paying them a reasonable remuneration? It would take a great deal of money, but there are a great many people in this country to share the burden. The men at the front enlisted for patriotic purposes; they did not enlist for the sake of the pay, but that is no reason why we should not give them a reasonable remuneration. Is it?

Mr. EDWARDS: No.

Mr. NESBITT: Then we absolutely agree. That brings me to the question of taxation which the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) touched upon this afternoon. The Minister of Finance this afternoon made an admirable speech, with which I cannot possibly find any fault excepting that he emphasized the fact that we have as much need for effort now as we ever had before. Surely such a statement was unnecessary. Any one in this country over five years old who reads about the war knows that it is absolutely necessary to make as much effort now as it was before. Then the minister, discussing the objections taken by some hon. members on this side of the House to the Bill, discussed the question: Shall we not send troops outside of Canada? There is no question as to whether we should send troops outside of Canada or not; the question is as to the methods of raising troops, whether by voluntarysm or by conscription, to send to the front; at least, that is my understanding of the arguments presented on this side of the House. The Minister of Finance also stated that the voluntary system had failed in England, and he quoted the Conscription Bill there. The minister must bear in mind that the English people, before bringing conscription into force, organized labour and industry in

9 p.m. England. That is the difference between this country and England. I am not going to discuss what the minister should do in regard to taxation; but while the minister has taxed wisely in many ways, I have never agreed with his blanket increase of 7½ per cent, and he will notice that while the United States complimented him to the extent of saying they were going to do likewise, they afterwards did not do so. Every one in this country, no matter whether he is rich or ordinarily well off, or in whatever financial condition he may be, will have to pay more taxes on account of the war. We cannot continue to borrow. I think we have paid $100,000,000 towards the expenditures of the war. Am I correct in that?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This year we paid $60,000,000 on account of principal. So far as I know, only ourselves and Great Britain are paying towards the principal of war expenditure.

Mr. NESBITT: What the other fellow does, does not help us. The capital debt in the United States is very small in comparison with its population and resources, so that that country can well afford to borrow a few billions of dollars and still not have a large capital debt. We, however, cannot do that, and moreover, we have no means of securing the money, because if we borrow too much, we check the commercial development of the country, and we cannot afford to do that. At the present time we cannot borrow from the United States; we have made several large domestic loans, and there is a limit to such borrowings. Therefore, while I do not say that we should pay all the expenses of the war as it progresses, we must pay more of the war expenditure as we go along, and we must tax every one regardless of whether he is rich or not. I have no faith in that catch-phrase—conscription of wealth—that one hears everywhere throughout the country. I have asked many people what they mean by "conscription of wealth," but nine

out of ten, in fact, ten out of ten, cannot tell me what they mean. We must tax wealth, and probably what the people mean by "conscription of wealth," is that we should impose an income tax. The Minister of Finance will have to resort to an income tax, although he has told us time and again that the expense of collecting an income tax will be very great. I appreciate that fact; but we have to form a basis for the taxation of wealth, and in my judgment, we shall have to resort to the imposition of an income tax; indeed, I would not be surprised if we had to resort to a land tax, because we have to tax the people of this country in such a way that they will feel it. The minister spoke this afternoon very eloquently about what discussion in this House would do towards organizing the people. We, as a Parliament, must organize the people, and the minister must tax the people so that every one will feel that he is doing something towards this war, as every one has a right to do.

I object to the regulations, with reference to the guidance of the tribunals that select the men, being made by Order in Council. The Parliament of Canada is the place where such regulations should be made. It is all very well for the Government to ask us to trust them, and to say that they will not exhibit partyism in these tribunals; but the Government has shown partyism from the very start of the war. They must remember that they have done so, and therefore they must remember that in the ordinary Liberal mind there is a suspicion —that perhaps should not be there, but that is still there—and all that the Liberals I know of want is fair play in this selection. The suspicion in their minds is that they will not receive fair play if these regulations are made by Order in Council. I do not think I have anything more to say at the present time with reference to the backslidings of my hon. friends on the other side of the House.

I come now to the question of the war. It does not matter to me particularly whether this Government have done what they should have done since the war started. It does not matter to me particularly, except as a citizen, whether they do what is right in the future or not, but my duty is plain. I am only answerable for myself and on this question, as on every other, my conscience must be absolutely clear. I am in no way responsible for the sins of the Government; I am not responsible for anything they have done in the past or may do in the future.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

We are at war. The leaders of the two great parties have both declared that we are in the war to the last man and the last dollar, and the press of the country have declared the same thing. Our men are fighting at the front and they have to be supported. Apparently voluntary enlistment has fallen down. No matter whose the fault, it certainly has slackened up within the last five or six months; the men required are not coming forward. In view of the slaughter that is going on at the front we do not know how many men will be required, and if we are going to act on the principle that it is the duty of every man to defend his country there is nothing else for us to do but to pass this Bill. Voting according to my conscience, being left absolutely free to do so by my right hon. leader, I shall support the Bill on its second reading. On the third reading I shall vote according to my conscience again, and I reserve the right to vote for or against the Bill according to the improvements that may be made in it in committee, and according to what concurrent legislation may be introduced in the way of taxation, the organization of labour exclusive of manpower for the front, and the organization of industry. I should not like to suggest an election, as did my hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney). If I might suggest anything to hon. gentlemen opposite it would be this; in place of a referendum that when this Bill passes they close up this legislature for a couple of weeks or a month, for the purpose of forming not a coalition government, but a coalition of both Houses of Parliament in one grand effort to get the necessary men for the front by voluntary enlistment. I say that because I cannot help feeling that a grave responsibility rests upon the people of this country, and unless something of this kind be done there is likely to be produced in this country a disunion that must last for a considerable number of years. While I believe that conscription is the proper basis, it being every man's duty to serve his country, at the same time I most strongly urge that both sides of this House and both Houses of Parliament get together for two weeks in one grand effort to get the necessary men by voluntary enlistment, and if I might say so, I think my hon. friends from the province of Quebec could well join in such a campaign, and I hope they will do so. I believe such an effort would bring unity throughout the length and breadth of this land. Unity perhaps is not so important as winning the

war, but next to winning the war the most important thing to this country is to have the people of all the provinces of this Dominion united. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BURRELL: I understood my hon. friend in the earlier part of his remarks to make a statement to the effect that the Dominion Government had expended $60,000 in an advertising campaign for munitions workers. I am sure my hon. friend would not wish to have any statement of his that was inaccurate go out to the country, and I wish to say for the Government that I believe there is absolutely no basis for such a statement. I felt so at the time, but to make sure I called up the Deputy Minister of Militia, and he tells me that absolutely no such expenditure was made through that department; and I do not see how it could very well have been made through any other department.

Mr. NESBITT: My information comes from the man who got the contract. The minister will possibly say that it was English money that was being spent.

Mr. BURRELL: If the Munitions Board spent that sum of money in an advertising campaign, it had absolutely nothing to do with this Government; it was not our money.

Mr. NESBITT: That is only a subterfuge.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not at all.

Mr. NESBITT: Who pays the money eventually?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The British Government.

Mr. NESBITT: Do not we have to pay our proportion of it?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If we lend any money to the British Government here for the expenditures of the Imperial Munitions Board, it is a set-off to money which the Imperial Government advances to us for expenditures in Great Britain and on the Continent. It is just as much the money of the Imperial Government when our cheque passes to the Imperial Munitions Board, as my hon. friend's money is his own. This Government is not in any way responsible, and has no authority whatsoever over the expenditures of the Imperial Munitions Board.

Mr. NESBITT: I quite appreciate that, but when the grand settlement is made in the end, do not we have to pay our proportion of the expenditures that have been made for getting munitions for our men at the front?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In virtue of an arrangement which has been made, we pay the Imperial Government a certain amount in respect of the maintenance of our men at the front and the munitions which our troops use. But the policy of the Imperial Munitions Board is not necessarily the policy of this Government. I do not think my hon. friend would say that we have responsibility where we have no authority.

Mr. NESBITT: I only mentioned that point as one of the reasons for the failure of voluntary enlistment. If the minister says that this expenditure concerns the Munitions Board alone, I have nothing more to say, but undoubtedly we shall have to pay our proportion of it when the final settlement comes. I have not the remotest intention of wishing to mislead the people of this country. I know my information is absolutely correct, because I got it from the man who took the contract.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, there are occasions when it is difficult for members of this House to decide what is the best course to pursue. I quite understand that the legislation now before us is causing a good many to have doubts as to what is their proper course. Speaking for myself, however, my path of duty lies perfectly clear before me in the support of the measure the Government has brought down. Never have I seen a great measure brought before the House that I could support with so good a conscience, or with a clearer belief that I am doing what is best in the interests of my country and my Empire.

I was somewhat surprised that my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) spent so much time, first, in proving that the voluntary system was a comparative failure, because it had not been carried on as it should have been carried on; deciding, then, that he would vote for the conscription measure on the second reading, but advising that it should be held in abeyance for some weeks or months, after which Parliament should be brought together and put it through, so that it could be satisfactorily carried out. That seems to be his policy. I say I am surprised that a gentleman who has such a good knowledge of world affairs should, on a question of this importance, give forth any uncertain sound. I understand tha the provincial leader of the Liberals, Mr. Rowell, recently held a meeting in his constituency, which is also that of

my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt)—both these gentlemen are elected by the same constituents. This meeting was held in Woodstock, and a resolution was moved by one of the gentlemen present to the effect that those present were heart and soul in favour of conscription. That resolution was carried, I understand, by a practically unanimous standing vote, and amongst those who voted, I believe, my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) himself had the honour of appearing, as well as the gentleman who was formerly representative of South Oxford and is a candidate for the next election, Mr. Schell. Having taken that stand in his own constituency, I think it was the hon. gentleman's duty to himself and the House to state more plainly his attitude and to give more whole-souled support to this measure, which is undoubtedly required, which is in the best interests of Canada and of our army at the front, as well as of the Empire as a whole.

This departure upon which the Government has embarked is the first real out-and-out war measure proposed, according to my way of thinking. It is not designed, as my hon. friend would intimate, to be a conscription of one party or another party, but of all; and I think my hon. friend is scarcely true to his own knowledge when he stated that all the matters in connection with the war have been administered with more or less of a partisan bias. I think that is not true of the county of Oxford; it certainly is not true of the neighbouring county of Brant. In the county of Brant, Liberals and Conservatives have had a square deal throughout. The first man to go from Brantford in command of a contingent was a Liberal; and I can say as having had a great deal to do with the raising of the 125th Battalion, that the question of politics had nothing to do with its management or with the filling of its ranks. And I think the same conditions prevailed in Oxford.

Mr. NESBITT: That is what I said—I said there was no partisanship so far as sending men to the front was concerned.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think that Hansard will show that I have correctly represented what the hon. gentleman said. He said the whole war had been conducted in a partisan way. Of course, I do not wish to misrepresent the hon. gentleman.

Mr. NESBITT: I said it was so reported.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Oh! But the hon. gentleman's own experience in Oxford does not warrant any such statement. My experience in Brant certainly does not warrant it; and I think that other hon. members can testify to the same effect with regard to their several counties. I say this is a real war measure. And I think that the Government mean business in it. If not, they certainly will not get my support for long. If they pass a Conscription Bill, declaring that they want to put it in force, and then leave it idle on the statute book and do not push it, I shall certainly be dissatisfied and shall criticise any turning back in this measure, or with regard to the control of food and fuel, or the grain commission. All these are thorough war measures, the kind of measures we have been calling for for some time. My hon. friend knows that we have been calling for them, and knows that now that we have got them we expect the Government will carry them out without fear or favour. If they do not live up to my expectations, all I can say is that I do not expect to follow a Government that makes fine professions but does not carry them into effect. I believe they are honest and that they intend to carry out this law.

Mr. NESBITT: Then my hon. friend and I will have to form a separate party, for I quite agree with him.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I suppose I should be very proud of one sincere follower. The hon. gentleman has told us that the voluntary system is exhausted.

Mr. NESBITT: No, no.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: He told us that it was not effective because it was not properly carried out.

Mr. NESBITT: No, you have a bad memory.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think that Hansard will show that the hon. gentleman attempted to prove that voluntary enlistment had been so bungled that we did not get the men we called for.

Mr. NESBITT: No, I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. gentleman said that officers had been put on the platform and given large money, husky chaps that ought to be at the front.

Mr. NESBITT: Sure, I said that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The voluntary system was successful to the extent of procuring for our armies over 400,000 men. I do

not think that any one is justified in describing that as a failure.

Mr. NESBITT: You are saying just what I said.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If the hon. gentleman agrees with me, I hope he will allow me to proceed. The voluntary system as carried out, I think, has been a great credit to our people. I believe that as many men enlisted under the voluntary system in the Dominion of Canada as enlisted in any other part of the world. But it succeeded only in those parts of the country that gave it a fair trial and did their best under it. If it failed in any place, it failed because it was not pushed with sufficient vigour by the natural leaders of the people. And who are those leaders? The members of this House. The man who represents a constituency in this House is the first citizen in his riding, and he is the man who should have taken the responsibility for recruiting in that riding. There were no kid-glove methods pursued in the province of Ontario when getting recruits, let me tell my hon. friends from the province of Quebec. These hon. gentlemen tell us that the voluntary system has not had a fair chance, that it has not been pushed for all it was worth in Quebec as it has been in other places. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen that the same methods that were pursued in Ontario were open to them in Quebec, if they chose to employ them. How were recruits raised in the various constituencies in Ontario? The member for the constituency—and I include the Liberals as well as Conservatives and think they deserve probably as much credit as we do; I will say that for Oxford, though I have not been closely associated with recruiting in that county; and I believe the same is true of Wellington and Lambton—put himself at the head of the movement and carried the message to all the countryside. We did not get recruits in Brant to the number of 4,000 out of a population of a little over 40,000, let me tell my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), without putting forth exertion. The men in the county formed themselves into a recruiting organization, including the best citizens on both sides of politics—there was no politics in it.

We did not know the politics of the men upon that recruiting committee. Men of all parties, all races and all creeds were there. They got together, a band of citizens, believing that the life and unity of the Empire were at stake, that Christianity, civilization, liberty and religion were in the balance and, like men realizing that all these responsibilities were upon them, they placed themselves willingly in harness; their cars were at the disposal of speakers, their houses were opened to visitors who came to speak, their money was at the disposal of the committee, and thousands and thousands of private dollars in the city of Brantford and county of Brant were spent in getting these 4,000 men together. We did not have any rosy way of doing it; it was done by solid work and I ask the hon. member from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) as he seems to be one of the few representatives from Quebec in the Chamber now, if the same methods were fairly tried in Quebec. If they were not fairly tried in Quebec he and his fellow members should shoulder the responsibility. The responsibility rests primarily upon the members of this House from the province of Quebec if the voluntary system did not receive the support it should have received. That is gospel truth and no one can deny it. Throughout Ontario this message was carried, at every cross-roads the doctrine was preached and at every school house the flag was unfurled and the message was delivered. People who had never had much experience in speaking, who previously had been slow in speech, roused their fellowmen in a way that I had never seen equaled in a public meeting in the city of Brantford or the county of Brant. What was the response? From the good old province of Ontario about 180,000 voluntary recruits offered their lives on the altar of their country, and to-night many of them are laying down their lives in the trenches that you and I may enjoy our ease at home. This thing has been done and it has been done by disinterested citizens in all parts of this country. What took place in Ontario I am sure also took place throughout the whole of the West and if it has not applied to the East it is because the members, primarily of the Opposition, have not done as was done in Ontario—placed themselves at the head of a recruiting league and gone out and carried the message and planted the cross—the fiery cross—upon every road that leads to every town, city, and hamlet in Quebec. I feel confident if that had been done the response from Quebec would have been better than it has been.

We are told that this is a fit subject for a referendum. Governments in this country have not frequently shifted their responsibility and placed upon the people the lead that they themselves should take. That

has not been the vogue in Canada. It may be wrong. In Australia they pursue a different course but in this country Governments have shouldered the responsibility with regard to all the questions they have had to deal with and they have placed them fairly and squarely before the people. But now we have the policy proposed of a referendum to the people so as to allow the slacker, the man who has not gone under the voluntary system, to say that he will not go under the compulsory system; while our 400,000 soldiers are out of the country. Is that a fair proposition? No.

This is not a fit subject for a referendum because in many cases the voter to whom it will be submitted is not a fair and impartially-minded man to give a decision on such a subject. If the liberties are worth having they are worth fighting for, and if the liberties which we in Canada enjoy are as great as we think they are, they are worthy of the best efforts of every citizen.

I do not want to reprove my fellow citizens from Quebec. I am sorry to disagree with them on a question of such great importance, but I must say that Quebec has been the greatest disappointment to me in the whole war. I say that from the bottom of my heart. When this war began I thought: Now, Canada will be a united country; never have we been entirely united but now we will be absolutely united. Look at the great, old land of France, valorous, brilliant France; there she is with every man available, every woman, every child throwing their lives into the struggle spending their last ounce of energy, their last drop of blood, in defence of the great old land that gave our friends their language and their liberties in the first place, and to whom they owe a great deal of what they possess. I said: There will be no doubt about the position of Quebec on this great question, because all her people will stand shoulder to shoulder with us. But now is there to be a referendum—to all the people of Canada?—No; to the people who stay at home, to the people who should have gone but who did not go. It has remained for the province of Quebec to furnish, in my mind, the most pathetic and outstanding figure in Canada in this whole war.

I am sorry that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is not here because I wanted to make a special appeal to him. I was going to propose one referendum that he should make. Although I disapprove of the spirit of the proposal I would give in to the extent of such a referendum as that which I propose. I would be willing and delighted to pay the expenses of this particular referendum if my right hon. friend would make it. What is it? It is that he immediately send a wireless message to Dr. Beland, the ex-Postmaster General in his own Government, telling him the situation in which we are placed in Canada to-day in regard to recruiting and conscription and asking him, on behalf of his own people here, to tell them truly what in his heart he thinks should be done. If such a message were sent to Dr. Beland, I can imagine that a reply would come back, written almost with his life blood, that must appeal to every Quebec citizen: Recall your resolution, recant your opinions, repent of your mistake and come; stay not upon the order of your coming, but come. Let me appeal to the pity of my hon. friends from Quebec—Dr. Beland, visiting in the neutral country of Belgium, seized upon almost immediately after war broke out; his new bride done to death by the ruthless Hun; he, himself while we are here debating and discussing ways and means, eating the bread and drinking the water of affliction in Germany, a man who cannot move hand or foot without the permission of the Huns! Is this a time to sit here in idle debate? Is this a time to say that you cannot do any more than you have done? No, Sir, let that referendum be taken and if my friend does not answer somewhat in the line I have indicated, then I think I might almost venture to oppose the Bill myself.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: If we in Quebec do as the hon. member from Brantford suggests, will the Government repeal the School Act of Ontario?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am hardly ready to discuss the bilingual question on the present occasion.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: And we are not ready to go.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have my views about it, but I do not think the people of Quebec can escape defending our common country, because we do not speak as good French in Ontario as we should.

I have spoken strongly on this question, and I feel strongly. It is a profound regret to me, personally, that I have not the support of my hon. friends on the other side of the House, especially the members from Quebec. I feel that they have misjudged the situation, and are not prizing the liberties that have been theirs under the British flag and Crown. I ask them to

repent, ere it is too late, and join us, and, in one united effort, let us bring the war to a close, because if we allow the enemy to defeat us in this matter, we will only regret it once, and that will be for all time to come.

An attempt has been made, on the part of many, to confuse the one issue in this Bill, and we hear a great deal about the conscription of wealth. The hon. gentleman from South Renfrew dwelt on that at great length, and the Finance Minister has replied very ably. I look upon this and other matters which have been discussed as side issues, which have nothing to do with the question before the House. These questions have been dragged in, but are not properly matters to be discussed in this debate. The conscription of wealth is a subject by itself, which seems to be not very well defined, and the Finance Minister tells us he has been able so far and expects to be able, in the future, to furnish all the funds that are required for the war. We want the men, and the money will take care of itself, and will be provided in due course. The ministers of every denomination have preached conscription of wealth as well as of men. I attended a church meeting this week, and this question came up, and in my own church I said what I am not afraid to say here, that this proposition, with regard to the conscription of wealth, is going to hit some of the preachers, if it is carried, and I think it started them puzzling a little bit. Let it be remembered that, if you conscript a man, you take the whole of him, and do not leave a leg or arm behind, and you require a good sound man. If the conscription of wealth means the same thing it is going to take the whole pile of wealth which a man possesses, leaving nothing. Many of our clergymen brethren are lords over a great pile of money. I think Quebec can tell us something about that as well as Ontario. It must be remembered that, if conscription of wealth is coming, some of the churches are going to be hit. It reminds me of a remark a Six Nation Indian used to make, when they told him the preacher had given them a very poor sermon—"Well, it was poor pay and poor preach." It will be a good deal the same with our clerical brethren. If all the wealth be conscripted the churches will not be supported as they have been. Wealth has been accumulated by many of the religious bodies, and the clerical gentleman cannot refuse to obey the scriptural teaching, that a man should always pay taxes and obligations of that kind, especially if he is a religious man. I throw out that hint to the preachers who are propounding this doctrine from the pulpit: that the conscription of wealth will take the accumulated wealth of the churches, as well as the wealth of the individuals. We are all prepared for that to the full extent necessary to conduct this war to a finish. Canada has the right to expect from its citizens the surrender of all that they possess to be used in defence of the country. In other words, the rights of the State are superior to the rights of any individuals. That is a strong doctrine perhaps to preach, but it will be found to be absolutely true. It has been the price of liberty and freedom for all time, and always will be. The state, which is the accumulation and union of individuals is always superior to the units which compose the whole. The State at the present time says we want men, we want more men, they have not volunteered. We are bringing down legislation to conscript these men, or, to use a selective draft, or whatever you wish, and put them into line. These men will be selected without fear or favour by the powers that be.

It has been stated in the House on several occasions that our soldiers are not paid as they should be paid, and that we are making them serve for a very much less wage than they could earn in any of the ordinary walks of life. While that may be the case, can any gentleman present tell me of any soldier in the world who is better paid than the Canadian. I have yet to hear of him. Therefore, I do not think we can be accused of being niggardly. What was the pay of the French soldier when the war broke out? A penny a day, raised since, I believe, to five cents. The German pay is so small you do not hear of it at all. The British pay is less than half of ours, and the Australian pay is less than ours. Being in constant communication with those at the front, having blood relations there, I think I know what I am speaking about when I say that the Canadian soldier is one of the best treated men and one of the best soldiers the world has ever seen. The pay never was presumed to compensate him for his effort. The soldier's life is presumed to be sacrificed to the State. No money value can be placed on that life. It is beyond price, and cannot be measured by dollars and cents. It is a gift from God. A man who goes to the trenches, and lays his life on the altar of his country, cannot be paid in money. People have raised the bogey

that the pay of the Canadian soldier is insufficient, but the pay never induces these men to join the ranks. The first contingent did not enlist because the men desired to draw $1.10 a day, nor did any of the subsequent contingents go to the front on account of the remuneration. They said: our country needs us at the front; by Divine Providence I have been created a man fit to serve; I am sound in wind and limb; I place my services on the altar of my country, and the $1.10 or $2, or $5 per day I get amounts to nothing; I am fighting because I believe in the cause. I am fighting because my King and country need me; I am fighting for the liberties of my people, and in order that the British race may be supreme in the future as it has been in the past; these are the things that have appealed to me—not the paltry $1.10 a day. Mr. Speaker, you cannot pay these men with money; it is folly to try to raise the bogey of our men being insufficiently paid and of that being the reason for lack of enlistment. In most instances, our men are getting all the pay that they expected, and all that they asked. But they do want to be sustained in their work; they ask that we at home, instead of bickering and quarrelling over minor matters of detail, should get together and, in conjunction with the boys overseas, present a united front to the Hun and give him to understand that we are in the fight to a finish. I do not like the clause of this Bill—it happens to be No. 13, the unlucky number—which limits the number of men required to 100,000. We may need more men than that. We must give all that the successful prosecution of the war requires; we have engaged to do our part to the utmost of our ability and to the limit of our resources. Therefore I say that this section of the Bill should be struck out.

It has been said that labour is opposed to conscription. Well, I come from a town in which 7,000 of the citizens work in factories and earn their daily bread at the bench. While a handful of them, in meeting assembled, did pass a resolution against conscription some weeks ago, I do not think that their opinion represents the attitude of labour. I do not believe that the views of the gentlemen who met in Ottawa represent the attitude of labour. I believe that the attitude of labour now is what it has been; the testimony of the men in the trenches is the best answer to the assertion that labour is opposed to conscription. From 100,000 to 150,000 workingmen are either fighting in the trenches or are ready to go to the front when they are needed. It is plainly evident that this war is a war of the people. Every class is in line to do its part in the prosecution of the war—from the richest to the poorest, from the highest to the lowest. To say that the wealthy man has not done anything because his wealth has not been conscripted is simply begging the question. I do not know that there are any millionaires in the community from which I come, but I believe that the sons of the well-to-do in the county of Brant have gone to the front in just as great numbers as the sons of the needy and the poor. The comradeship and the good feeling that has prevailed among the men and the officers who have gone to the front has done my heart good on many occasions. I know of university boys from Brantford, qualified lawyers and medical men, who have enlisted in the ranks. One young man in particular was offered a commission. He said: No, I am no soldier; I know my limitations; I know that without experience I am not fit to lead men; I will go and fight my way upwards from the ranks. That boy came from one of the best families in Brantford; he had been accustomed to the very best living that the city could furnish. He went overseas and put in a year and a half in the trenches as a private. He qualified for a lieutenant's commission, and a month afterwards fell while leading the platoon that my own son had been leading. His body has not been recovered and his friends do not know where that body lies. I mention that only to show the spirit that prevails among the men. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if we in this House had applied ourselves as diligently to carrying out the requirements of the war as we have to finding fault with each other, things would be very different from what they are to-day. This war is far from being over. The submarines are taking a very heavy toll of the mercantile marine; this week 27 or 28 of the largest British ships of the line have been sunk. The men at the front need help; the situation is serious. I believe that the House should put this measure through as quickly as possible and that both sides of the House should get behind it and make it successful. We should present a united front in obtaining the 100,000 men, or whatever number is required, drilling them, equipping them and getting them to the firing line, thus saving many lives and perhaps, materially shortening the war. It

is up to Canada to do as she has done in the past. She has done nobly, but let her not now spoil her splendid record of three years by faltering or giving evidences of decay. Let her be just as resolute, just as firm as she was in August, 1914. Let us now be just as firmly resolved as we were at that time to carry the grand old flag to victory; to ensure the freedom and the liberty of the nations of Europe, both small and great. I have had occasion to criticise the great nation to the south of us; I have even been termed an anti-American. But I rejoice now that the people of the United States are shoulder to shoulder with us in the great fight for the liberty of the world. Only last January I criticised President Wilson; I thought that he deserved criticism. I want to withdraw that criticism now in same degree and give him credit for having thrown himself into the war as few statesmen on either side of the Atlantic have done. Every step that he has taken has been wisely conceived. In the United States they are giving the very best that they can of their wealth and of their energy to the prosecution of the war. They are forming aviation corps; sending ships across the sea and building more; taking other steps to help the Allies. That, Mr. Speaker, should give us encouragement. That should cause us to resolve anew that we will continue the great work we have undertaken. I believe that, by the providence of God, the British Empire and its Allies—France, Italy, Russia, Belgium, Serbia, Roumania, Japan and the United States —will secure a vindication of the principles of liberty and justice which they have enunciated and will be justified in their upholding of the right of smaller nations to live in peace and amity and to have absolute control of their own affairs.

Although history may contain pages that contain more words and tales that take longer to tell, history will contain no prouder or brighter page than that which tells of the noble part that has been played by the Dominion of Canada up to the present time on the battlefields of Europe, and if we at home are only as good, true, and honest in our hearts as the men whom we have sent to the front we shall have no regrets; we shall have nothing to recall; but we shall have the proud satisfaction of a good heart and a clear conscience in the presence of both God and man.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to confine my remarks almost wholly to the measure before the House, and to give this House my reasons why it is my intention to support that measure. I am going to make my position clear at the commencement of my remarks. We are in a serious stage of the history of Canada; not only have we before us the winning of the war, but those of us who look at questions from a national standpoint are fearful for national unity, and in my remarks to-night I do not wish to say anything that will be a reflection upon any other province or section of the Dominion of Canada. I do not feel that I have any right to cast any reflection of that kind. I feel that if some of us, coming from other provinces of this country, had to face the conditions that have been faced in the province that has been frequently mentioned in this debate we would not be so boastful of our position in this war. No poison has been spread abroad in our provinces. If that poison had been spread abroad there might have been a different attitude on the part of many people in the other provinces at this particular period in our history.

I am in favour of conscription because I believe that this is Canada's war; that we are fighting for our own defence and for our own existence. That is why I have said, on many occasions since this war commenced, that we must give the last man and the last dollar to win it. Why do I say that? I do not want to boast that I can make my position clear to the people of other provinces that do not see as I do, but I believe that all fair-minded people throughout this country could be convinced that this war is actually Canada's war. If, after the war commenced, Great Britain had not gone into this struggle in Europe, and if we had not entered it, and if as a result of the war between Germany on the one hand and Russia and France on the other, Russia and France had been conquered, Germany would have been dominant in Europe, and Great Britain and the British Empire and the United States would have been in danger whether they went into the war or not. We may have to resort to conscription now, but under those circumstances we would have had to have larger armed forces; we would have had to spend more money in the maintenance of troops than we have ever had to do in our history, because we would have had to protect ourselves against the dominant power of the world. When Great Britain went into this war we were part of the British Empire.

10 p.m.

and, consequently, we could be looked upon at once as a prize of the victor. If Germany could have reached us in the early stages of this war, no matter whether we had decided to participate or whether we had decided to remain out of the war, she would have reached us; she would have possessed us, and she would have had something to hold against Great Britain and the other Allies. For that reason I say that we had to go into the war; this war is ours. The only thing that prevented Germany from reaching us and the other parts of the British Empire was the existence of a power which Germany did not possess. Had Germany possessed that power, then her troops might have been on our shores to-day; our cities might have been destroyed, and many more of the lives of our citizens lost. If Germany should win in this war—and there is always that possibility—what would happen? If Germany should be in a position, after three years of war, to defeat great powers like France, Russia, Great Britain, and the United States, once the latter is prepared, then Germany would dominate the world; she would rule this world, she could dictate terms to the powers, and she could tell Great Britain that she wanted as a prize the Dominion of Canada. Could we prevent her taking Canada as a prize? I say to those who are not in favour of conscription to-day to keep in mind the fact that if those conditions should come about, we might be possessed by a nation that believes, not in conscription for to-day nor for a few days nor for a few years, but in military service for its citizens all the time. Is it not worth while that those of us in Canada who love liberty, freedom and democracy, that we should put forth every effort to prevent that occurring? Should we not adopt measures that we never thought of in the past, in order to maintain the principles we love, and in order to prevent this Dominion from becoming dominated by a power that does not believe in democracy, freedom, or justice? If all Canadians took the view that I take of our place in this war, they would support conscription; they would see to it that every available man was sent forward to help Canada and to help the Allies, and to maintain civilization as we want civilization to exist.

I would like to emphasize again the fact that, should Germany be a victor in this war, even if she were not in a position to possess us, she would force us into the position of spending more money in our defence and in maintaining a standing army. Is it not therefore better that we should spend the money and use the men now to prevent that happening? Sir, to my mind it is much better that we should now send overseas the greatest army we can possibly gather together, to prevent that fearful possibility occurring.

Another reason why I am in favour of conscription is this—we have sent many thousands of our young men across the seas to fight for us and for the principles we hold dear. Those men have enlisted voluntarily; they are fighting in the trenches to-day, or they are preparing to go across the channel to fight for us, or they are in Canada ready to leave our shores to participate in this war. We find that under the voluntary system at the present time we cannot get the necessary men to back up those brave fellows, and I am not going to vote in this House any other way than in favour of some measure that will send reinforcements to our boys, so that we can carry out our honest obligations to them. I wish that we were all imbued with the spirit that possesses many of those young men. It has been intimated that many men who went across the seas to participate in this war went over there out of a spirit of adventure, that some of them even went there because they could not get any work to do in Canada, but in my judgment the bulk of the men went over there knowing what they were fighting for; knowing they were fighting for Canada and for those great principles which I have mentioned. I remember reading a letter that came to a member of this House from his only son who went overseas with the First Contingent. He was an officer, and was one day instructed by his superior to lead a party of men up to a very dangerous position for the purpose of examining the territory. He realized it was likely to lead to his death, and he left a letter which was to be sent to his father in case he did not return. The young man fortunately was not killed, but was seriously wounded. He lost the sight of one of his eyes and is now back in Canada, proud of the part he played in this war. His instructions as to the letter were not carried out, and it was sent to his father. It was to this effect: "I am going to lead a party into a very dangerous position to-day. It is quite possible I may never return, but I do not want you to worry. You ought to be proud that you had a son who saw the issues of this war and was prepared to go forward and do his duty." That was the character of this

young Canadian who was prepared to die for the principles which he felt were at issue in this great war. I am satisfied that the bulk of our men know what they are fighting for. They realize the issues involved in this war, and what the consequences would be if we were to lose.

I come from one of the new provinces of this Dominion. I represent a constituency which covers a very large territory, and although it has within its confines only two large centres, I think I am quite safe in saying that it has sent at least 7,000 men to the front. In the city where I reside about 3,000 men have been recruited. I do not mean to say they have been recruited from the city of Lethbridge alone, but they have been recruited at that point from the city and the surrounding territory. Now I could not conscientiously do anything else but back up these men, many of whom have enlisted because I stood on the platform and urged them to go and do their duty to their country. I could not face them when they come back if I had failed to support a measure of this kind; I want to be candid with the House and with my own constituents, and that is one of the reasons I am supporting this measure.

We have been asked to make suggestions as to the Bill. I should like to make some now, because there are some faults to be found with the Bill as I have examined it. I think there are many men who would be required in this country, farm labourers, railway men, miners and the like, who would fail to ask for exemption under this Act, because they would feel under the responsibility of going forward and joining the colours if they were called up. There are many men of this type who could not conscientiously ask to be exempted. I believe it would have been best under all circumstances to have had a system of registration. We would then have got information about all the individuals in every part of this country, and should have known whether a certain man ought to go and another man to stay. As I understand it, under the Bill a man must come forward and ask for exemption.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One can apply for another or for a number of others.

Mr. BUCHANAN: If that is the case I am perfectly satisfied, but I want to make it clear that instances of that kind might occur; I know they would occur in my own part of the country. Many men would not ask for exemption, and the board might not know the men's circumstances.

There is another matter that I should like to emphasize, and that is this. In all the communications I have had from my part of the country since the Bill was introduced and its contents made known, there is the feeling that it should be brought into effect without much delay. Now I am in agreement with those who urge that if possible we should give another chance to voluntary recruiting, but if we are not going to do that, if the need is as great as we are told it is, there should be no hesitation in bringing the Bill into effect.

There is another matter. In the provinces of the West at any rate, where the sentiment is absolutely sound behind this war, no man would be exempted by the boards that would be constituted in that part of the country unless he was absolutely entitled to exemption There is a possibility that in other parts of the country the sentiment of the boards would not be of that character and that men would be exempted who had no right to be exempted. There is the right to appeal under the Bill, but that involves delay. In the provinces of the West we have already fulfilled our obligations and raised more than our quota. With the sentiment of the boards out there behind the Act it might possibly be that from those provinces alone almost the whole of the 100,000 men required under the Act would be raised; there is that possibility; I do not say it would occur. This is certain, however: no slacker in Western Canada who is not required in that country in pursuits that are necessary for the successful prosecution of the war will be exempted by any of the boards appointed, unless the board should be dominated by men who would display favouritism to individuals, and I hope that will not be the case.

As to the amendment moved by my right hon. leader, I might say as a personal matter that I was not born into the Liberal doctrine. I did not inherit my Liberalism, but became possessed of it because of my high regard of Sir Wilfrid Laurier back in the days when I first commenced to take an interest in public affairs. I love and respect him, always have, and always hope to do so. He has been an ideal to me in many respects, but in this particular matter I honestly differ with him. I believe the view he has taken to be an absolutely honest view, and that he thinks it is in the best interests of unity and the welfare of the

country. But I do not think the referendum would reach the object I have in view. I believe that conscription is necessary. I believe I am a member of this House at a critical time in the history of Canada and in the history of the world. I have a duty to perform, and I am prepared to perform it by declaring myself absolutely in favour of conscription. I am prepared to face my people on the stand I have taken, and to accept the consequences whatever they may be.

I do not want the men who, I feel, are neglecting their duty at this time, to have an opportunity of saying whether they should stay at home or not. I want to see these men go forward and serve their country. They have refused to go under a voluntary system, and they must go under some other system. And if these men go forward under a system of conscription, go to the front and perform their duty, they will come back to Canada, I believe, thankful to this Parliament that they were sent forward, even under compulsion, because they will feel in after years proud of the fact that they participated in this war, and we hope they will participate in it to save liberty, justice, and democracy and to prevent the domination of this world by the Germans.

I have very strong views on another matter which has been frequently mentioned in this debate, one that I have mentioned on other occasions during the present session. I will not use, in describing it, the term that is quite often used, because I think that term does not set forth its real meaning. I refer to taxation. We must have taxation that will make the people realize that we are undergoing a real strain on account of this war. My hon. friend, the president of the Patriotic Fund (Sir Herbert Ames) had a slogan, " Give until it hurts." I suggest that the Minister of Finance should tax the people until it hurts. We cannot expect to have conscription carried into effect and our young men who are sent to the front go forward satisfied unless they feel that those who are left at home also are bearing a heavy burden. This is not the case at the present time. I know in my own city men who are not being reached in any exceptional way by taxation, men of wealth who are not being forced to pay one red cent into the treasury of this country except through the tariff. These men also are neglecting their duty; they are financial shirkers. And if we are dealing with the men who are shirking their duty for service overseas why not deal also with the men who are shirking their duties at home? The income tax has been mentioned. I have a letter to-day from a very prominent citizen of Lethbridge giving his views on conscription. He declares himself in favour of conscription, but says, also, that he was in favour of the conscription of wealth—he uses those words. He intimates that, though he has an income of about $10,000 a year, he was not being reached in any way. He says that he and such as he ought to be reached, that there ought to be some form of taxation that will make them realize that the war is taking place and that they have to do their duty as much as the men who are forced to go overseas to defend the country. This gentleman is a liberal contributor to the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross, and other good movements; he is one to whom we can go at any time and get a generous contribution for a good cause. Still, he feels that he is not doing his duty and that he ought to be taxed. The Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) told us this afternoon that financially everything was all right. But we must remember that when this war is over financially things may be all wrong. Now is the time to get at the people. They are prosperous; they are making money, many of them making money out of the prosperity due to this war. We should not hesitate to impose income taxes upon our people, and heavy income taxes. I could mention case after case that strengthens my opinion in favour of a tax of this nature. We do not want any favouritism in our war policy; everybody should be forced to make sacrifices at some time or other. There are many men of wealth who are not doing their part in this war. While many are giving handsomely to the Red Cross and the Patriotic Fund, everybody is not doing so. Many are not doing anything to maintain our position in this war If they will not do their duty voluntarily, then let us force these shirkers to come through with good contributions directly to the public treasury.

In closing, I wish to give expression to what I believe to be our duty at this time. I think it is our duty to establish in this country a government representative of all classes and all occupations—at least the occupations necessary to the prosecution of the war. In saying this, I make no reflections upon the Government or any member of it. In speaking as I do I wish to make reference to labour and agriculture especially. I quite appreciate the attitude that the labour men take in this matter of conscription. In my own city, the labour

men are demanding what is called the conscription of wealth. They are quite satisfied to have conscription of manhood if there is conscription of wealth. But there are the same feelings between employers and employees as in times of peace. They want to see the man with money doing his part. If we had a Government at this time, whether partisan, or coalition, or National, with a real representative of labour, as one of its members, a man who had the confidence of labour from the Atlantic to the Pacific, I think we should avoid, for instance, strikes in the coal mines of western Canada; I think we should get the labouring men behind conscription and every other war measure.

Again, with regard to agriculture, there is talk, for instance, of fixing the price of wheat, and other measures affecting the farm. All this could be best done by having in the Government a real representative of the farmers, a man who could go to the farmers and have such influence with them that he could get them to do what is necessary. There are men of that kind, I know, in western Canada—big men, men of influence and ability, men thoroughly in earnest about this war. In all honesty, we cannot have a successful prosecution of the war until we have in existence in this country a government that has the confidence, not of one party only, but of the whole people. That is the request I make to-night—that we constitute in this country, for the period of the war at any rate, a government that shall have the confidence of the people, that will prosecute the war to a successful issue, a government that will not be for party but will be for the state entirely and all the time. If we have a government of that kind from now on until the conclusion of the war, many of the problems that face us will be solved; much of discord that exists will pass away.

I think I have made my position clear. I am in favour of conscription because I think it is the only possible method we now have left of providing reinforcements for our men at the front. I will support the measure and I will appear before my people and defend my course. I am satisfied that, from their record since the commencement of the present war to the present, they will endorse the attitude which I take with the view of doing everything possible to assist in carrying on this war to a successful conclusion.

On motion of Mr. Wilcox the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Monday, June 25, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

LABOUR STRIKE IN WESTERN MINES.

DIRECTOR OF COAL OPERATIONS APPOINTED.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I desire to lay on the Table two Orders in Council with respect to the difficulties which have occurred in the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, in the district known as District 18. One of these Orders in Council constitutes a Director of Coal Operations for that District; the other appoints Mr. W. H. Armstrong, of the city of Vancouver to that position.

STATEMENT BY MR. L. J. GAUTHIER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, on my arrival here this morning, I took cognizance of the remarks made by you on Friday last and reported in Hansard of that day. In deference to your wishes as there expressed, I desire to say that there was no intention in my mind to reflect on you, Sir, when speaking on the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette). My statement was directed against the Government. If anything in my remarks can be construed as reflecting on the Chair, I withdraw it.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 101, respecting The Canada Preferred Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 102, respecting The Western Canada Accident and Guarantee Insurance Company.—Mr. Bradbury.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 86, respecting the Western Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Schaffner.

TORONTO, HAMILTON AND BUFFALO RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill No. 39, respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company (Mr. Stewart), Mr. Blain in the Chair.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: I propose that this Bill should be amended by striking out sec-

tions 1 and 2, and I think that in that form it might be read the third time. I do not desire to take up the time of the committee in explaining the Bill, because I have done this once or twice already.

Mr. G. C. WILSON (Wentworth): This Bill affects only the town of Dundas and not any other part of the country. I am opposed to the withdrawal of sections 1 and 2, and I take that position at the request of the Town Council of Dundas whose representatives were present at the meeting of the committee by which this Bill was considered. At the meeting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company was represented by counsel, and the town of Dundas was represented by the mayor and members of the town council. The provision of the Bill granting an extension of twenty-nine years was opposed, and the committee amended it so as to provide for an extension of five years. If the House approves of that, I have nothing to say against the Bill; but I do object to dropping clauses 1 and 2. The Bill was carefully considered by the committee and there was a large majority in favour of the amendment, and I believe that the Bill should carry as it is.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: Considering the course the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. G. C. Wilson) has taken, it will be necessary for me to explain the Bill. This Bill arises through an agreement made between the town of Dundas and the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway Company for the removal of freight to and from the town. Dundas is in a valley, and no steam roads go there, and it is necessary that the freight should be removed by electric railway. The agreement was for a period of twenty-one years, which was as long as it could be made, but it was provided in the agreement that the town of Dundas, if it chose, might pass a by-law, and get it approved by the Ontario Legislature, extending the term for twenty-nine years more, making a total of fifty years. This was afterwards done. The Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway Company entered into an agreement with the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company, under which the latter company was to take the freight from the former at the end of their electric track. Practically, the action of the Ontario Legislature ratified the agreement with the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company, but that legislature could not ratify it formally because the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway has a Dominion charter, while the other road has a local charter. The agreement with the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company could be ratified only by this Parliament. The company has come here to ask this Parliament to confirm the rights given by the town of Dundas, and to make this agreement binding for fifty years. The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company has come here in good faith expecting that its agreement will be ratified by this Parliament. The committee saw fit to refuse that ratification. But, instead of simply refusing, they did that which, I am advised by the Law Clerk of this House, they had no right to do. The town of Dundas, and the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company were represented before the committee, but the Hamilton and Dundas Railway Company was not represented. The committee amended the Bill so as to provide that the time fixed should be five years instead of twenty-nine years. In my opinion they had the right to confirm or to refuse the agreement for twenty-nine years, but this is the only legal right that the committee had.

The committee did not follow these rules but made a new agreement in the absence of the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway which could not be legally done under the agreement. For that reason and because of their refusing to allow us to proceed with our Bill, I made the motion today to have it withdrawn. The town of Dundas is objecting to this Bill because they say that the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company have no right to keep their cars in front of the doors of the people in Dundas. The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company were not responsible for that for the simple reason that they were using the tracks of the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway Company and therefore they did not have control of the track or the use of the track. But the people of the town of Dundas say it is unfair to keep these freight cars in front of the people's doors and the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway company agreed to an expense of $15,000 for buying the right of way and removing the cars to some switching place in Dundas that would be suitable. That removed that objection. Then the town of Dundas said there was another objection; they did not want to be bothered by the smoke nuisance. They wanted the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Company to buy two electric motors for removing freight cars that would cost the company $80,000. The interest on that

investment would be $4,800 while the total profit obtained from handling freight in Dundas is only $5,000 and some odd dollars. Therefore the company said that there was not enough in it and said they were quite willing to drop out. The authorities of the town of Dundas said: We would be very glad. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Wilson) told me that they would be very glad if we would drop out of the town. The mayor of Dundas said that he would be very glad if our company would drop out but when we asked for the privilege of having our Bill withdrawn, they said: No, I do not know what answer to make to them. They want to force us to accept a Bill that we will not accept. I do not think it is fair that the company I represent should be forced to accept a Bill they do not want. For that reason I ask this committee to allow the company to withdraw these clauses and give the Bill its third reading.

Mr. NICKLE: When this Bill was before the Railway Committee it was well discussed. This is not a Bill that in any way touches the riding I represent, but I was in the Railway Committee when the matter was up for discussion. Shortly, the facts are these: Twenty-one years ago the town of Dundas entered into an arrangement with the street railway company. The agreement was made for a term of fifty years. By a provision of the Ontario statutes of that time, a municipality was prevented from entering into an agreement for a term exceeding twenty-one years. The municipality recognized that the agreement was illegal beyond the 21 years, and so also did the street railway company, who went to the legislature and had the agreement ratified in so far as it affected Dundas and the street railway company. I am a bit ahead, however, of my story in this respect. The street railway company subsequently to its entering into the agreement with the town of Dundas, made an arrangement with what I shall call the steam railway company by which the street railway company extended to the steam railway company certain privileges over the street railway company's tracks for a period of fifty years. That agreement was also ratified by the Ontario Legislature. For some reason that was not disclosed to the committee, the steam railway company, which had its incorporation from this Parliament, stood by for twenty years and never came to secure the ratification of the agreement in so far as it was concerned. At the expiration of twenty years they come before this Parliament, and in the face of the most acute objections from the town of Dundas, who assert that the main street of their town is being destroyed, that their citizens are being annoyed by the smoke and noise incidental to railway traffic, try to force upon Dundas an agreement for twenty-nine years, which the town of Dundas does not want. I cannot understand why the street railway company were not represented before the committee. This Bill was not before the committee once, but, I think possibly twice or thrice, and if the street railway company wishes to be heard there is no reason why they should not have been present. The committee felt that they were confronted with this difficulty: It seemed to be an obvious hardship to throw the Bill out altogether because that would practically deprive the town of Dundas of steam railway accommodation. It is all very well for the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Stewart) to come here and say that they are quite prepared to drop the Bill and leave the town of Dundas entirely helpless. The committee thought that Dundas was entitled to protection. As the two railway companies and the town had entered into an agreement that was at its inception illegal, it was felt that the town of Dundas should not be compelled to recognize a twenty-nine years' extension or to submit to an agreement that was working great hardship to its citizens. At the time the agreements were made between the two railways and the town the policy of this Parliament, and the policy of the Legislature of Ontario, was against protracted agreements, because they felt that the rights of the people might not be adequately protected. It would be unreasonable that this Parliament should impose on the town of Dundas an agreement for a further term of twenty-nine years when the railway company most particularly concerned stood by for twenty-one years without seeking parliamentary ratification knowing that at the expiration of twenty-one years if ratification was not obtained from this Parliament neither Dundas nor the street railway company could compel them to carry out that agreement now they have come and asked for a further extension of twenty years because they think it an advantageous agreement. If it had been a disadvantageous agreement they could have repudiated responsibility after twenty-one years.

Mr. STEWART: We do not ask to be relieved of responsibility. We brought this Bill here and we ask to be allowed to withdraw these clauses. We do not create any liability. The lawyer from Kingston, being a lawyer, ought to know that very well. He is mistaken when he says that the agreement has been in existence for less than twenty-one years. The agreement has been in existence for less than that, for about twenty years and it has another year to run. We are advised by more than half a dozen lawyers that the committee have no right whatever to pass that limitation for five years and they have no right to make a renewal of the agreement. We ask that we be allowed to withdraw those clauses. We are not treating the town of Dundas unfairly. Furthermore the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Company is under a Dominion charter. They want to have the freight removed by electric power. One of the arguments is that the Dominion Railway Board has no power in this transaction because one portion of the road is under an Ontario charter and the other under a Dominion charter. If that be true, the town of Dundas if they have no other purpose in view, on the face of it, would not insist on what they are doing to-day because if the Dominion Railway Commission have no authority to order these cars to be removed by electric power they could not so order them. But, we have agreed to allow such legislation to go through this House as would place the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Company entirely under the Dominion Railway Board. We have offered to do everything that was fair but we want the two clauses left out of this Bill. We are not going to accept the Bill as it is and we take the ground that the committee have no right to amend the Bill. Therefore, we should be allowed to amend these clauses.

Mr. G. C. WILSON (Wentworth): The remarks of the hon. gentleman for West Hamilton (Mr. Stewart) would lead one to think that we were asking that this road be electrified right away. The town of Dundas is not asking any such thing. The railway company is asking for an extension for twenty-nine years. We, in turn, in the town of Dundas, have asked that it be extended for five years only, and then, if the company comply with the regulations and do what is right by the town, there will be nothing to prevent Parliament further extending the time. Our request is a fair and reasonable one. The matter was well threshed out in the committee. The hon. member for West Hamilton is not interested in this railway, while the town of Dundas is. I have a letter from the mayor of the town, which I shall read. It is as follows:

Dundas, Ont., Canada,
June 23, 1917.

Copy of Resolution.

Whereas, Bill No. 39 respecting T. H. & B. Railway was amended by the Railway Committee of the House of Commons to provide for the termination of the agreement between T. H. & B. Ry. and H. & D. Ry. in November, 1922, and

Whereas, the T. H. & B. Ry. have notified our manufacturers that their freight service will probably be withdrawn in November, 1918, and

Whereas, Bill No. 39 has yet to be passed by the House, and the T. H. & B. have threatened to withdraw the clauses therein relating to said agrement.

Be it resolved,

That this council request our local member, G. C. Wilson, Esq., M.P., to use his best endeavours to prevent the withdrawal of the amended clauses referred to and to have the clauses as amended by the Railway Committee adopted by the House.

And that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to G. C. Wilson, Esq., M.P., and to Richard Blain, Esq., M.P., Chairman of Railway Committee of House of Commons.

Chas. E. Dickson,
Mayor.

Let me further say that this is a threat on the part of the railway company that they will withdraw their freight service. This whole matter was threshed out in the committee. The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway at its inception, wanted $30,000 from the town. That demand was turned down by the people and the railway want to get their hands on our throat again, and practically strangle the town if this House gives them permission to do so. I do not think the House will. I think that the House will agree that it is fair to give a five year extension and if the railway take their cars off the streets and put in their own sidings and so on, appropriate action can be taken. The company do not own a mile of track or a piece of property in the town. They run over the Hamilton and Dundas railway; they do not own a siding, as all the sidings are private. Therefore it is not taking anything away from the company or interfering with their rights, and I hope the committee will agree to this clause as amended.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: If my contentions are right, the railway committee of this House had no right whatever to pass this

amendment. Then I do not think it would be wise for the House to adopt it. If there is any doubt about the right of the committee to amend the Bill in any way, then I do not suppose the House will want to pass the Bill with that amended clause in. Why should we not allow the Bill to stand over until to-night and have legal opinion on it? I have a legal opinion, and your solicitors tell me that the committee had no right to do this. I did not know that this opposition was coming up to-day. The town of Dundas did not say that they were going to oppose the Bill. Mr. Wilson has said all along that the town would be glad if the company would withdraw it, and now to-day I have no one here except myself. There were lawyers in the committee who took the ground that the committee had no right to make the amendment. Mr. Wilson never gave me any idea he would oppose the withdrawing of this clause, and so I think that, to say the least, it is playing a little sharp.

Mr. G. C. WILSON: If there is sharp practice I am not guilty. The Bill was brought up in my absence on Friday. I have no excuse for not being here, but had I known it was coming up I would have been here. I am following the instructions of the town, the only corporation really interested in this matter. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr Stewart) is not interested, as the railway does not run through his constituency. Practically the only reason why he should take an interest in the Bill is that he must be interested in the T. H. and B. more than in the town of Dundas, and I would ask to have the Bill put through as it is.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: I can assure you I am not interested in any way in the T. H. and B. railway. I never had any stock in it and never intend to. I am not interested except that I was asked to allow the Bill to go through in my name, and I agreed. After the Bill had been before the House for some time I was informed that the town of Dundas was going to oppose it. My hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Wilson) and I have always been exceedingly friendly, and I am very sorry that this clash has come up between us. I am interested in this just as any member is interested in a Bill which he undertakes to put through the House; it is his duty to be fair and honest to the persons in whose behalf the Bill is introduced.

Mr. NESBITT: I suggest that we let the Bill stand and let these gentlemen get together.

Mr. G. C. WILSON: I have tried that three times already.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): The committee will notice in the first section of the Bill, which I have just read, a change was made in the date; instead of extending it for the full period it has been extended only until 1922, that is an extension of five years.

Mr. NESBITT: Is that one of the clauses to which the hon. member for Hamilton objects?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Blain): That is the clause now before the committee. The hon. member for Hamilton moves that this clause be struck out, along with another clause that is to come later, clause 2.

Mr. CARROLL: Would not that kill the Bill altogether?

Mr. NESBITT: We do not know anything about the agreement. The members of the Railway Committee who were present when it was discussed no doubt know all about it, but unfortunately I had to go to another committee on that day. I think we had better allow the Bill to stand till we see if we cannot get some more information.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: I am a little surprised at the movement to put the Bill through. No one has had the courage to say that my contention that the committee had no right to make the amendment. Then why should anyone try to shove something through that has no right to go through? Why not allow the Bill to stand over until to-night in order that it may be looked into?

Mr. CARROLL: If I remember rightly, this Bill has been before the committee at five or six sittings, and I do not think our allowing it to stand over until to-night or for two weeks will get us any further, because the parties who could not agree in the committee after five or six sittings are not likely to come together now. As to the legal question which the hon. member for Hamilton brings up, if this Parliament has the right to extend the agreement for twenty-nine years, as the company are asking, I, as a layman, would say that we certainly had the right to extend it for five years.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: Do you contend that this Government have a right to make an agreement to bind me when I am in British Columbia, or somewhere else, and have had nothing to do with the making of it?

Mr. CARROLL: That is what my hon. friend was trying to impose on Dundas. The town did not want to accept twenty-nine years, but the hon. member and his friends were trying to force on the town an agreement which it did not want. My only reason for rising is that as a member of the committee I do not believe that the company should be given any further extension of time in this matter, or that further consideration would get us any further than we are now.

Mr. KNOWLES: While the members of the committee may have had opportunity of familiarizing themselves with this somewhat complicated matter—a matter which is evidently of very great importance—I accept in good faith what the member for Hamilton (Mr. T. J. Stewart) an hon. gentleman in good standing in the House—has said, as indicating that certain things connected with this matter should be considered more thoroughly than members of this committee are capable of considering them. I speak now more particularly of members who did not attend the sittings of the Railway Committee; for if the names were polled it would doubtless be found that not more than half the members of the committee were present at the meetings. For my part, I am quite incapable of expressing anything like an intelligent opinion on this controversial matter without having discussed it or having had an opportunity of looking into it more fully. In deference to the member for Hamilton, and with due regard to the merits of the case, I think that we should let this matter stand for consideration at a future date. This would be only fair to those who are called upon to express an opinion; to do so now would be merely making a shot in the dark. I move, therefore, that further consideration of the Bill be deferred.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: Some hon. gentlemen have said that the committee held four, five or six meetings. I wish to say—and I am sure that no hon. gentleman can successfully contradict me—that the committee really had only one meeting. It is all very fine to say that we had half a dozen meetings, but the rules provide that the quorum of the committee shall consist of a certain number of members, and owing to inability to make a quorum we had only one meeting, and that was the last time the committee was called before the Bill came to the House.

Mr. CARVELL: I feel like seconding the motion of the member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) for this reason: I dislike registering my vote in respect of a matter about which I know nothing whatever. I thought that when the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) took part in the discussion this afternoon, he would give us some explanation of the matter, but unfortunately he did not go far enough to convey anything to my mind. I say frankly that if I were called upon to vote on this Bill I should not know how to vote; I do not know anything about it. I would like to see gentlemen representing the different aspects of the question take sufficient time to explain their respective contentions, so that those who were not in the Railway Committee would be able to vote intelligently on the subject. Otherwise, I suggest that consideration of the matter be deferred until we get the necessary information.

Mr. NICKLE: I shall again endeavour to make myself clear, perhaps taking more time than I originally did. My information concerning the matter is, of course, gained from the records and from the information given to the Railway Committee. Some twenty years ago the town of Dundas entered into an agreement with what I shall term the street railway company. By the terms of that agreement they gave certain rights and privileges over the streets of the town of Dundas to the street railway company for the term of fifty years.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: Agreement for twenty-one years.

Mr. NICKLE: They gave certain rights and privileges to the street railway company for the term of fifty years, as defined by the agreement. At that time it was against the policy of the provincial legislature to permit municipalities to bind themselves for a longer term than twenty-one years. Possibly the member for Hamilton is right in this: that the agreement was stated to be of legal effect for twenty-one years; and that it would become legally binding for the further term of twenty-nine years if legal ratification was secured from the province and from the Dominion. The street railway company then entered into an arrangement with what I shall term the steam railway company, by which they gave running rights and privileges over the

steam railway company for a period of fifty years.

Mr. NESBITT: When was that agreement entered into?

Mr. NICKLE: Very shortly after the original arrangement was made between the town of Dundas and the street railway company.

Mr. CARVELL: Was the town a party to this transaction?

Mr. NICKLE: The town was not a party to that agreement, but there is no doubt that the town was cognizant of the fact that the agreement was being made.

Mr. NESBITT: That is, the agreement between the street railway company and the steam railway company?

Mr. NICKLE: Yes.

Mr. T. J. STEWART: Did not the town of Dundas make the agreement with the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway Company first?

Mr. NICKLE: Yes.

Mr. STEWART: You said that the town was not a party to the agreement.

Mr. NICKLE: I said that the town of Dundas was not a party to the agreement made between the steam railway company and the street railway company; but there is no doubt but that the town of Dundas had knowledge that the agreement was being made and approved.

Mr. KNOWLES: What ground has the hon. gentleman for believing that the municipality was cognizant of the making of the agreement?

Mr. NICKLE: If I may be permitted to finish what I have to say, I shall endeavour to make the matter abundantly clear; I shall then be glad to answer any questions that may be put.

The town of Dundas and the street railway company then made application to the Ontario Legislature for ratification of the agreements between the town of Dundas and the street railway company and between the steam railway company and the street railway company and the provincial legislature ratified the two agreements. The net legal effect of that seems to have been that in so far as the provincial legislature could ratify the agreements they were binding on the steam railway company, the steam railway company, the street railway company, and the town of Dundas. The steam railway company, however, was incorporated by Dominion charter and was therefore amenable to the principles of Dominion law. By the principles of Dominion law at that time, the steam railway company and the street railway company had no right to enter into an agreement for a longer term than twenty-one years. For some reason not explained, neither the town, the steam railway company nor the street railway company ever came to the Dominion Parliament and asked for a ratification of the agreement between the steam railway company and the street railway company. Twenty years have passed; conditions in the town of Dundas have very radically changed. It is admitted by all parties that the agreements were valid as among the three for the term of twenty-one years, but not of legal effect—although not void—for any term beyond the twenty-one years. After the expiration of twenty years the steam railway company comes to this House and asks that the town of Dundas be compelled to recognize the agreement as drawn twenty years ago for a further term of twenty-nine years after the expiration of about one year. The town of Dundas says: no; we were not a party to that agreement between the steam railway company and the street railway company.

Mr. NESBITT: When the street railway company and the steam railway company went to the provincial Government to have the agreement ratified, was the town of Dundas willing that that agreement should be ratified for the term of fifty years?

Mr. NICKLE: I say it concurred in that; it was agreeable, and the agreement was ratified by the provincial legislature for the term of fifty years. But the town of Dundas now says this: the steam railway company, by virtue of its agreement with the street railway company was bound only for the term of twenty-one years. For twenty years they slept on their rights. They now realize they have a good thing, and, although they could have escaped liability at the expiration of twenty-one years if the agreement had been to their disadvantage—their solicitor admitted this when I questioned him—their agreement not having been ratified by this Parliament, they now ask Parliament to make the agreement binding for a futher period of twenty-nine years. The position the Railway Committee took was this: if you wanted that agreement ratified you should have come to Parliament twenty years ago and

obligated yourselves to perform your part of the contract. If through your laches twenty years have passed and you now, because you think it an advantageous privilege, ask Parliament to do what the town does not want you to do, we are not going to impose on the town any limitations or restrictions that are not now acceptable to its people. The steam railroad does not own the tracks; they have no sidings of their own, the sidings being privately owned by companies or individuals; the main track belongs to the street railway company. The citizens of the town are inconvenienced by smoke and noise and life is made unbearable on the main street of the town. The committee said we are not going to do now what the policy of the Dominion Parliament was against at the time the agreement was made: that is, bind the generation of to-day by an arrangement illegally entered into by the generation of twenty years ago. Then the committee were confronted with this problem: The twenty-one-year agreement expires in about one year, and if it is not extended, at the end of about a year the town of Dundas would be deprived of its steam railway connection.

Since the committee said that the agreement should be extended for five years, the steam railway company have notified the town of Dundas that at the expiration of twenty-one years, the legal term, they are going to discontinue the operation of their road in the town of Dundas and then Dundas will have no steam railway connection. The committee said: That is not a fair thing to do, you will have had twenty-one years' use of this franchise in Dundas, and if the town does not want to extend the agreement for 29 years, then you should stand by the agreement for a few years so that all the parties may have an opportunity of adjusting their conditions. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. T. J. Stewart) raises the point—and I can express no legal opinion on it—that the Railway Committee have no right to make a new agreement for the street railway company and the steam railway company; that they have a right only to ratify the original agreement or throw out the Bill. The hon. member says the committee have no right to extend the agreement for four or five years. The steam railway company asked that the original agreement between them and the street railway company should be ratified. The steam railway company says: If you do not ratify the agreement in toto, we will quit in a year. The Railway Committee says: You should do nothing of the sort; under all the conditions you should give the town of Dundas a reasonable service, say for four or five years.

Mr. CARVELL: What does the town say?

Mr. NICKLE: The town says: We want a chance to turn around and make other arrangements; give an extension of the agreement for five years more; then, if the steam railway company are willing to build their own tracks and get off our main street, we are willing to concur in a reasonable arrangement, but the generation of to-day are not willing to be bound for twenty-nine years more owing to the ill-advised arrangement of twenty years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The town of Dundas and the street railway company are both bound by the agreement for fifty years, that having been ratified by the provincial legislature.

Mr. NICKLE: That is, the agreement between the town and the street railway company is made applicable for fifty years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company come here and simply ask that, so far as they are concerned, being a Dominion corporation, this agreement already ratified as to the town and as to the street railway company, shall be ratified by this Parliament as to the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company, and made binding.

Mr. NICKLE: That is not the fact. They ask that an agreement between the street railway company and the steam railway company to which the town was not a party by signature, be made binding for the term of fifty years, and by implication then, it would be binding on the town, and the steam railway company would have the right to run steam cars over the street railway company's tracks for 29 years from the expiration of the 21 year term.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the Ontario legislature not ratified the agreement between the street railway company and the Toronto Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company?

Mr. NICKLE: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We have an agreement between the town and the street railway company ratified by the provincial legislature for fifty years—

Mr. NESBITT: And the town was agreeable to that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes. We have an agreement between the street railway company

and the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company also ratified by the provincial legislature, and made binding as against the street railway company for fifty years. Therefore, we have the provincial legislature, by legislation within its jurisdiction, binding both the town of Dundas and the street railway company for fifty years, but it is alleged that the provincial legislature has no jurisdiction over the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company, it having a Dominion charter. As I understand it, the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company is asking that that agreement be ratified by this Parliament, which ratification will have the effect of making the agreement binding on the three corporations. Has this Parliament any right as against the town of Dundas and as against the street railway company to alter the legislation of the Ontario Legislature? I do not think so, and I would agree at the present time with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. T. J. Stewart) that this Parliament must reject the Bill altogether or else ratify the agreement, it cannot alter the agreement.

Mr. STEWART: The hon. member for St. John is correct in his view. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) attempted to keep back what was favourable to my side of the question. He wanted to think that the town of Dundas had nothing whatever to do with this agreement. The town entered into this agreement with the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway Company, knowing perfectly well that they were going to make a bargain with the steam road. It was understood that these three or four parties were going to enter into this agreement. What difference does it make to the town of Dundas what railroad takes the freight from the Dundas road? The Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway Company made an agreement with the steam railway company before the town passed the by-law asking the legislature for an extension of twenty-nine years. The town of Dundas was pleased with the agreement, and asked the Ontario Legislature to make it binding. Now they come here to-day and object to our withdrawing the Bill. If the Bill goes through with an extension of five years, we will not accept it, but we are willing to permit such legislation to be put through as will place the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company entirely under the control of the Dominion Railway Board, and if they are under that Board, the town of Dundas will surely have no complaint to make. The railway will have to comply with every order issued by the Railway Board, and there can therefore be no unfair treatment. Hon. members will see that there is something that has not been brought to light, because the town made this agreement in good faith, and now because we want our side ratified, and put in the same position as the town of Dundas, they say: No. They are like the dog in the manger; they do not want to eat and they will not let anybody else eat. I appeal to hon. members to allow this Bill to stand over until we get a legal opinion on the matter. I claim that the committee has no right to alter the agreement. Surely hon. gentlemen are not going to press this Bill through to-day if this Parliament has no right to alter the agreement.

Mr. NESBITT: How long after the original agreement is drawn up between the three parties, was it confirmed by the Ontario Legislature?

Mr. STEWART: At the first session of the Ontario Legislature after the agreement was signed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The questions that arise in connection with this Bill seem to be of a somewhat complex character, both so far as the facts are concerned and in respect of the legal questions that have arisen. It is alleged, as I understand it, by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. T. J. Stewart); that the applicant companies have the right either to have the agreement ratified in its entirety or not at all, and that this House has really no jurisdiction to make another agreement between the parties.

That point is emphasized by what was said by the hon. member for St. John. As I understand it, the only change that is made in the agreement by the terms of this Bill is with respect to the time it shall be in force. Under the circumstances it seems to me that the considerations that have been put forward might very well be referred to the Department of Justice for consideration and report. I would, therefore, move that the committee rise and report progress.

4 p.m.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 93, to incorporate The Kenora and English River Railway Company.—Mr. Carrick.

Bill No. 94, to authorize the issue of a patent to James Wallace Tygard.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 95, to incorporate the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and the Children of the Empire (Junior Branch.)—Mr. Macdonell.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterick).

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL McSPADDEN.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has Lieutenant-Colonel McSpadden, of Vancouver, been on the pay-roll of the Government since the outbreak of war?
2. If not, from what date did he begin to draw pay?
3. What amount has he received to date, and what have been his duties?
4. Has the Government hired Lieutenant-Colonel McSpadden's automobile?
5. If so, from what date, and how much has been paid therefor?
6. For what purpose was the said automobile used by the Government?
7. Was the chauffeur of the said automobile a man with military rank?
8. If so, did he receive double pay?
9. Did the said Lieutenant-Colonel McSpadden sell to the Government a site for the drill hall in Grandview at the east end of Vancouver?
10. If so, how much did the Government pay therefor?
11. What is the description of the lots purchased for the site of the said drill hall?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.
2. Answered by 1 and 3.
3. $7,106.35 to 31st May, 1917. Officer commanding 11th Regiment (Home Guard), from 10th August, 1914, to date. Lieutenant-Colonel McSpadden's regiment defended the wireless station at Point Grey. Part of the battalion also defended Prince Rupert in the early days of the war. The force was used for defence on bridges and other public works. He recruited a large portion of the 7th Battalion, 1st Contingent, also 199th Irish Fusiliers, and a large number of drafts of other battalions.
4. No.

5, 6, 7 and 8 answered by 4.

9, 10, 11 refer to the replies given by the Minister of Public Works on the 5th of February last.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—TRACADIE SIDING.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Is there a siding on the Intercolonial Railway at Tracadie, N.S., for the accommodation of one Abram Myatt?
2. If so, when was it built?
3. After being built, was it taken up and the rails removed?
4. If so, were they replaced, and on what date?
5. Why was this siding taken up?
6. Why was it replaced?
7. Did Abram Myatt pay anything to the Intercolonial Railway on account of the said siding?
8. If so, when, and how much?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No. There is a public siding at Mileage 103.1, Mulgrave subdivision.
2. Siding was put in during July, 1916.
3. Rails were not removed, but frog and switch gear was taken up October 10, 1916.
4. Frog and switch gear was replaced on October 18, 1916.
5. Frog and switch gear was required for urgent need, equipping Halifax terminals for handling war supplies overseas.
6. To make the siding again available for use.
7. No.
8. Answered by No. 7.

MR. JOSEPH MAXIMILIAN DANIS.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Is Mr. Joseph Maximilian Danis an employee in any part of the Government service?
2. If so, when was he appointed?
3. Was he appointed a messenger on the House of Commons' staff?
4. If so, what pay per day did he receive?
5. Was he ever employed in the Department of Inland Revenue?
6. If so, for how long?
7. Is Mr. Danis now Preventive Officer at North Battleford?
8. If so, what is his rate of pay per annum?
9. Is Mr. Danis also acting as Food Inspector in the province of Saskatchewan?
10. If so, what salary is he drawing as Food Inspector?
11. Is Mr. Danis a returned soldier?

Mr. SEVIGNY:

1. Yes.
2. March 22, 1917.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. Yes.
6. From January 8 to March 22, 1917.
7. Yes.
8. $1,200.
9. Yes.
10. $600.
11. No.

MAJOR ALFRED LEFEBVRE.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Has the Government since the 3rd of May last demanded the reimbursement of the separation allowance alleged to have been overpaid to the wife of Major Alfred Lefebvre?
2. If so, what has been the result of such demand?
3. Is the Government aware as to whether or not the said Major Alfred Lefebvre, whose

wife may have unduly received the said separation allowance from August, 1916, to April, 1917, is in the service of the Government as Assistant Collector for Inland Revenue at Valleyfield, at the salary of $1,200 per annum?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Refund was demanded on May 2.

2. No result so far, but matter being pressed.

3. Captain Lefebvre signed an application for separation allowance, in which he stated that he had not been employed by the Dominion Government since 1st June, 1916. On reference to Department of Inland Revenue, it was learned that he drew full pay as deputy collector at Valleyfield, Quebec, during February, March, April and May, 1916, when he appears to have left the Civil Service.

MR. ARMAND LAVERGNE.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Has Armand Lavergne been appointed by this Government to obtain recruits or in any other military capacity?

2. If so, when and by whose order was he so appointed, what rank does he hold, and what pay does he receive?

3. How much money, if any, has been paid to the said Armand Lavergne for military services since the war began?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. None.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

RELEASE OF EDWARD LEVI BAUGH.

Mr. MURPHY moved:

For a copy of the reports made by the Trial Judge and the Penitentiary Surgeons in connection with the release from penitentiary of Edward Levi Baugh.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no objection to producing these papers except the judge's report.

Mr. MURPHY: Very well.

Motion as amended agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MORNING SITTINGS DEFERRED.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That on and from Tuesday the 26th instant, and until the end of the session, the House shall meet each day at 11 o'clock in the morning, and that in addition to the usual intermission at 6 o'clock, p.m., there shall be an intermission from one to three o'clock, p.m.

He said: In view of the considerable amount of business still before the House, and in view also of the apparently lengthy debate upon the Compulsory Service Bill, as to which of course there is no desire to prevent the fullest possible discussion, perhaps my right hon. friend would have no objection to the passing of this motion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My right hon. friend has alluded to the very important debate on the Compulsory Service Bill. I think nobody will complain of the length of the speeches that have been made or say that the debate has not served a useful purpose. I would ask my right hon. friend to let this motion stand at least until the debate on the Compulsory Service Bill has been concluded. After ample latitude has been given to every hon. member to speak on this Bill I shall have no objection to facilitating the business of the House as much as possible.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not want to be understood as complaining of the debate as it has proceeded; I am not speaking in a critical way at all; I think it has been a useful debate. My object in making this motion was to afford even greater opportunity to hon. members who desire to speak on the Bill. I could hardly undertake to let the motion stand until the debate is concluded because that might be a very large order indeed. I will, however, let it stand for the present and renew it perhaps in a couple of days. In the meantime we may ascertain what are the probabilities of concluding the debate within a reasonable period under present conditions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Very well.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (St. John): I desire to interpose a very strong objection to having morning sessions. They are all right in the case of a parliament which rises at six o'clock in the evening, but this House sits until eleven and twelve, and if necessary, one o'clock in the morning. I think it is unfair to expect members who have attended the evening sessions to be present again in the morning at eleven o'clock. It has an injurious effect upon their health. I know that the attendance at morning sittings after a late night is very wearing upon one's health.

To hold morning sittings now would prevent the committees, including the Committee on Public Accounts, from discharging their duties. It is customary to have morning sittings only when the end of the session is in sight, and when, as my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has suggested, it is the general sense of the House

that it is desirable to get through. Now, we are led to believe, not only by what has been stated by the leader of the House, but also by what we see in the newspapers, that there is a very considerable amount of public business still to be considered, including some which has not yet been brought down. This indicates that it is too early to begin the morning sittings. I voice my own protest against such a proposal; I do not think it wise to begin the morning sittings at this stage of the session, for it will prevent members of the House from fairly and properly discharging their public duties.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There will be opportunity to take into consideration what has been said when this motion is renewed. But meantime, I would point out that forenoon sittings are by no means a new departure in this Parliament. I have been familiar with them, and have had to endure them for many years in the past. Even since I entered this House twenty-one years ago, there has hardly been a session in which forenoon sittings have not been in vogue at some time, and often they have begun at an earlier stage of the session than this. The reason which the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has advanced seems to me not against but rather in favour of the proposal; for, if there is, as he suggests, a great deal of public business still to be considered, there is a stronger case than there otherwise would be for beginning morning sittings at the earliest day. However, we will let the matter stand for the moment, and of course my hon. friend will have the right to renew his objections when the subject is again before the House.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would suggest that, especially if we are to have morning sittings, the adjournment at six o'clock should be until nine instead of until eight. That will not interfere with the progress of business. Adjournment only from six to eight means pretty rapid dining and a hurried return to the House. I think it would be better all around to make the hour nine o'clock.

Mr. NESBITT: My suggestion is that, no matter at what time we meet, we should adjourn not later than 11 o'clock in the evening. Let us not have any of these sittings until two o'clock in the morning.

Motion stands.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

ADJOURNMENT FOR DOMINION DAY.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That when this House adjourns on Friday, the 29th day of June next, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 3rd day of July.

He said: The second of July has been set apart for very important ceremonies in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, and it seems quite appropriate that we should adjourn on that day.

Motion agreed to.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Consideration of the motion of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto, and on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barrette, resumed from Friday, June 22.

Hon. Sir EDWARD KEMP (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, since this war began the Canadian army in France has taken part in a good many difficult battles and has won for itself great credit and has brought great honour to Canada. The victory which seems to have attracted particular attention of late is Vimy Ridge. I have to-day received from Lord Beaverbrook the following letter:

Historical Section
Canadian War Records Office,
14 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1,
June 8th, 1917.

The Rt. Hon. Sir A. E. Kemp, K.C.M.G., M.P.,
Minister of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir Edward,—

I am sending you by registered post, under separate cover, to-day, two copies of an "Order of the Day," published by Field Marshal Sir Douglas Haig after the battle of Vimy Ridge. You will notice that he placed the capture of Vimy Ridge first in the Order. I have had these prepared on parchment and signed personally by Sir Douglas Haig. I suggest that one of them might be made use of in the House of Commons, Ottawa.

Will you kindly let me know if you receive these in due course, and if you approve of their form.

Yours faithfully,
Beaverbrook.

The special Order of the Day referred to is not long, and I am sure hon. members will be glad to hear it read. After reading it, I will lay it on the Table, and I would suggest that perhaps the Clerk of the House may have it framed that it may be preserved:

Special Order of the Day
By
Field-Marshal Sir Douglas Haig,
GC.B., G.C.V.O., K.C.I.E.,
Commander-in-Chief, British Armies in France.

The Field-Marshal Commanding-in-Chief desires to express to all ranks his great satisfaction on the important successes achieved on the 9th instant by the First and Third Armies. The manner in which the operations were prepared and carried out reflects the greatest credit on commanders, staffs and troops.

The capture of the renowned Vimy Ridge is an achievement of the highest order of which Canada may well be proud.

The performance of the VI, VII and VIII Corps of the Third Army in surmounting the difficulties which confronted them is proof of very great skill and gallantry.

The Royal Artillery, Heavy, Siege and Field, by its untiring efforts and accurate fire, prepared the way for and supported the advance of the infantry in the most efficient manner.

The splendid work of the Royal Flying Corps under very adverse weather conditions and in face of most determined opposition has contributed largely to the success of the operations and calls for the highest praise.

The heavy branch of the Machine Gun Corps has been of material assistance and has, under difficult circumstances, played a useful part.

The Cavalry Corps and Corps Mounted Troops have taken the fullest advantage of such openings for cavalry action as the course of the operations has so far afforded.

The Royal Engineers, both in the field and in their work behind the line, have carried out their many duties with the thoroughness and efficiency in which they are never found wanting; while all the various special corps and services which took part in the battle, as well as the administrative services, and departments on which the armies depend for their maintenance, have taken their full share in bringing within reach the great success gained.

The Second, Fourth and Fifth Armies have played their part admirably in keeping the enemy employed on their respective fronts, while to the Fourth and Fifth Armies in particular belongs the credit of having opened the way for these fresh successes by their splendid achievements on the Somme and the Ancre.

The Commander-in-Chief desires to convey his warmest congratulations to all ranks of the armies which he has the honour to command on the great success already achieved by their untiring and self-sacrificing efforts, and on the prospects of further successes which have been opened.

D. Haig, F.M.

General Headquarters,
12th April, 1917.

In resuming this debate, I think there is more than one reason why we should approach the subject in a serious frame of mind. In the first place, we have sent overseas a tremendous army of over 330,000 troops, and the losses due to the war among these troops have been the cause of great hardship and suffering. Another reason is that there is a great difference of opinion in this House itself with respect to the course we desire to pursue. In the South African war we were very pleased and proud that even a small army volunteered to go overseas in support of a great principle. We were proud that we had men in this country who were brave, who were venturesome, who were patriotic, who were willing to volunteer for service on that occasion, and who thereby brought credit to their country.

When we look back to the time previous to August 1914 and consider what was in our minds then, when we consider the peace which prevailed not only in Canada but all over the world and when we remember the blessing of peace, we cannot but feel that if any one had predicted that by this time we would have recruited an army of over 400,000 and sent overseas an army of over 330,000, we would have said that the person responsible for such a prediction was hardly in a sane state of mind. Yet, that has been done by this country. That is one of the reasons why, taken in connection with the incidents to which I have referred, we should now be serious in respect to the discussion of this question.

The question before the House is whether there should be a new form of recruiting, whether we should go on in the old way or proceed by the system of the selective draft and it is on this point that there appears to be a wide difference of opinion. For myself I do not see why there should be any great difference of opinion. We are trying to meet existing conditions and I believe that this Bill will meet the conditions and give a fair measure of satisfaction in so far as enlistment is concerned. There has been a very strong feeling existing in many parts of the country in regard to what has taken place in the past and in regard to the method of recruiting which was adopted. Great pressure has been brought to bear on members of both sides of this House to formulate some system or scheme. Some members of this House during vacation, as well as during the time Parliament has been sitting, have visited the trenches in France and they have come back and told us many things which were interesting and many things upon which we might base our judgment in respect to future operations in regard to the carrying on of the war. I wish that some of my hon. friends in this House who are opposing this Bill could visit certain parts of the country and hear what fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers and orphans have to say and how they feel re-

garding the voluntary system on which we have been relying. In referring to that, I desire to say that it has performed its part, it has done good service and it was the only system which we could have proceeded upon, and I approve of it in so far as that is concerned. But, I wish some hon. gentlemen who are opposing the Bill could go among the people where the recruiting has been heaviest and hear what they have to say about the inequalities and injustices of voluntary enlistment. If they did this they would come back to this House with an entirely different opinion in respect to the Bill which is now under consideration.

This is no time for recrimination in this house. In the heat of debate sharp words pass from one side to the other and that has been the custom from time immemorial. At the present time, however, I feel that this should be absent from this discussion. There are no politics in this question, there is no room for politics or political advantage in any shape or form. I regret that there were no means found by which the coalition arrangement which was proposed could have been brought to a successful conclusion. As far as I am concerned, and I think I can speak for my colleagues, there was no one who criticised the proposal of the Prime Minister in saying to our opponents that he would let them have half the seats in the Cabinet. There was never any criticism raised in regard to that proposal of the Prime Minister and I believe that if it had been carried out it would have resulted in great advantage. Now that it has not been carried out, we must proceed to work out this problem in the best way possible in order to help to win the war. We cannot fail to admire the splendid exhibition of unanimity of feeling in regard to the method they have adopted in the United States with reference to enlistment. I wish we could feel in this country that we had advanced as they have advanced in that regard. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in speaking to the motion, seemed to pay a good deal of attention to incidents spread over the last century but which did not seem to me to have very much bearing on the present situation. He referred also at some length, as did other speakers, to the question of the meaning of the Militia Act introduced into this House by his Government in 1904 and amended in that year. It was pointed out by himself, as it has been by other members of this House, that under this Act we could not send troops outside of the borders of this country to fight. I do not think that it is a very important matter for discussion as to whether that Act permitted us to do that or not. We have sent troops outside of the country and both sides have approved of the course which has been taken. However, it might be useful to refer to the Militia Act, 1904, and while opinions have been given to the House, and while the opinion of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, the Minister of Justice of that day, seemed to set aside the theory propounded by the leader of the Opposition, yet there are some other opinions which to my mind are more important than any of the opinions that were given to the House. I am surprised that the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), who is learned in the law, and other hon. members, have failed to bring to the attention of the House a very important opinion to which I am about to refer. While I say I do not think it is very important whether the Militia Act, 1904, for which the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, as he was then in power, is responsible, permitted us to send troops out of Canada or not, we might as well understand what that Act really did mean. I have no hesitation in concluding that it meant that we could send troops out of the country and that it was designed for that very thing. Since this war began a very important judgment was rendered by a jurist of high authority. I am sure that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) will recognize the gentleman to whom I am going to refer as a very high authority because he not only bears his name but is considered to be one of the most eminent jurists to be found in the province of Quebec. Before this gentleman, Sir Francois Lemieux, there came a habeas corpus proceeding for the purpose of releasing Felix Pierre Fournier, private in the 171st battalion, directed to the officer commanding the battalion. The object of the proceeding was to have Private Fournier freed or discharged from service on the ground, among others, that Private Fournier's enlistment in a corps which was to be sent out of Canada was null and void because the Parliament of Canada had no power to create or organize an Expeditionary Force for service out of Canada. In Canadian Criminal Cases Reports, 1915-16, on page 415, is to be found a judgment of Sir Francis Lemieux, Chief Justice of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec. I shall read that part of the judgment which has reference to this particular case:

Another of petitioner's contentions is that Private Fournier's enlistment in the Expeditionary Force, i.e., in a corps which is to be sent abroad and merged with the English troops, is null, seeing that the Canadian Parliament is not vested with the necessary power or jurisdiction to create or organize such expeditionary forces and is legally empowered but to deal with the defence of the country.

And we have been cited section 91 of the B.N.A. Act, which reads as follows:: "It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Canada. . . . The exclusive authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters concerning . . . 7. Militia, military and naval service and defence."

Such is the section of our constitution pointed to when it is contended that militia and military service are to be made use of for the defence of the country only and not to act as an auxiliary force for the benefit of another country.

On the other hand the Militia Act (R.S.C. ch. 41, Sec. 69) enacts that the Governor in Council may place the militia or any part thereof on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

On this particular point, it will not be amiss to repeat with the most noteworthy of our public men, among whom are authorities of some repute on constitutional law, that from the moment Great Britain is at war, her colonies are equally at war. The fact that the Allies have captured all of Germany's colonies since the opening of hostilities is a striking case in point.

In my humble opinion, the defence of Canada implies not only the power to safeguard the territory itself and the lives and property of Canadians, it further includes the faculty recognized in international law to prevent, by all legitimate means, the invasion, ruin and sacking of the country, in attacking the enemy in his own country, pursuing him everywhere, destroying his resources, giving him no rest until he be reduced to utter powerlessness. The very legitimate necessity of opposing an onslaught quite naturally justifies the attack of the enemy in his own country or wherever he may seek refuge. It often is by taking the offensive, attacking and invading, that the defence of one's own country may be better attended to. It would indeed be imprudent, if not utterly reckless, for a country at war, to be content with a defensive strategy and to refrain from hostilities until the country were invaded and sacked.

Surely, it is useless to insist; it is obvious that Canada has the unquestionable constitutional right to raise troops and to send them overseas for the defence of the Empire, which defence embraces and guarantees that of Canada herself. The enlistment in an expeditionary corps is therefore legal and valid.

That is the part of the judgment of Sir Francis Lemieux which has reference to the point to which I have referred. As I have said, I do not think that the Militia Act as amended in 1904 need be discussed at any great length in its bearing on this point. It is clear to my mind that in the amendment of the Act made in 1904 it was intended that troops might be sent out of Canada, in accordance with my argument. If the argument of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should be correct, Canada would never have any enemies to invade her if they proceeded on this theory, because then what country would go outside its own borders? So it seems to me from that standpoint also, his argument falls to the ground.

Reference was also made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition to the fact that we in Canada need not fear invasion from Germany; but that if there was an invasion we would be visited with German insolence, cruelties and barbarities. That is no doubt true. If Germany invaded Canada we would have the same kind of insolence, cruelties and barbarities that she has visited upon Belgium and France. If we have not been subjected to those things it has been because of the assistance we ourselves have rendered in France, and because the armies of France and Britain met the enemy in France, and also because of the dominance of the British navy which guaranteed that Britain is still mistress of the seas. I do not believe in the theory that when we see the enemy just outside the three mile limit, or just beyond our borders on land, preparing to attack Canada, we should not proceed to attack him. It seems to me that there is very little indeed in such an argument.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and other speakers have referred to a referendum, and my right hon. friend has moved an amendment providing for one on the question whether or not this Bill should be enforced. The right hon. gentleman asks, why should we not have a referendum? We have votes for soldiers. A Bill was passed providing that our soldiers might vote and that they could vote. At the time this Bill was passed, there were a great many soldiers in Canada who, under the Bill, would be allowed to vote, and very few soldiers at the front. Exactly the reverse condition exists to-day; there are very few soldiers in Canada, and a tremendous number at the front and in England. Can one conceive of anything more distasteful to the soldier himself when fighting in this struggle for his life and existence than to have such a question brought to his attention and have a ballot box stuck under his nose in the trenches if, in fact, such a thing would be allowed? Therefore it seems to me that our soldiers who are fighting so valiantly would be put

under a tremendous handicap in respect to a referendum, in the first place in reference to the secrecy of the ballot. Every slacker might vote quietly and secretly, and as the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has said, vote against the Bill coming into operation.

Another serious handicap would be the alien enemy vote, which no doubt would be of some consequence. We would, therefore, handicap our soldiers at the front by loading this referendum up with, first, a secret ballot, second, the slacker vote, and third, the alien enemy vote.

I have referred to voluntary recruiting. I believe that it has served a most excellent purpose. We have raised a tremendous army under it, but we desire now to improve the conditions under which enlistment takes place, and to adopt the selective draft system instead. The selective draft is also needed at the present time for the purpose of furnishing more troops to be sent to the front. I believe that such a proposal as this would have been necessary even if voluntary recruiting had kept pace with what it was in the earlier part of the war, because of the injustices, the inequalities, and the haphazard methods of voluntary enlistment, which have burned themselves into the hearts of the people of this country. I desire to point out some of these injustices. Reference has been made to the coercive tendency of this Bill. Can any one imagine a worse form of coercion than that which has existed in some of the towns and cities of this country under the system which has been in vogue and of which we have all approved in the past? A young man would, perhaps, be buttonholed two or three times a day, perhaps ostracised in some sections of the society in which he moved, because he had not joined the forces. There may have been reasons, there doubtless have been many reasons, why that young man had not been able to go to the front, perhaps some physical infirmity which was not known to his friends. I say that, so far as coercion is concerned, there is no worse form of coercion than that which has dogged many young men in this country, and this is one of the things that has ripened public opinion for something better.

In all parts of the country those who have taken an active part in recruiting are in favour of some form of a selective draft system.

I should like to mention to the House a few instances that have come to my attention; I have heard of hundreds of similar cases. About 15 or 20 miles from Ottawa, at Kars, Ontario, live Mr. and Mrs. Cyrus Scobie. Six of their sons have enlisted, and the seventh, who is a doctor, is taking out a commission in the Army Medical Corps. Five of the sons have gone overseas and have seen active service at the front; of these, two have won commissions since their enlistment. I noticed in a local newspaper the record of the family of Mr. and Mrs. Denis Carrigan, of Westville, N.S. Six of their sons have enlisted; all have proceeded overseas; three have been wounded. The seventh son was debarred from service on account of weak eyesight. A friend of mine in Toronto, Mr. Lockhart Gordon, has four sons, who have all enlisted. These young men all had promising careers in civil life. One was killed, one is missing, and one is severely injured and incapacitated for further service. The remaining son is in command of a battalion at the front. I could cite hundreds of cases of a similar character.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Suppose four sons had gone and one was left at home, could that son be forcibly taken under this Bill?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I suppose he could be; but the tribunal—

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is no exception for him.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The tribunal, which will be free from any political or other influence of an unfair character, will settle that matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It could not, under this Bill.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Absolutely.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Absolutely not. Exemption is to be granted only on account of important financial obligations, family ties or things of that sort.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I disagree with my hon. friend, but I shall not now stop to argue the matter with him, and for this reason: the Prime Minister said more than once since this Bill was introduced that he would welcome suggestions, from members on the opposite side or from any one in the House, that are made with a view to improving this Bill. That is what the Prime Minister said, and I stand by what he said.

Compulsory service under the system proposed will do away with unjust and unfair treatment; I believe that enlistment under this law will be more popular than enlist-

ment has recently been under the voluntary method.

I wish to point out that in the month of May the total enlistments amounted to 6,407. Of this number enlistments in the railway construction and forestry corps were 1,842; in the artillery, 955; in the infantry, 1,208; miscellaneous, 2,402—" miscellaneous " meaning such corps as cavalry, engineers, Army Medical Corps, Army Dental Corps, Army Service Corps, and various branches of the service, numbering about twenty-three in all.

Mr. MACDONALD: When was recruiting for the artillery stopped?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I was just coming to that. Recruiting for the artillery was stopped a week or ten days ago, the reason being that there were more recruits for artillery in Canada and in England than were needed. The artillery seems to attract recruits more than some of the other branches of the military service; it is one of the popular branches. Under the voluntary system the man who wishes to join the army selects the corps or unit in which he wants to serve.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Those who have enlisted for the artillery would hardly go to England until they had a year's drilling. Is the stoppage of recruiting for the artillery only temporary, or is it permanent?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The stoppage is temporary, until we get caught up. We have a surplus of artillery.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In Canada?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: In Canada, and also in England.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister say that when a man voluntarily enlists for service in the Imperial army he cannot be transferred to any other part of the service?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: They can be transferred to any part of the service, but when they go voluntarily into a certain branch of the service we have to keep faith with them. We cannot say: although you enlisted in the artillery, we shall use some sort of influence to get you into the infantry —I do not think that is fair. What is needed at the front more than anything else is infantry; that is what the authorities overseas are crying out for. Of the 6,407 who enlisted in May, only 1,208 were infantry. I have given a little time and attention to this matter, because it seems to me that it is a point which has been overlooked in the discussion of this Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister says that the English authorities are crying out for infantry.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Our own authorities overseas.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That would be in writing, would it not? Can the minister submit to the House any communications showing that it is infantry that they are crying out for?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I have not any written information here, but I may tell the hon. gentleman that the communications we have had from Great Britain indicate that they need infantry.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Prime Minister has informed the House that it is railway construction and forestry corps that they are crying out for.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Yes, he told the truth when he said that. They do want forestry and railway construction corps. I understand that lately some of our forestry men have been going to France; a great many of them are also employed in England. It is true that they need men for these branches of the service as well.

It is contended by some that we should not now have conscription or selective draft because in the early stages of the war some one said that conscription would not be necessary; that there would be no conscription. A good many things were said and thought in the early stages of the war about matters which have been vastly changed by the war's duration. The whole situation has changed because of the unexpected length of the war.

An authority who recently came over from Great Britain to the United States said that the war is only beginning, and it would be rash for anyone to predict when it will end. Out of a population of 1,583,000 of military age such as we have in Canada, 100,000 men fit for military service seem to be but a small quota and would, if they were carefully selected cause very little inconvenience to the industries of the country. About a year ago at this time there was a marked decrease in voluntary enlistment. As the figures have already been placed upon Hansard, I will not take up the time of the House in referring to them again. For several months past the number of enlistments has varied from 5,000 to 7,000 a month, there being a spurt every now and

then because of special efforts that were put forth.

Mr. MACDONALD: On April 28, the minister stated that the Government had not, up to that time, considered the question either of introducing conscription into Canada or of putting into force the terms of the Militia Act. When did the Government first consider the question of introducing conscription, and when did they first come to a decision?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I would refer the hon. member to the statement made in this House by the Prime Minister in the first speech which he made after he returned from England. He is the authority on that point.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister, as Minister of Militia, made a definite statement in the House on April 28, that, up to that date, the Government had not considered the question of conscription. When did they first consider it?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The Prime Minister first introduced the question of conscription into this House. I must ask my hon. friend to ask the Prime Minister when he first considered that question and when the Government first considered it.

Mr. MACDONALD: You are the Minister of Militia and you ought to know.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The Prime Minister first introduced that question into the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then I understand the Prime Minister introduced the question into this House, and the Government considered it afterwards. That is the inference.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I am quite willing to leave my hon. friends from St. John and Pictou to fight the matter out with the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The minister is making a speech and it is only by courtesy that he has been answering questions.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Many of my friends from Quebec have made statements in regard to recruiting in that province, and I think it best to be frank and to make as clear a statement as possible in regard to the matter. I desire to discuss the matter without giving the slightest offence to my hon. friends from Quebec, and I am sure they will understand that. Every method of recruiting that was adopted in other parts of the country was adopted in Quebec. I have a statement here which shows that recruiting reached the highest point in March of last year when the number was 32,819. The reason that recruiting was more successful in other parts of the country than in Quebec was because the whole population, men, women and children, became interested in recruiting; every one, clergyman as well as sportsman, politician and member of Parliament, all put his shoulder to the wheel and recruiting received such an impetus, nothing could stop it. My hon. friends from Quebec will know best whether or not those conditions existed in their province; I am not going to attempt to say what conditions existed in their province, because that would be presumption on my part. If they did not exist in Quebec, the success in recruiting would not be as great as in other parts of the country, and as a matter of fact, it was not.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: The war commenced on the 4th of August, 1914, and the mayor of Montreal had a resolution passed on the 5th of August stating that all employees of the city of Montreal who enlisted for overseas service would be paid their salaries while they were absent. In other provinces, that was not done. In Quebec we have done many things like that to encourage recruiting. Did the Government take that action in connection with civil servants?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: So far as the Government is concerned, they do pay the salaries of civil servants who have enlisted.

Mr. MARTIN: Did they take that action before the 5th of August?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I do not know, but I think they did so pretty early in the war.

Mr. MARTIN: I did it before the Government.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) questioned the correctness of a return which I laid on the table of the House in regard to the number of enlistments of British-born, Canadian-born, speaking the English language, and Canadian-born speaking the French language. He did not think that return could be correct because he had noticed in the casualty lists the names of a great many French Canadians. I do not think my hon. friend, as a lawyer, can claim that that is sufficient evidence to bring forward to show that the return in question is incorrect. During all the time that I have been in this House, I do not

think I have ever before heard of the correctness of a return laid on the Table being questioned. That return, so far as I know, is absolutely correct; that is to say, it is as nearly correct as it is possible to have such a return correct. I shall be very glad to have this matter discussed in committee. The exact figures are these:

Number of soldiers born in Canada and speaking the English language who had gone overseas on the 30th of April last, 125,245; number of British subjects, born outside of Canada, who had gone overseas on the 30th of April last, 155,095; number of French Canadian soldiers commanded by officers speaking the French language, serving with units organized in the province of Quebec, 5,443; number of soldiers speaking the French language, commanded by officers speaking the English language, belonging to units organized in the province of Quebec, 1,536; 1,217 is the number of soldiers speaking the French language said to have been with the first contingent at Valcartier. I have allowed three-quarters of those as coming from the province of Quebec. That would make 913. Total number of French Canadians enlisted in Quebec who had gone overseas up to the 30th of April, 1917, 7,892.

The number of French Canadians, including Acadians, enlisted throughout Canada was 5,904. This made a total of 14,100. I can assure my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), who raised this question in the House, that the greatest possible care was taken in compiling this return, and the figures are as approximately correct as they can be.

Mr. CARVELL: What was the number of French Canadians and Acadians who enlisted in the province of New Brunswick?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The return does not show that.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Upon what information does the department rely in determining the language spoken by the soldiers? For instance, I know a good many French Canadians by the name of Fraser, Warren, McKenzie, and so on, who speak the French language only.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: It is a very long story, and I shall be very glad to go into it thoroughly and to answer any other questions relative to these matters when we are in committee.

My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) referred to a certain recruiting officer in Montreal known as the Rev. Major C. A. Williams. He thought it was unreasonable to have a Methodist clergyman recruiting amongst French Canadians in Montreal. I believe the hon. member for Rouville and this clergyman are old friends and on intimate terms.. The Rev. Major C. A. Williams was not appointed for the purpose of recruiting amongst
5 p.m. French Canadians. An attempt was made to get certain clergy of the Roman Catholic church in the province of Quebec to co-operate in recruiting, but these effects did not meet with success. I repeat that Major Williams was not appointed for the purpose of recruiting amongst the French Canadians. He is a gentleman of very high standing in Montreal, and has done splendid recruiting work amongst the English-speaking population there. There have always been attempts to form committees and associations to help recruiting. The last attempt —and some reference has been made to this —was made by an officer of very high repute indeed, General Lessard. Accompanied by Colonel Blondin he started a campaign for recruits in the province of Quebec. Both of them canvassed many parts of the province, and their efforts were rewarded by the enlistment of 221 soldiers, made up as follows:

Recruits obtained in the province of Quebec	92
Transfers from Winnipeg, Calgary and Edmonton	90
Transfers from other units, men who were left behind in hospital and afterwards got well	74
	256
Number of discharged and transferred..	35
Net result	221

General Lessard and Colonel Blondin put up a splendid campaign, and I have no doubt that General Lessard's influence was of great value in securing recruits from that province. Lieutenant-Colonel A. M. Labelle of the 64th Regiment also did his best to secure recruits. As results were not as good as anticipated, the officers of all French Canadian regiments were authorized to recruit, and they did so. A return will be brought down in a few days giving the names of the officers engaged in recruiting in the province of Quebec and the amounts paid to them; there has been a little delay in getting the return compiled. These officers did their best to get recruits for the different regiments and for the drafts that went overseas.

Mr. MARTIN: The hon. gentleman mentioned Colonel Labelle. Does he know that this gentleman has three sons, and not one of them has gone to the front?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I am not personally acquainted with him.

Mr. MARTIN: He has not sent one of his three sons to the front.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I should like to say a word or two with reference to the Home Defence scheme which was announced on March 6, 1917. As hon. gentlemen know, there has been talk from time to time in this country of men enlisting for home defence who would not care to go overseas, and it has been suggested more than once that some scheme whereby men could enlist for home defence only would meet with considerable success. The militia force in Canada has become almost less than a skeleton, if that were possible, since the war began. Practically all the officers and men of the militia who were medically fit have gone overseas, and there is now only a very limited force in Canada. The overseas authorities had asked us to send troops over to England while the daylight was short and the submarines had less chance of operating successfully. When that request came we had about 50,000 Canadian Expeditionary Force troops in Canada, and we determined to send them over. It was felt, however, that we should have some defence force in Canada. That has always been the policy in this country, and it has been the policy of this Government ever since the war started, it being impossible to leave a country without troops in time of war. Because of this request for troops from the overseas authorities, and because of the depleted condition of the militia force in Canada, and because of the general idea that there were a great many men in this country who would enlist for home defence but not for overseas service—because we all know that it was largely through the efforts of the militia force that such splendid results in recruiting were secured—it was thought desirable to institute this campaign as a last new effort in voluntary recruiting. Side by side with that a campaign was carried on for overseas enlistments. It was thought that enlistments for home defence would stimulate enlistment for overseas, but it was found that the young men did not enlist in the home defence force except in a very limited number indeed. Only city battalions were authorized, and it was thought desirable not to interfere more than was absolutely necessary with the employment of men in agriculture.

Mr. OLIVER: When was the campaign for home defence begun?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: It was authorized on the 15th March, 1917. Since that time however, the United States has come into the war, and the necessity for home defence, of course, has lessened.

Now the question of reinforcements is of importance. A statement has been laid on the Table showing the summary strength of all units of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in England, and a sufficient number of copies have been printed for the use of hon. members. This shows the strength of these forces as on 14th May, 1917. A good many members, in looking at that table, have been surprised at the number of our troops in England on that date, the total being 126,241. That seems like a very considerable army for this country to have in England. But when we note how the troops are divided into the different categories, and units, we see how it is that there are so few men, comparatively, for the infantry and ready for the trenches. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), in introducing the Bill, went into this matter very carefully, and explained the make-up of the different categories, here entitled A, B, C, D and E, and showed how these were subdivided in the different units, 23 in number, and how these were further subdivided. I need not elaborate these figures. No doubt, when the Bill is in committee, hon. members will have further questions to ask—

Mr. PUGSLEY: As I understood the Prime Minister, he did not explain the matter in the way suggested by the Minister of Militia. He said that there were a large number in England, but gave as the reason that they still required training before being sent to the trenches.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: If the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) will refer to the speech of the Prime Minister on introducing the Bill on the 11th June he will see that the right hon. gentleman explained the matter fully, and will get a full understanding of how these units are subdivided.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When it is said that a large number of men are not available, that might be explained in different ways. It might be, for instance, that the men had become invalided. I would like to

know how many are supposed to be fit for military service and how many are delayed owing to the need of further training.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: There is delay for various reasons. There are 28,000 at present in England in a category, who are ready to go to France.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How many of these are in the infantry?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I have not the details before me. I wish to refer to something that was said by some hon. gentlemen opposite as to retarding enlistment. Enlistment has not been retarded; enlistment by voluntary methods is going on today, as it has gone on from the beginning of the war. So far as I know, no attempt was ever made to retard it.

My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) suggested that we might pursue the voluntary system further. But the reason against this course is that which I have suggested to the House—that we cannot select the unit into which we desire to have the men go, and consequently they go into the most popular branches of the service, and the infantry is left without sufficient troops. Besides, the difficulty arises that men are taken from occupations where they are needed, leaving at home men who could be spared for the front. It seems to me the time has come when all this should be regulated. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) is pessimistic. He fears that there will be inequality in the administration of the measure, that there will be "discrimination, favouritism, and patronage." It seems to me that such a thing is imposible, considering the way the tribunals are formed and the safeguards that are thrown around the administration of the measure.

The sorrows and grievances attendant upon our participation in the war, and which are incident thereto, reflect themselves doubtless to a greater extent than in any other place in the department over which I have the honour to preside. From this position one can look out over the whole theatre. One sees the obstacles to be overcome, he sees the heartburnings, and realizes that the greater part of the people of this country harbour deep convictions in their hearts regarding many aspects of the war. A sentiment, I believe, has developed in this country which speaks in thunder tones. It asks that the lives of those who have been sacrificed shall not be spent in vain; that the sorrows of the mothers, the fathers, the brothers and the sisters, the orphans, shall not go for naught. This sentiment is deeper in the hearts of the people in those parts of the country which have sent the most soldiers to the front.

The contestants are now engaged in a life and death struggle. Owing to a great extent to the Russian situation, the combat is now more fierce than at any time since 1914, the burden having fallen upon the mother countries of the two great races in Canada.

Those who have been at the front, and who have written both poetry and prose, reflect more keenly the situation than can any words that I might utter. The poem read in the House by the hon. member for South Wellington, "In Flanders Fields" will have more influence upon this country than the writer ever imagined. Several of such poems and writings have come into my possession, and I feel that they convey to the hearts and minds of the people deeper thoughts than could any words of mine. I desire to read two references to the war. The probability is that hon. members have already read them. They are not poetry like the contribution read by my hon. friend from South Wellington, written by a friend of his own, Jack McCrae. Perry Robinson, telegraphing from British headquarters in France, describes at length the horrible desolation of Vimy Ridge. Referring to the Canadian cemetery there, he says:

> "In the middle of the waste on the summit of Vimy Ridge there is a little group of white painted wooden crosses marking the graves of the Seaforth Highlanders of Canada, who fell in the capture of the ridge. These Canadian Seaforths were mostly British Columbians. A long, long way they came to die, these long-limbed sons of Victoria, Vancouver, Westminster and Nanaimo. Some came even farther, for they came from the far off slopes and peaks of the mountains or upper waters of the Fraser river, when they heard the call.
>
> Nothing Finer in the War.
>
> "Many other feet will tread the same journey after them, the feet of pilgrims, who through generations yet to be born, will come here as to a shrine. The little graveyard will be as a flame of inspiration to Canada in the ages, for there was nothing finer done in the war than the achievement of those western men on the ridge."

Stewart Lyon, whom most of the members of this House know, only last week sent the following despatch:

> Yesterday, while out visiting the front, I saw an incident that proves that the finer feelings of the men are not blunted by daily contact with death. Three bodies of victims of the enemy artillery lay on a mortuary

truck, awaiting removal to the cemetery behind the lines. Each was wrapped up in his blanket, which is the universal substitute at the front for a winding sheet and coffin. A companion of the dead lads, himself a young fellow, barely out of his teens, had risen early and gone out into the wood of "The Swallows" to find some flowers that he might lay upon the breasts of his friends as a last tribute of affection. He returned carrying an armful of roses, wet with the dew of morn and shedding their fragrance widely. It was a touch of poetic sentiment amid the grit and prose of war.

Later in the woods we came upon the place where the roses grew in great abundance. In a small clearing girt about by German wire entanglements lay the ruins of an isolated cottage. A shell had so smashed it that scarcely one brick remained unbroken. Around this heap of "war desolation" bloomed a rose garden that must have been the pride of its owner. A refugee far from the roses she had tended with still evident care, the woman of the rose garden, would find consolation in the thought that her flowers had lain on the breasts of men who came from the surf-beaten shores of Canada to redeem her garden with their life blood.

These things speak louder to the people of this country than any words I can utter. The sufferings of 68,629 wounded speak to us; 2,460 prisoners of war in Germany send their appeal; 28,550 dead call to us in the words of Jack McCrea.

The Bill which has been introduced is not for the purpose of doing an injustice to any one; it is to ameliorate the conditions which now exist, not only looking forward to the filling of the ranks at the front, but to provide equal, right, and just treatment to those in Canada who want to bring about better order in respect to enlistment.

The measure is not a political measure; the Government in framing and introducing it never looked upon it in this way and as one which would bring political kudos. But the Government could not refrain from instituting so fair and just a measure under all the circumstances.

The Government may or may not go down to defeat under this measure; but rather than not to have taken such a step it would be better for the Government to have been defeated a hundred times.

It is our duty to supply men equal to the wastage at the front. How could we ever look these grand men in the face when they return did we not promptly and steadily fill up the gaps. How could we bear to see our splendid battalions dwindle to half or one-third their strength, thereby losing their morale, and fretting their hearts out because we had forgotten and left them to their fate, and we ourselves had become tired. It is only by reinforcements that we can maintain our honour in France, in Canada and in the British Empire.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I rise with a good deal of trepidation to address the House, for I realize that the seriousness of the occasion demands not only our intelligent thinking but the courageous action of every man in Canada. I would approach this subject dispassionately and with a desire to arrive at a conclusion which would be not only satisfactory to myself but to those whom I have the honour to represent and to the people of the country generally. We have a duty to perform to our country, to our King and to our Empire, and how best to perform that duty is the question which we are to consider at the present time. While our sons, our relations and our countrymen are fighting and dying that freedom may live, it is our duty to see to it that we do not deal a greater blow to freedom in this country by our actions in this House. "Win the war," as announced the other day by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy, was the slogan of the country. Win the war is our wish, our desire. At the beginning of the war the Montreal Star sent throughout the whole country, and to all members of Parliament, a telegram. I had one, asking what, in my view, was Canada's duty in the emergency. My reply was that Canada should spend her last dollar and give her last man to secure success in this conflict. I have not changed my mind, I am of the same opinion, that Canada should give her last dollar and give her last man to win this great war for freedom. The most effectual way to produce the last dollar and the last man to the winning of the war, is the question to be considered.

I have a resolution passed at a meeting in my own town of Welland a few nights ago. It was a public meeting addressed by Mr. Arthur Hawkes and gotten up by the Welland branch of the Organization of Resources Committee at the request of the Win the War Association. A like meeting was addressed by Mr. Hawkes in Niagara Falls the night before. These meetings are part of a province-wide campaign of education on the conscription issue. At the meeting in Welland a resolution was moved by Mr. John H. Crow and seconded by W. J. Hickey and unanimously passed, strongly urging myself as their member to speak and vote for the Military Service Bill and to use my utmost influence for a coalition

Government. At that meeting, which was held in the course of a win-the-war campaign on the conscription issue, Mr. Hawkes used words that would naturally have a considerable effect on any resolution which might be passed. Mr. Hawkes words were:

> I hope I have not given the impression that Quebec will not accept conscription. My fear is that it will not without a referendum. It is only just to Sir Wilfrid Laurier to say that he pledges his support to conscription if the country proves that it wants conscription. I believe, too, that the clergy in Quebec would see that the law is enforced. What I want to emphasize is that I believe Canada can have conscription and national unity too.

And, Sir, I am prepared to subscribe to those words of Mr. Hawkes: If conscription is necessary, I believe that, by adopting a proper method, we can have conscription and national unity also. I have received this resolution, passed unanimously at that meeting in Welland after Mr. Hawkes had made that observation. Undoubtedly the resolution would be influenced to some extent by the remarks of Mr. Hawkes who was the principal speaker. I have also had resolutions and statements, letters, communications, from many individuals, associations and organizations in that county and other parts of Canada, some in favour of this referendum proposal, some of them opposed absolutely to conscription. Thus we see that there are resolutions and suggestions and propositions not only in favour of conscription but opposed to conscription, and in favour of a referendum and conscription if necessary. It seems to me, in view of that situation, only one course is open to a member of Parliament, and so far as I am concerned I shall follow that course; that is to decide for myself as to what stand I shall take in regard to this matter, and leave my action to the judgment of the people. That, Sir, is the position that I propose to take. I cannot speak for the people of the county of Welland because the people of that county have not, except by letters, resolutions and so on sent to me, expressed their views on that subject. On that subject I do not represent the people of the county of Welland, and no man in this House represents the constituents of any part of Canada. So, Sir, all that I can do, and what I will do as courageously as I can and as intelligently as I may, is to express my own views on this important subject and leave the result to the judgment of the people whom I represent.

The boys of our country have gone to the war. The son of the very gentleman who moved this resolution, a bright young man who was just finishing his medical course at Toronto University, enlisted and went to the war, and received rewards for distinguished bravery over there. His dead body fills a hero's grave. Other friends of mine in that country, numbers of them, have had their sons go to the war—some of them have been crippled for life, many of them have been killed. A son of mine is in a machine gun section some place there, and while I speak his mangled remains may be lying on the shell-torn plains of Flanders. Around me sit men whose sons have paid the last sacrifice. Shall it be said that we shall stand in the way of winning this war or doing anything that mortal man can do to win this war? I think, Sir, that no one will say that or should say that.

As I have said, my suggestion was, and I believe it is right, that the last dollar and the last man should be devoted to the winning of this war. But how is that to be done? My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has given notice of a resolution in regard to the raising of money in advance of anything that the Government has done or suggested. The Minister of Finance last year and this year was requested and urged to do something towards, to use the expression which has been employed, the conscription of wealth, the procuring of the last dollar to the winning of this war, but nothing has been done. My hon. friend from South Renfrew has given notice of a resolution for the procuring of money; the Government has given notice of a resolution for the procuring of the men, and it is to that that I shall devote my attention. It is acknowledged that voluntary recruiting has fallen down. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in his remarks said that, after about three years, voluntary recruiting has fallen down. That is admitted on all sides. Well, is it much wonder that voluntary recruiting has fallen down? I do not wish to criticise to too great an extent, but I might be allowed this expression of opinion, that everything the Government has touched in regard to this war so far has fallen down. Their national service scheme fell down, and fell down lamentably; their home defence scheme fell down, and fell down lamentably; their voluntary recruiting has fallen down, and fallen down lamentably. Why? The ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) gives some reasons—I think that I can give another good reason which has come directly within my own observation. In the begin-

ning of this war, as the Minister of Militia rightly said only a short time ago, every man, woman and child throughout the province of Ontario put his shoulder to the wheel and did everything he could to procure enlistment, and that continued for some little time until the serpent of politics began to raise its slimy head, and then what happened? Patriotic endeavour began to wither and die, and it was politics that caused the death of that effort, and politics only. I am not charging the Prime Minister, perhaps, with knowledge of this—but had politics been kept out of the voluntary recruiting system, we would have had voluntary recruiting to-day as energetically as ever it was carried on. But, Sir, that was one of the reasons why it fell down, and fell down so lamentably.

Undoubtedly this House has the power to pass this Bill, but as was stated by the leader of the Opposition, we have no right to pass this Bill without the approval of the people. I should like to see a Bill passed which would bring about compulsory service, but I want to see a Bill passed that will be effective and that will have the approval of the people behind it. Unless you pass a Bill with the approval of the people behind it, you might as well not pass any Bill.

It is said that the Parliament of Great Britain, which passed a Conscription Bill, has outlived the term for which it was elected. That is quite right; but what a difference there is between the situation in Great Britain and the situation in Canada. In the first place, in Great Britain they have a coalition government. The Minister of Militia said this afternoon that he was sorry that a coalition government had not been formed in Canada. I am sorry also that a coalition government had not been formed in Canada—but when should a coalition government have been formed? Now, or when the war began? Hon. gentlemen talk now about a coalition government after the Government's mismanaging everything as badly as everything could be mismanaged. They produce a policy which they know would not be accepted by the leader of the Opposition, and they say: join us in a coalition government, help us pass this conpulsion Bill, and then the coalition government will appeal to the people. Sir, had they fairly, honestly, and patriotically desired the formation of a coalition government, or, what might be called a national government—a government behind which the people could stand—they would have made the proposal not to-day, but a year or two years ago. That is what they did in England at the beginning of the war.

Further, the British Government, being a coalition Government, has been in touch with the people from the day the war began. They have had by-elections—three, four, and five every year—since the war began. In this Parliament twenty constituencies which should be represented under the redistribution measure are not represented. There has been no expression of opinion from the people in any one constituency since the war began as to the conduct of this Government in the management of our part in the war. The only expressions of opinion obtained have come in the way of resolutions adopted by different societies and communications sent to members of Parliament. I say, therefore, that there is absolutely no comparison between the situation in England and the situation in Canada.

I admit that the need for men is imperative. In this terrific struggle in which the Allied nations are engaged, men are being slaughtered by thousands, and their places must be filled if the war is to be won by the Allied nations. Men must be got; that is the need of the hour. The Government says: We will pass this Bill. The right hon. leader of the Opposition proposes what is, in my opinion, a better, safer and surer course: that of asking the people whether they are in favour of compulsory service for the remainder of the war. The Prime Minister has spoken of a general election. The member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) said the other day that we were to have a general election. But the question of compulsory service cannot be properly settled through the medium of a general election—there are too many side issues to be considered; too many sins of commission and omission on the part of the Government have to be discussed and criticised. The question of conscription, therefore, could not in a general election be treated as it should be treated or given the consideration that it deserves. To my mind, the only way is to go straight to the people, with candour and with courage. And if we do, I am sure that we shall not go in vain; I believe that the people will support the measure.

The question is whether this Bill shall be further proceeded with, or whether we shall stop now and submit the matter to the people for their approval or disapproval. That is the issue in this discussion. Whether we do or do not need the men; whether we

are in favour of conscription now or of its adoption later, is not the issue at this moment. The question is: Shall this matter be submitted to the people? Some members of this House, and some prominent gentlemen out of the House, have said: We do not favour a referendum, because we believe that the people are overwhelmingly against conscription. In the name of high Heaven, what doctrine is that to preach in this country? We will not ask the people for their approval or disapproval of a proposed measure, because we believe that the people are absolutely opposed to it; therefore we will try to force it upon them! That is the doctrine which these gentlemen advocate. For my part, I will never subscribe to a doctrine of that kind. It is Prussianism; it may be Toryism, but it is not Liberalism and it is not democracy—and to Liberalism and democracy I pin my faith. The leader of the Opposition says: Trust the people. I trust the people, and in doing so I follow in the footsteps of such illustrious Liberals as Baldwin, Lafontaine, Brown, Dorion and Mowat.

I am proud to-day to assist our great leader to carry aloft the banner of Liberalism so nobly raised by these eminent gentlemen. Only a few days ago one of England's greatest statesmen, a gentleman born in the purple almost, a Tory of the Tories, uttered from the Speaker's dais in this chamber these words, which should be engraved in enduring marble:—

> Ever more clearly as the months go on, it becomes evident that this is becoming a world war between the powers of democracy on the one side and the powers of autocracy on the other side. We in this room, whatever shades of differences may separate us, can, in such a contest take only one side. We can only be on the side of democracy
>
> We are convinced that for every human combination who have reached the degree of civilization and development that has been reached by all the great western communities, there is but one form of Government, under whatever name it may be called and that is the Government in which the ultimate control lies with the people. We have staked our last dollar upon democracy, and if democracy fail us we are bankrupt indeed. But I know that democracy will not fail us.

That is the way I feel about that matter, that democracy will not fail us on this occasion and on this question. In my opinion there never was and never will be an occasion so grave or a condition so critical that we can afford to ignore the basic principles of democracy and pass legislation in this House against the expressed wishes of the people.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland) (Resuming): At six o'clock I was reading to the House the eloquent words used by the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour when he addressed this House a few weeks ago, and I think one sentence of his is worth repeating:

> There is but one form of government, under whatever name it may be called, and that is the government in which the ultimate control lies with the people.

That is the doctrine in which I was brought up and have always lived; it is the principle which I always intend to maintain, in season and out of season, irrespective of what any one else may do, irrespective of what any newspaper may say. I say that we in this House would be better employed if at this hour we were going through the country endeavouring to induce the people to agree to the proposals which have been submitted by the Government, than enacting here a law against the wishes of the people. If by dispassionate appeal, by moral suasion and friendly intercourse, we cannot get the people to agree to these proposals, we can never get the people to agree to them when they are embodied in enforced legislation. This law cannot be enforced if it is against the wishes of the people, and if some hon. gentlemen who have spoken in this House are correct in their judgment the wishes of the people are absolutely opposed to the principle of conscription. Punitive legislation such as this has never been placed on the statute book and enforced unless there was behind it a predominant public opinion. I have heard that statement made on several occasions by the Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat and by practically every man of thought in Canada; it has been made by the present Prime Minister, it has been made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in this House in regard to temperance legislation.

The experience of the past is a better guide than present theories, and the experience of the past teaches every man who has given any thought at all to this question that punitive legislation cannot be enforced unless public opinion is in its favour.

Let me cite one very pronounced example. In many of the states of the Union —states in which there is a law-abiding, honest, chivalrous and intelligent population—positive laws have been enacted against lynching. But of what effect have they been? In many of the states when a

diabolical crime has been committed and the people fear that fitting punishment will not be meted out, a lynching takes place, although the laws against it are most stringent. Did any one ever hear of a person in those states of the Union being even prosecuted, much less convicted, for taking part in a lynching? No. Why? Simply because public sentiment among the law-abiding citizens in those sections appears to be in favour of lynching under certain circumstances. There are instances of that continually.

Take the case of Ireland. The British Parliament has passed a conscription law, but it was not applied to Ireland. Why was it not applied to Ireland as well as to England and Wales and Scotland? Because public sentiment in Ireland was against it. I apprehend that the British Government knew the law could not be enforced in Ireland, that it would do more harm than good if they attempted to enforce it. What further has happened? For centuries Ireland has been governed by laws made in England against the will of the Irish people. The result has been murder, bloodshed, and anarchy almost. Why? Because public sentiment in Ireland was against the legislation. But now the British people have come to their senses. At long last they have decided that the people of Ireland must rule and shall rule themselves. They have said to the people of Ireland: "Go your own way to this extent. Select men from among yourselves and work out a suitable form of government. When you have settled upon that form of government we will embody it in legislation at Westminster, and peace and harmony will then reign instead of anarchy and rebellion." Is not that an object lesson to us in this crisis?

Some people say: Why hesitate? Pass this law. I hesitate because there is a pronounced public sentiment against the law as at present being enacted. I doubt very much whether, if the people were educated on this matter, they would oppose the law so strongly; I do not believe they would. If we went to the people honestly and fairly and gave them an opportunity to express their opinion in a referendum, without reference to any political conditions, without any circumstances to detract their mind from the one question of winning the war, I believe we should get an expression of popular opinion in favour of the Bill. It is because I believe you will get an expression of popular opinion in its favour that I am in favour of the amendment before the House. What does our honoured leader say about this matter? Here are his words:

> 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. When the consultation with the people has been had, when the verdict has been pronounced, I pledge my word, my reputation, that to the verdict, such as it is, every man will have to submit, and I claim to speak at least so far as is concerned the province from which I come. 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.

I say that it is so fair, so true to democratic principles, that I, for one, support it now and continually. I want a Bill that can be made effective, and it is for that reason that I support this proposition. It is alleged that time will be lost if there is a referendum. How long would it take? The Minister of Militia has told us that we could not get the soldiers' votes. But the Government are the people who have assured us that we could get the soldiers' votes. They intended to have an election last year.

An hon. MEMBER: Two years ago.

Mr. GERMAN: Yes. And they were going to take the soldiers' votes. Their ballot boxes and ballots are over there in England now. They could cable to the High Commissioner in London the form of ballot: "Are you in favour of compulsory military service in Canada during the progress of this war? Yes or no." That ballot could be printed there and distributed among the soldiers, and they could get the vote of the soldiers as quickly as you can get a vote here. It would take six weeks at the outside. Give the women votes. I will cast my vote with the mothers of this country; I am not afraid to give the women votes in this referendum. Let every person who has an interest in this war have a vote in this matter. Having taken a referendum, you will have a full expression of the people's will, and we will carry out in legislation the will of the people, no matter what it may be. Time will not be lost—time will be gained.

The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) says we shall have an election.

The Prime Minister says: pass the Bill and then have an election and coalition government. Did any one ever hear of a contest of physical strength in which one contestant says to the other: "I will shackle your feet and hands, I will tie your elbows, and having shackled you to my satisfaction I will match strength with you?" That is the way it would be if a coalition government passed this Bill and submitted it to the people. With both parties united on this principle, with every organization in their support, and the people without organization and without leadership, what possible chance would they have to express an opinion? They would not submit to that any more than they would submit to this proposition if it is forced on them now. But give the people a chance to express their opinion freely and frankly at the polls, and I for one believe that the majority of the people would be in its favour. That is why I say have a referendum.

I trust the proposition we make will be accepted. I believe it is the safest proposition; it is the only democratic proposition. But, if the proposition is refused, what then? The occasion is grave, the possibilities are grave. I would like the Government to adopt the proposition in favour of a referendum, but if they refuse, then, in consequence of the gravity of the situation, I will not by my vote stand in the way of the Government putting the Bill through and making it a success, if they can, and desire to.

Now, I ask, what is going to happen? It is said that coming events cast their shadows before. The shadows of coming events are hanging over us now, and beneath those shadows I venture to express an opinion as to what the events themselves will be. I do not wish to impute motives, but you will see that this is what will happen. This Bill will pass this House. In about six weeks, or, perhaps, more, it will receive the assent of His Excellency the Governor General. The Government will then immediately appoint their officials, who will immediately begin to draw their pay. They will then begin to make regulations, for the making of which they intend to take power. They will, perhaps, issue a proclamation calling up the first section of recruits. And they will stop there. Their courts of appeal, the machinery with which this Bill is weighted, will stop the proceedings from that time on. And they will have an election.

They will dissolve this Parliament, they will go to the country and say: We want the approval of the people to this Conscription Bill. We will have an election, not on conscription—that will not be the issue—but the issue will be between English and French, between Protestant and Catholic. We will have an election which will not be excelled by the villainous P.P.A. election in this province of Ontario in the campaign against Sir Oliver Mowat in 1894, the enmities from which have not died out yet. I do not want to see that. I would like to see this matter amicably settled now by sending it to the people for their approval or disapproval. If you do that you will get harmony; if you do not you will have disunion and disruption. I feel strongly on this matter because I have seen in our province of Ontario these same questions raised and I feel in my soul that the question will be raised now. I fear that this is not a Bill to gain recruits; it is more like a Bill to gain an election. They had a Minister of Militia who was striving to win the war, they have a Minister of Public Works who strives to win elections. They put out the Minister of Militia who was striving to win the war and they keep the Minister of Public Works who strives to win elections. It is more like winning an election than it is like winnng the war.

I do not know that I should occupy the time of this House any further. I have stated my position with as great fairness as I am capable of. I contend that the safe way, the sure way, the only way to bring about compulsory military service is to secure the will of the people in favour of that policy and then carry it out. If you have not the will of the people in favour of it, you will have discontent, distrust, disunion and disaster. Get the will of the people and all that discontent is done away with. I would like to adopt the eloquent words of the Prime Minister in closing the speech with which he introduced this Bill. I would in thought call to our deliberations our brave comrades who have fought, and the spirits of those who will fight no more, and in their presence, and with all the solemnity that presence would command, I would say that I will do everything that in me lies to bring about success and victory for the allied cause in this great struggle for freedom and to see to it that the sacrifices which have been made shall not have been made in vain. But in doing that I will endeavour to maintain unity in thought and action between all classes of people in this country for whose freedom those brave comrades have made their sacrifice and given their lives.

Hon. ALBERT SEVIGNY (Minister of Inland Revenue): Mr. Speaker, for a period of nearly three years we have witnessed the horrible war which has brought terror upon the world. From the beginning of hostilities we realized the strength of our enemies and it has been with the most painful anxiety that we have seen the German armies throw down everything in their way and rush towards Paris and Calais. Before the entry of England into the conflict the question came from the province of Quebec as one voice: "What will England do?" The answer was given that England had decided to throw her great power and all her resources against Germany, and we experienced a return of hope in our souls. It was then that all the representatives of our people, with enthusiasm, and without the slightest hesitation, swore to take up arms, make all the sacrifices necessary and stick to the Allies till the day of victory.

Enormous sums of money were voted, thousands of soldiers were trained, and each time the Government asked for additional sacrifices, the representatives of the people gave their consent. In 1911 not a single member of this Parliament had received the mandate to authorize the Government to carry on the war, but the people did not reproach the members for having consented to our participation. If England, France or Canada had provoked the war our people might have conducted themselves differently, but in the presence of the ferocious enemy who caused this great evil to come on the world, our population unanimously stood up and since then it has never weakened its firm decision to avenge outraged civilization, justice and liberty.

It is the outraged conscience of our people which has given us an absolute mandate. Last year, when the question came before us of the prolongation of the term of the present Parliament for another year, not a single member declared that it would be an injustice to the Canadian people, and the Canadian people have never complained of the conduct of its representatives. No one can deny that the prolongation has had for its only reason the war. In Canada, as in France, England, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Roumania, Serbia, in Montenegro and the United States, and in all the British and French colonies, it has been understood that the struggle was waged for civilization and that the greatest sacrifices were demanded in order to be victorious on the battlefield. It is in the following terms that a resumé of the situation was made by the representative of France, whom we had the honour to receive in this House a few weeks ago:

"It is the great conflict between triumphant autocracy—which we have already thrown down, in a large measure by the arms of our soldiers—it is the great conflict between triumphant autocracy, which wants to rule the world, and democracy, which simply wants to regenerate. It is the great conflict between absolute monarchs, who consider the people as their tools, and wish to conquer the bodies, and democracy which wants to elevate the spirit, the conscience and the soul."

The people of democratic Canada especially would not submit to German civilization. It is to prevent this danger that her sons have died like heroes; that our women have grieved and suffered from the remembrance of their absence, and that our country has worked and sacrificed these three years. Each one can judge the events of this epoch as he wishes.

It is not my intention to retaliate the insults of those who have cruelly insulted me during the last month; it is not my intention to review the past for the purpose of demonstrating how unjustifiable those attacks have been.

My intention is to admire and help the 400,000 of my Canadian compatriots who have died for my country, or are ready to die, facing the enemy, far from Canada where they might have remained instead of sacrificing themselves for their country. To those who threaten my life and the lives of my family I say that I am not more in danger than the soldiers in the trenches.

Since the talk on conscription has been under way an agitation against this Bill has taken place in the province of Quebec and pressure has been brought upon me for my resignation from the Government. I considered I should resist this pressure for the following reasons:

On the 27th December, 1916, the Prime Minister of Canada made the following statement, which was published in all the newspapers of the country:

You have asked for the assurance that under no circumstances will conscription be undertaken or carried out. As I stated to you at our interview, I must decline to give any such assurance. I hope that conscription may not be necessary, but if it should prove the only effective method to preserve the existence of the state and of the institutions and liberties which we enjoy, I should consider it necessary and I should not hesitate to act accordingly.

A few days afterwards one of the departments presided over by a French Canadian became vacant by the death of Hon. Mr. Casgrain. When the question came up of replacing Hon. Mr. Casgrain, if the Prime

Minister had decided to choose a Canadian of English origin, I know that all the French Canadians, Conservatives, Liberals, and Nationalists, would have declared that it was an injustice, and would have strongly criticised that decision.

I was chosen, and no one blamed me for having entered a Government the chief of which had made, two weeks before my being sworn into office, the statements which I have just quoted. An election took place in the county which elected me in 1911. Everywhere, in 20 meetings, I stated that it was the policy of the Government to carry the war to the end at the price of the greatest sacrifice, and that it was our duty to support our soldiers.

In that election many newspaper men accompanied me and their reports will show that I always spoke in the frankest manner of our duties in the crisis through which we are now passing. Our adversaries made a spectre of conscription, and used the National Service cards, which my electors had received a few days before, to make it appear before the people that we were to have conscription. I answered these attacks by explaining that the National Service cards did not have to do with conscription in any way and that if a measure of conscription should be adopted it would be submitted to both Houses and decided by the representatives of the people.

The electors of my county knew what the Government which I had just entered had done since the beginning of the war, so far as expenses and military recruiting were concerned. The statement made on December 27, 1916, by the Prime Minister was known by all the inhabitants of Canada. The electors of Dorchester elected me with a greater majority than in 1911 if you consider the number of votes in each election.

What does the vote given at this election mean from a constitutional point of view? Does it not mean that the war policy of the Government was approved, as it has been approved by the members for the past three years, and has not this policy of the Government been to make every sacrifice to carry the war to a successful end, as far as conscription if necessary, as the Prime Minister stated on December 27, 1916, that is to say, a month before the election in Dorchester, which took place on January 27, 1917.

It was a war Government which I entered on January 8, 1917, and in assuming the heavy responsibility which was laid upon me, I have thought that in a war it is often the unforeseen which awaits a government, like the chief of an army, and that the developments of the war must inspire the measures to be taken to resist the enemy.

To-day the Government, conscious of its duty, perfectly informed of the seriousness of the situation, in the face of Russia demobilized, in the face of the greater effort Germany is making on account of Russia's inaction, in the face of appeals from our soldiers, who have written the finest pages of our history with English and French blood from Canada, in the face of unbounded sacrifices of our Allies, who are groaning under the weight of German oppression, the Government, I say, asks the nine provinces of Canada to furnish 100,000 men to carry on the battle to the end. It is for this reason that I am asked to resign. But why is not the same thing asked of my colleagues from British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, and the Maritime Provinces?

Why should the province of Quebec now cease to be represented in the Government of Canada, after all her representatives in Parliament have approved of her part in the war for the last three years? Why should our minority be isolated on this continent of America, where we are surrounded by English provinces and by the American nation with her 100,000,000 inhabitants?

If my colleague Blondin and I would abandon the Government, what other French Canadians would consent to succeed us? And tell me if, with the expression of opinion in the English provinces, among the Liberals as well as among the Conservatives, we would not see an alliance being formed which would exclude the French Canadians? To-day the broad-minded man who occupies the position of Prime Minister does not refuse us a part of the representation, but if we refuse it ourselves, could we reproach him if he invited those of English origin to take our place?

When we think of the sacrifices which the world has been making for the last three years, we here in Canada should thank God, who has spared us up to the present; and, for my part, I do not want to complain of my isolation in performing my duty.

I have before me a man of 76 years of age who is ending his career by seeing the two races more divided than ever. History will tell what he could have done but did not try to do. It will tell about my colleague Blondin and myself, what we wanted

to do—and thank God if it may be that in a certain measure we succeed.

Many of my right minded compatriots have advised me to stick to my post, and I thank them for their advice. I know that in the performance of my duty I may end my political career, but such a sacrifice would be still less great than the one which has been made by our soldiers who have died on the field of honour, while making for us a bulwark of their breasts. Mr. Speaker, I want to communicate to the House a letter which I have received from a man I do not know, but whose father has played a very important part in the history of our country:—

National Trust Building,
Winnipeg, June 11th, 1917.

The Hon. Albert Sévigny,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

My dear Mr. Sévigny,

Although a stranger to you, I cannot refrain from addressing you as I have done and from writing to congratulate you most warmly on your patriotism in deciding to retain your Portfolio. I have always had a deep and warm interest in my French Canadian fellow-citizens, whom I used to know extremely well when I was a boy and a young man, and it would be very strange if this were not the case, as, during my father's long political career, he never had a friend with whom his relations were so intimate, in whom he placed so much confidence and for whom he had such a deep affection, as Sir George E. Cartier, with the possible exception of Sir Charles Tupper. Sir George and he (I mean my father) were, as you, of course, learned from history, generally known as "The Siamese Twins" and it was to a great extent due to their joint efforts that Confederation was possible. Such being the case, I cannot but regard with horror the prospect of seeing our people divided on racial lines, for I can conceive no greater misfortune that could befall our young Dominion. It is impossible for me, or any one else, to foretell what the consequence might be, but that they would be serious no one can doubt, and I congratulate you on playing the part of a true patriot in doing what in you lies, and that is much to avoid such a catastrophe. It must have required no small amount of moral courage to take the position you are doing, when, by adopting a different course and appealing to the passions and prejudices of your compatriots, you might, and probably would, have greatly increased your popularity with them. This, however, could at best been have temporary, and I am sure you have adopted what in the end will prove to have been the wisest course.

With kindest regards and best wishes for your future success in every way, I remain,

Yours very sincerely,
(Sgd) Hugh J Macdonald

The member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) said in his speech that public opinion in the English provinces, the United States, France and England, had been poisoned against French Canadians. Will what has been going on in this House and in our province since the conscription measure was spoken of restore public opinion in our favour? No; far from it. The people will still more firmly believe that the French Canadians refuse to enlist and to take their part in the present war. How can it be otherwise, surrounded as we are, we French Canadians, with a population which does not understand our language, and consequently does not read our newspapers and our books?

We must regretfully admit that in the English provinces and in the United States those persons are very scarce who take the trouble of defending us or even of trying to understand us. The result is that the public believes what is said about us and renders its judgment accordingly.

Many members have stated that effective measures to stimulate recruiting in the province of Quebec have not been employed since the beginning of the war. I think, however, that the time has come to speak frankly. I do not hesitate to say that the French Canadians have not used the means they should have employed. In my opinion, a French Canadian organization, independent of politics, and composed of earnest men, should have been formed long ago in the province of Quebec to encourage recruiting. Furthermore, we should have completely put aside our political feuds. If our public men had worked hand in hand and had placed before our people the question of the war as it presented itself, it would have been easier to have the province of Quebec answer the appeal with the other provinces of the Dominion. Various influences have strongly contributed to paralyse recruiting. If we had had an organization composed of earnest men who would have taken upon themselves the responsibility of consulting the Government respecting the measures to be taken in our province, I am convinced that this organization would have triumphed over those which were discouraging recruiting.

To prove to you that French Canadians know how to do their duty when unfavourable influences are not exerted, let us look at what has taken place in the English provinces. We will see that French-Canadians have answered the call in great numbers. This fact was brought out by the figures which were submitted to the House a few days ago by the Minister of Militia.

Let us look at what took place in the United States when the American Govern-

ment applied to all men from 21 to 31 years of age to register for conscription.

I sent the following message to Hon. A. J. Pothier, of Woonsocket, and Mr. L. N. Asselin, of Biddeford, Maine:

> Please tell me how French Canadians and Americans of French origin have answered to the application of the American Government to establish conscription in the United States.

I received from Mr. L. N. Asselin, of Biddeford, Maine, colonization agent for the Canadian Government, the following message:

> In Maine, I may say generally New England, French Canadians and French Americans have answered call conscription unanimously and heartily. Locally 792 French Canadians registered.

I received the following answer from Hon. A. J. Pothier, of Rhode Island:

> Franco-Americans have answered loyally and patriotically to conscription. Fair number of French American volunteers enlisted.

I received also from the newspaper L'Opinion Publique, of Worcester, Mass., U.S.A., the following message:

> Our French compatriots have answered to the call of the country with loyalty and unanimity which deserves the admiration of all. We exceed all other elements of the population for the figures of enlistments.

Many soldiers returned from the front have expressed to me the greatest praise of French Canadians who are in the army. To-day we have but to mention the brave deeds of the 22nd regiment before an audience in the province of Quebec to see that our population is proud of the conduct of these brave men.

Unfortunately there are too many narrow-minded people who have undertaken the task of hindering our population from doing as others have done. Since the question of conscription came up, men of talent, in newspapers or in public meetings, denounce our participation in the war, making believe, to succeed better in their denunciation, that the country is ruined, that we have done enough, and that we owe nothing to England. Some others, more brave, advise people to stay here to defend Canada if ever Germany wants to come here to attack us. To those who tell me the country is ruined, I answer, as far as the province of Quebec is concerned, that that province has never been more prosperous. The farmers have made a fortune since the beginning of the war; everywhere in the cities there is much work to do.

I know as well as any one that the expenses of the war are heavy, but as we have decided to take part in the conflict, we could not hope to carry on the war with prayers alone. If the Allies were to begin to consider the great sacrifices of money which they have made for three years, they would certainly feel, if they were like the economists of our country, that the time had come to stop the struggle. Those who say that we have done enough are those who would have wanted to do nothing from the beginning and who have done nothing else since that time but arouse passions and prejudices, while receiving their large salaries.

Some people say that we are not concerned in this war. It is certain that we have not wished nor provoked this terrible scourge which is sowing in the world devastation, mourning and ruin. However, in spite of the fact that we have not wished nor provoked the conflict, the fact remains that we are in the war in spite of ourselves, and we must accept the fact, and the terrible consequences.

It is a regrettable situation. It is a situation extremely critical for us. But it is not a question of knowing if it is in spite of us or with our consent that the European nations launched themselves against each other in the month of August, 1914. We have but one thing to do, and that is to realize the sorrowful state of affairs; to realize that we are at war; that we are living in a troublous period in the history of the world, and that, unfortunately, we must bear the terrible consequences.

We must then accept the brutal fact of the war and that leads me to ask, Mr. Speaker, if it was possible for us to remain out of the conflict. I do not think so. Some people have said: "If we were in the United States, we would be free from all this trouble." Those people were mistaken. Despite ourselves, we have been drawn into the war, as the United States themselves were a few months ago. But how many insults and indignities was not our neighbour of the South, the great American Republic, subjected to before entering the war. They endured all that was humanely possible to bear before definitely entering into the conflict. The time came, however, when endurance could no longer be tolerated and the greatest and most powerful of all neutral countries on earth cast its sword into the balance to assure the triumph of democracy and crush forever the Huns who are eager to enslave humanity.

Such has been the fate of the United States, and such would have been our fate if, in the month of August, 1914, we had refrained from entering into the struggle. We would inevitably have been drawn into the battle, as were our powerful neighbours of the South. If one of the most peaceful nations of the globe could not keep away from the horrors of the battlefields, how could we remain indifferent to the great drama which is being enacted to-day on the European continent, and on the great seas of the world?

Others, Mr. Speaker, have said: "We owe nothing to England, so why fight for her?" To those I answer: We are not fighting for England, but we are fighting with England. England is fighting to protect her Empire; we are fighting to protect our territory. In the same way we are fighting, not for France, but with France. We know fairly well that if France is conquered

9 p.m. England will be conquered also, and that Canada would then suffer the horrors of defeat. If England were defeated the territory of our Mother Country would be invaded, and then it would require only six more days for the Germans to invade Canada. The time would be passed then to organize armies and issue the call to arms. Our country would be pillaged and plundered, our population slaughtered, and we would witness the horrors and crimes committed in Belgium and in northern France by the barbarians of the twentieth century. When we study the situation we should consider ourselves fortunate, indeed, to defend our country on foreign territory, especially when we know what misery and distress have been inflicted on the inhabitants of northern France and Belgium, whom a cruel invader has robbed of their homes and possessions, and who to-day, in order to regain possession of those villages where they were born and grew up, are forced to shell the places they have loved so well. So, we are not fighting for England, but for ourselves, and it is to secure liberty for ourselves and for those who will follow us that we are fighting to-day. Since I have proved that we are fighting, not for England, but for ourselves, it is needless to ask if we owe anything to England.

But there is one point on which it is not permitted to differ, viz.: since the beginning of the war the British fleet has kept the route from America to Europe open, and we have thus been permitted to export our products at prices so remunerative that our population has never been so prosperous as since 1914. The British fleet has kept the way free for our commerce, and that fact has been worth millions to us. What would have happened without the British fleet? We would not have been able to export to Europe a single bushel of grain or a single manufactured article. Our harvest of 1914 would have remained on our hands. The United States would have been in the same position. The farmer, with his harvest of 1914 on his hands, would not have sown his land in 1915, and as early as 1915 famine would have prevailed in the great cities of Canada and of the United States. The farmer would have said: Why should I work my land at such a high cost when I cannot market my products? Consequently our cities would have suffered from lack of production. The large cities of Russia are actually suffering from famine. The Russian farmers are producing for themselves only. Blockaded by land and sea, they were unable to export the surplus of their harvest of 1914. They used to export about 300 million bushels of wheat. In 1915, as their harvest of 1914 was still on their hands, farming was considerably decreased. In 1916, they produced enough for themselves only, and as a result, the inhabitants of the large cities are famishing. This economic situation, due to the blockade, is more disastrous to the Russian people than the invasion of their territory by the Germans. Russia is virtually under the ban of an embargo imposed by Germany.

We owe more than that to England, because, without England's powerful fleet, this British colony, Canada, would have been conquered by the Germans as the German colonies were by the Allies. What would have happened to Canada if the British fleet had not cleared the seas of the German fleet? We would have seen our cities, such as Halifax, St. John, and Quebec, bombarded by the German fleet and forced to accept the conditions imposed upon our country. Our people would have been crushed with taxation, and instead of the abundance we have known since 1914, we would have experienced misery and poverty as Belgium did.

The reason why we do not stand humiliated in face of the services rendered us is to be found in the presence of our Canadian boys at Ypres, Festubert, Givenchy, St. Eloi, Neuve Chapelle, Courcelette, Vimy, and those who stand prepared, up to the last, to die in defence of the cause, with the soldiers of England, of France, and soon of the United States. If valuable services have been rendered us, let us be proud of

those who enable us to say that we also have done our share, and let us not forget that our boys kept the Germans from reaching Calais in 1915. Let those who have sacrificed themselves for us, as we have sacrificed ourselves for them, speak. This is what M. Viviani said to us but a few weeks ago:

> Yes, Sir, your Canadian boys have fought along with the English and French troops without paying any heed to racial differences. Under the flags of all the Allies they have all shown a similar courage. It must not be forgotten that in the month of February, near the Belgian frontier, in a country devastated by floods, after the terrific assault of the German soldiers by means of asphyxiating gases —Germany, the country that has caused science to swerve from its true ends, and, instead of pouring its benefits upon mankind, has visited humanity with manifold evils and crimes —the same Germany has had to meet your Canadian soldiers. On that terrific day, your sons, rising in their might, saved the situation.
>
> And throughout many battles, throughout numerous and recent victories, the soldiers of Canada stood up heroically against the foe. Even at this moment, we have before our eyes your boys, so alert, so athletic, so brave, the first to storm, victoriously carrying their flag to those heights of Vimy which were reputed to be impregnable.

I am proud to see in this chamber one of our heroes of Vimy in the person of our colleague, the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs).

Let us solemnly register these words of Marshall Joffre:

> What the soldiers of Montreal and of Canada have accomplished will always be appreciated in France. The soldiers of Canada are courageous; they despise death, and their bravery equals that of the French troops. I thank you for what you have said and hope that your words will bear fruit, but send along more men, we need them all.

The law authorizes the raising of 100,000 men, in nine provinces. I do not know what number of men the tribunals of each province will decide to send to the army, but let us suppose it will be as follows: British Columbia, 10,000; Alberta, 10,000; Saskatchewan, 10,000; Manitoba, 10,000; Ontario, 25,000; Quebec, 25,000; New Brunswick, 5,000; Nova Scotia, 5,000; Prince Edward Island, 2,000. We reach a total of 102,000 men; the law authorizes but 100,000. The Government thinks they can be found, but once more, I say the tribunals will decide.

The leader of the Opposition stated the other day that he regretted that the French Canadians were not in greater number in our expeditionary forces. I ask him, and I also ask his followers from Quebec who are in favour of our participation, as they have proved to be since the beginning of the war, if they think that Quebec would be ruined if she had furnished 25,000 more French Canadians. I know that the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe), and all the other members for the province of Quebec would be as happy as I to say that we have 25,000 more French Canadians in the army. I know that we would recall this fact with pride, to state that we have done our share as have all the others. I know that the French Canadians would be proud to have many regiments like the 22nd, which has shed such glory upon the French Canadians' name. If the province of Quebec had furnished 25,000 more men, would she be ruined? Without hesitation, I say, no. Will she be in a position to furnish them under this Bill? That is for the tribunals to decide, just as in the other provinces. No difference will exist between the French Canadians of Quebec and the English Canadians of the other provinces.

Our public men will be in a position to see that the law is carried out with justice to every one. Furthermore, a French Canadian organization should be formed to take special care of our soldiers and of their families. This organization could ask the Government to place French Canadian officers in charge of the military commands of our province, and I am sure that this request would be favourably received; and the same could be done in regard to promotions. This measure would restore the harmony between the two races and remove certain grievances which actually divide us.

In concluding, I say to my fellow citizens that we are proud of our ancestors of 1775 and of 1812 who saved this country for Great Britain. We are proud of these words so often repeated: "The last shot for the defence of the British flag shall be fired by French Canadians." We are proud of our pontifical Zouaves and we have cause to be proud of them. They have fought for sacred causes. But never a more sacred cause has called men to the flag than that of the present war, and millions have so far answered the call.

For our glorious ancestors dead on the battlefield; for our brothers who died or are ready to die in the trenches; for the sacred cause of justice, religion, democracy and civilization; so that our children and our grandchildren may be proud of us as we of our ancestors; to have understanding between the two races which God has placed in this young and great country; so that our fellow citizens of other provinces

be treated with justice; so that our compatriots of the United States who set us such a noble example may be proud of us; so that France may live with our dear mother tongue; so that the British Empire may still be the greatest power of the world and give us the pride to continue to bear our title of British subjects; so that Canada and the American continent may never be threatened by Germany; so that we may take part in the triumph and not be isolated and despised when the bell of victory shall ring—for all this, I say it is worth while to shed our blood. Others may say what they wish, but for my part, I accept.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John): Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry indeed that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue impaired what in most respects was a very admirable speech by the reference he made at the commencement to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Let me say to that hon. gentleman that in future years the historian will say: There is no man occupying a place in Canadian history who has done more to promote harmony between the two races than my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. His whole life has been devoted to that cause. Others might have won in a larger measure than he did the approval of his compatriots, but he has always sacrificed his personal ambition to his desire to promote unity and to add to the grandeur of our glorious Dominion. He has known no race and no creed, but has been in all respects and at all times a true Canadian citizen. I am sorry, as I have said, that my hon. friend made the reference which he did to my right hon. leader.

There is just one other remark which I have to make in regard to the hon. gentleman. He says there are many people in the province of Quebec to-day who are saying that Canada owes nothing to England. Let me ask my hon. friend if that statement is made by gentlemen who have great respect for my hon. friend. Is it made by those who listened to the hon. gentleman himself years ago when on platform after platform he stated that Canada owed nothing to England and should take no part in the wars of the Empire? True, Sir, down in Valleyfield not long ago the hon. gentleman said that when he made that statement he was young and his mind immature, his intellect had not been fully developed, he was only 30 years of age. Down in our part of the country it is generally supposed that fish is a very good article of diet, which leads to mental development, but let me say that I think there is no better food than the food which the hon. gentleman gets at the Government crib, for it seems to have developed his intellect and to have brought him at last to a right way of thinking, and to an appreciation of the duty which every man in this country owes to Canada and to the Empire.

The hon. gentleman said to-night that a great crisis has arisen. He intimated that the people of the province that he represents in the Government are greatly agitated over this question. If that is so, why does he not unite with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who has moved an amendment to the Bill calculated to promote harmony and unity between the different races in this country, and calculated also to serve the best ends of Canada and the Empire in this great world war? Why does he not do that, and show that he is prepared to sacrifice his place in the Government for the good of his country?

With regard to the question before the House, in my opinion the proper time to have introduced a measure of compulsory service was when this war broke out. The public men of this country knew then as well as they know to-day that this would be a conflict of giants. They knew then as well as they know now that Germany had been preparing for this war for 50 years, that she was armed to the teeth with great guns and plenty of ammunition, and that it would be a long and hard struggle. If the Government thought that it would be desirable at any time to introduce compulsory service into this country, the time to introduce it was when the war broke out, just as the United States Government, immediately war was declared, provided means for the enlistment of her soldiers. This Government, however, did not do that. You will remember, Sir, that at the session of August, 1914, my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was asked by the Government to assist in putting through as speedily as possible the different war measures which the Government desired to pass. My right hon. friend readily acquiesced. He took part in voting all the money that the Government required and assisted in every way, so far as this Parliament could assist, in the financial operations necessary to send our boys to the front. Not a murmur of dissatisfaction was raised against what the Government proposed to do. This side of the House assured the Government that anything they required for the carrying on of the war would be cheerfully given;

and from that day to this, that has been the policy pursued by this side. There was no suggestion that conscription would be resorted to; there was no suggestion that the compulsory system then or at any time was likely to be found better than the voluntary. To-day, the Government is trying to take shelter, so far as this Bill is concerned, behind the fact that the Militia Act of 1904 provided for compulsory service. They say they are making no change in principle, but merely an alteration in detail. I do not believe the Government at that time thought that the Militia Act would enable them to do what they are doing, and what this country has supported them in doing, namely, sending hundreds of thousands of our young men across the seas to fight the battles of the Empire, of freedom and of civilization, and to crush German militarism. To-day they seek an excuse for what they propose that this Parliament—which has extended beyond the term for which it was elected by the people—should do; and they seek also to afford the enemies in the province of Quebec of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) an opportunity of saying that this Bill is not more stringent in its provisions than the Militia Act of 1904, which was passed under the guidance of the Government of which that right hon. gentleman was the head. Other members who have spoken in support of this Bill claim that under the Militia Act the same thing could be done which is proposed to be done under this Act. The leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) went so far as to say that the Act of 1904 was the same as the Act that was in force before that statute was passed—similar in its provisions, but with a very slight difference in its terms. In order to show you that that was not the case, let me call attention to the Act that was in force before 1904, which will be found in the Revised Statutes of 1886. Section 79 of that Act, which is the section corresponding with section 69 in the Act of 1904, provides:

> Her Majesty may call out the Militia, or any part thereof, for active service either within or without Canada, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion or insurrection, or danger of any of them.

The power to call out the militia was not limited to an occasion which made that calling out necessary "for the defence of Canada." The words "for the defence of Canada" were omitted from the Revised Statutes. When this Parliament, in 1904, re-enacted the militia law, it sought to make it clear that the intent of the Militia Act was that our soldiers should be called out to serve, inside or outside the country, only for the defence of Canada. That is the material point in which the Act of 1904 differs from the Act of 1868 which was re-enacted in the Revised Statutes of 1886. Now, the Prime Minister and the newspaper supporters of the Government in the province of Quebec, such as L'Evenement, claim that the Liberal party is responsible for this conscription law, the law of compulsory service passed in 1904. But the change in that year was made for the purpose of making it clear that the militia could not be sent outside of Canada except for the defence of Canada. When this war broke out—no matter what we may think of it to-day—the people of Canada had no thought for their own safety and their own defence. They recognized that this was a case in which Germany had ruthlessly broken her treaties with Belgium and ruthlessly invaded France; that the British Empire must fill the breach in defence of liberty and civilization; and Canada determined to throw in her lot with the Empire. We did not think of Canada, but of the Empire, and of the noble ideals for which that Empire and the Allied nations were waging this war. With a unanimity which was wonderful the people of Canada themselves, and as represented in this Parliament, agreed that our boys who volunteered should be sent to the front to fight for these ideals. Surely it comes with ill grace from the Prime Minister to say that his excuse for the proposed law is that it is not a departure from the Act of 1904, that it does not change the principle of that Act but only some of its details. The Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp) emphasized this phase of the argument. Let me, then, even at the risk of repeating what was put before the House when my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Ernest Lapointe) and my hon. friend from St. Johns-Iberville (Mr. Demers) spoke, read what took place in the session of 1904. Sir Frederick Borden was then Minister of Militia, and he it was who had charge of the Bill. Speaking under the advice he had, he said that the reason for putting in the Bill the words "for the defence of Canada" was that this had been the spirit in which the Militia Acts had been administered, and that he was only making the matter clear so that it could not be questioned. I find that it was argued that as the law then stood troops could be sent under the Militia Act in defence of the Empire; but

the reason for putting in these words was that the power should be restricted. In one part of his remarks, Sir Frederick Borden said:

Sir Frederick Borden: That is the idea in the organization of any militia force—it is a home force for home service. When the troops were sent from Canada to South Africa, as I have said, it was not considered that the Militia Act which is now in existence, and the important clause of which in this connection the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley), has quoted, was sufficient to justify the organization of a militia force to be sent to South Africa; consequently, volunteers were called for and the force was organized purely as a voluntary service, and one in no way whatever connected with the militia at all.

Mr. Sam Hughes: That was an Imperial force.

Sir Frederick Borden: It was a volunteer force.

Mr. Gourley: With the hon. Minster's permission I would ask him a question. If there is no change of policy will he allow the old section to stand? It is far better worded than this new one.

Sir Frederick Borden: It seems to me that we have made clear in this section exactly what is understood as the object of a militia force in every country. In the mother country and in every province of this Dominion prior to Confederation, this has been the rule. We are always able to meet times of stress and emergency. If it becomes necessary to send troops to assist the Empire at distant points, we always have the means at hand of doing so. Parliament can be called and a special force organized, or the same thing can be repeated that was done before—volunteers can offer their services and those services can be availed of. I think it is very much better to leave the section as it is.

That is exactly what was done in this case. Instead of acting under the compulsory provision of the Militia Act, Parliament gave the money to enable the Government to organize this force of volunteers into this splendid army of 420,000 men; it was organized and a large portion of it was sent forward to Europe for the purpose of doing battle for the Empire. Then, at page 6,494 of Hansard, I find the following:—

Mr. Maclean: I would ask the minister if it is not the case that under the old section of the law as it now stands the militia of Canada could be used for the defence of the Empire and sent out of this country for that purpose? But under the proposed law that is strictly prohibited.

That is the view which he took.

Sir Frederick Borden: No. I am advised, and was advised at the time of the South African trouble, for instance, that under the law we could not do that.

Mr. Sam Hughes: Could not do what?

Sir Frederick Borden: That we could not send the militia to South Africa for service; under the law we were not able to do so. The present law has been changed, as I say, in conformity with that view, and in sympathy with the idea which, as I said, controls the militia of the mother country and the militia of every one of the colonies of the Empire, where you will find precisely the same clause. . . .

Mr. Osler: What is the meaning of the words "for the defence of Canada?"

Sir Frederick Borden: Suppose that Canada were invaded, it might be the very best means of defence to immediately send an army into foreign territory.

Mr. Osler: Quite so, but is not the existing law better and more definite; which says:

"Her Majesty may call out the militia, or any part thereof, for active service either within or without Canada, at any time that it appears advisable to do so, by reason of war."

Mr. Osler and others were arguing that the limitation of these words "for the defence of Canada" should not be included, but that the law should be left as it was.

Mr. Sam Hughes: I think there is no question as to the right of the Government to send troops anywhere for the defence of the Empire. If Canada wished her troops to take part with the imperial troops anywhere else than in Canada, for the immediate defence of the Empire, that could be accomplished as was done in England during the South African war, when whole regiments of English militia enrolled only to serve in the British Isles, volunteered for service in South Africa.

There was no further discussion and the Bill passed as introduced by the then Minister of Militia. Mr. Sam Hughes became the Minister of Militia in this Government; he was Minister of Militia when this war broke out, and he proceeded at once to organize under the volunteer system, recognizing, as he must have done, from the discussion which took place in 1904, that this was a case in which Parliament should act entirely independently of the compulsory provision of the Militia Act, and that the soldiers who should be sent over should be sent as volunteers.

What I complain of is that this Government is asking Parliament to make a radical change of enormous consequence in what both parties agreed to in the course which they adopted in connection with this war and is asking Parliament to do that after its life, in so far as that life had been given to it by the people of this country, has ceased to be. It is asking that this shall be done in the face of strong opposition in this House and in the face of tremendous opposition on the part of the people of this country. This Government has no right to do that. I protest, in the name of the people of the province from which I come, that this ought not to be done. It is a usurpation of authority which this Government ought not to be guilty of.

But further than that, it is contrary to the solemn declaration which the Government made to this Parliament and made to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in the session of 1916, when the Government obtained an extension of its life. What took place at that time? You will remember, Mr. Speaker, very well. In the speech from the Throne it was declared that the Government intended to introduce into Parliament a resolution asking the Imperial Parliament to extend its term either for the war or a limited period, and in the debate on the address, having in contemplation that an extension of the life of Parliament would be asked for, the leader of the Opposition referred to the fact that the Prime Minister had made a promise to the Imperial Government that 500,000 men should be sent from Canada, and he said: This seems to be a very large contract; I will make no criticism as to this at this time, but I trust it will not mean conscription. He went on to refer to the way in which the bogey of conscription had been raised at the time the Naval Act was passed in 1910 when, in the province of Quebec, the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House (Mr. Sevigny) and his colleagues went through the different constituencies and declared that the enactment of the naval law meant the imposition of conscription upon the young men of Canada. The leader of the Opposition referred to this bogey of conscription and declared from his place in this Parliament, and with the full responsibility which rested on him as the leader of a great party in this country, that there would be no conscription in Canada. He declared—not that there was not likely to be conscription in Canada but that " there will be no conscription in Canada." He went on to say, in order to allay the very thought that conscription would come in Canada, that the leader of the Government ought to make a pronouncement upon the question. Is that not to be taken as a serious matter when the leader of a great party in this country defines his own position, particularly in view of the fact that an extension of the life of Parliament is being asked and when it was expected that the two parties would unite in carrying on the war? Was it not important that the leader of the Opposition should define his position and that the leader of the Government should also define his? Let me call your attention to what the Prime Minister said on that occasion. He said:

My right hon. friend has alluded to conscription—to the idea in this country or elsewhere that there may be conscription in Canada.

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.

I repeat, he said, that announcement to-day with emphasis. Is no consideration to be given by Parliament to the fact that there was a positive statement, upon the one side by the leader of the Opposition, that there would be no conscription in this country, even though a promise had been made that 500,000 men should be sent to the front, with his invitation to the Prime Minister to declare his position in order to assure the country upon the point, and, upon the other, by the Prime Minister declaring that two or three months after the war he had said that there would be no conscription and he desired to repeat that statement with emphasis?

Not long afterwards the resolution for the extension of Parliament was introduced. I ask you, Sir, if that resolution would have been passed without the practically unanimous consent of this House. We have the statement of the leader of the Government that if there was any opposition to it on the part of the Liberal party he would withdraw the resolution. He said that he recognized that the resolution could not be passed except by unanimous consent, and I repeat to you, knowing what took place at that session, that if it had been suggested for a moment that there was any question as to the Government keeping faith with this Parliament and with the people of this country upon the question of conscription, his policy in respect to which had then been declared by the Prime Minister, that resolution for the extension of Parliament never would have been passed, and before October, 1916, there necessarily would have been an appeal to the people of Canada, and the people's voice would have been heard as to who should hold the reins of office in Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Now to come down with this Bill and to refuse the amendment that it shall be left to the people to determine is a breach of faith of the grossest possible character, not alone with the right hon. leader of the Opposition, but with the

members of this House and with the people of this country.

One hon. gentleman opposite has said that in these times of war he would puncture the constitution to pieces. I suppose he would say, too, that in this time of war there is no condemnation to be meted out to public men who break their promises, who disregard their pledges. I suppose he will say that. But, Sir, I think upon sober reflection the members of this House and the people of this country will entertain a different view. Further, when that resolution for the extension of Parliament came before this House, the leader of the Government said that he had had discussions with the right hon. leader of the Opposition with regard to the extension and as to what should take place if the extension were granted. There was to be no party warfare; if vacancies occurred by-elections were to be held and in each case the representative of the party which had held the seat before was to be elected by acclamation. But there was to be no party warfare. Yet only one year afterwards we find the right hon. leader of the Government coming down and proposing a measure which must necessarily be regarded as most partisan in its character, inasmuch as a large number of the members of this House are firmly and unalterably opposed to it, and inasmuch as some millions of the people of this country are also determinedly opposed to it. How could you get a measure more partisan in its character? For a measure to be partisan, simply means that upon it Parliament and the people of this country are divided, and, as I say, there never was a measure introduced in any Parliament which from that standpoint is more partisan than the Bill now before this House. At that time the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in his address in support of the resolution, referred to the fact that all was harmony, that the members of this House were united in the prosecution of the war, and he said:

> We are now at the beginning of the third campaign, and at this stage we may well appropriate to ourselves the invocation of the American poet:
>
> Our fathers' God! from out whose hand
> The centuries fall like grains of sand,
> We meet to-day, united, free,
> Loyal to our land and Thee,
> To thank Thee for the era done
> And trust Thee for the opening one.
>
> In the words of the poet, we meet to-day, united, free.

But we now have this Bill introduced into this moribund Parliament by a Government which is not here through the suffrages of the people of this country, but is holding power by the vote of this House, owing to the fact that we asked the Imperial Parliament to keep us in office beyond our term. This moribund Government is asking this moribund Parliament to pass this law of conscription, which will interfere with the liberties of the young men of this country. Whether, under other circumstances, it would be right or wrong to introduce such a measure, I need not say at the present time, but, by reason of their introducing this measure, Parliament is divided, the people of this country are torn asunder, and no man can tell what will be the outcome if this Bill is passed into law and an attempt is made to enforce it by compulsion. What a different picture is presented to-day from that which was presented to the people of this country a little more than one year ago! Now, Sir, is there any need of this? As I said before, the time to introduce a law of conscription was when the war broke out. At that time a vigorous effort should have been made by a non-party Government to organize for the national service the wealth and all the industries and all the resources of this country for the purpose of winning this war and doing the very best which it was possible for Canada to do in connection with that great purpose. That was the time to act. But this Government has done nothing in that direction. As has been said by hon. gentlemen who have spoken, as has even been said by hon. gentlemen on this side who have felt constrained to support this measure, from the beginning of the war until now, partisanship, party spirit, party patronage, have entered into almost every act of this Government in connection with the carrying on of the war. Apart from sending our young men to the front, they have taken no steps to organize the national resources of this country, no steps to make the wealth of this country respond to its duty in connection with the carrying on of this war. All they have thought of is to get our young men to the front; all they think of to-day is to pass a law of conscription under which they can send their officers throughout this country and take the young men from their homes, take them from their mothers, their fathers, their sisters, their sweethearts, their wives, and send them across the seas—that is all they think of. They have not built a ship. They have not built a ship to carry the products of Canada across the ocean. They have not taken one single step to cheapen transportation in

order that England and our Allies may be supplied with food which may be needed, and needed in the most dreadful way, before the war is through. They have taken no steps to control food prices in this country. They have allowed the cost of living to go up by leaps and bounds, so that the young man who has gone to the front and who has left his wife or family at home, is to-day in the greatest possible anxiety as to the way in which they are able to live on the small means which they receive. They have done nothing to assist in the production of food. They have seen the prospect of the crops being less and less from year to year owing to the scarcity of farm labour. They have had appeals made to them by members of this House and by the people to assist the farmers by putting fertilizers and farm tractors on the free list so that thousands, and tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands of acres might be put under cultivation, as could have been done if reasonable and progressive methods had been pursued, but they have done absolutely nothing. As I said, all that they think of, the only thing in respect to which apparently they think they have any duty at all, is to send our young men to the front.

I ask you, Sir, is it necessary to introduce this measure at this time? Canada has enlisted over 400,000 men for military service. As the Minister of Finance said the other day, the effort which Canada has put forward can be described as nothing less than a mighty effort, unparalleled in history. If Canada's effort were equalled by the people of the great republic to the south, they would send between six and seven million young men across the ocean to fight the battle of freedom as Canada has been fighting it side by side with the Allies during the past three years. The question is, after the putting forth of this great effort, is this the time to introduce conscription? Is it necessary to do so? We have endeavoured, but in vain, to get accurate figures from the Minister of Militia and from gentlemen who have spoken on behalf of the Government. When I asked the Minister of Labour, who knows about as much concerning Government matters as any other member of the Government—I am not quite sure, Sir, whether you will regard that as high praise—if the report in the newspapers was true that last month voluntary enlistments in Canada had reached about 7,000, what did he say? Bear in mind that before I had asked him the question he, a responsible minister of the Government, had told the House that voluntary enlistment had absolutely fallen down; that we could not get any more men; that the only thing to do was to resort to conscription. In response to my inquiry whether 7,000 men had actually enlisted in the month of May, the Minister of Labour replied that he did not know anything about it; he could not answer. Yet, he, a member of the Government, who is willing to take upon himself the responsibility of passing a law under which 100,000 young men can be deprived of their liberty, was not able to give the House any figures to show the necessity for such a course of action. To-day the Minister of Militia stated that 420,000 men had enlisted and that 330,000 had gone overseas. That would leave 90,000 still in Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, 330,000 had gone across the seas.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Of that 90,000 fully half did not stay in the service.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That has not been explained to us. The member for St. Antoine may know about these things, but he is not a member of the Government; he is not the gentleman to whom we have a right to look for information of this kind. These are the figures which were given to us: 420,000 had enlisted, 330,000 had been sent across the ocean; there were 130,000 in France and 126,000 still in England. The casualties have amounted to 87,000 or 90,000. If the Minister of Militia is right, and we are still raising in Canada 70,000 to 80,000 men a year, the figures are these: We have in Canada 90,000 men. If we get in a year 80,000 more, that will be 170,000. Add to that number 126,000 who are in England, and you will have available within a year about 300,000 men for the service of the Empire, in addition to those now at the front.

Mr. MURPHY: But you will have no election cry against Quebec.

Sir HERBERT AMES: I understand that there are not over 17,000 men in Canada who are in training for combatant service?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman should at once be favourably considered for the position of Minister of Militia, or of assistant to the minister.

Sir HERBERT AMES: I have quite enough on my hands at present.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well, we will put it at 17,000. Out of 90,000, only 17,000 remain; that means that 73,000 men who enlisted in Canada have disappeared. Of that we have no explanation. The minister did tell us that 126,000 men were in England, ready for service or being prepared for service. There were 90,000 men in Canada, 73,000 of whom, the member for St. Antoine has kindly informed us, have disappeared, so that only 17,000 remain. However, if you add to these 17,000 the 126,000 who are in England and the 80,000 men that we would raise in a year under voluntary enlistment, you have upwards of 200,000 men available inside of a year for service at the front or for training in England. Mr. Speaker, that is not a bad showing, nearly at the end of the third year of the war. I am unable for the life of me to see why the Prime Minister, in the face of the pledges and promises which he made to the people, should introduce this measure. I fail to see any justification for such a course at the present time. One ought to take this stand whether he be in favour of conscription or against it: Having started upon the policy of carrying on the war by voluntary enlistment—Canada having contributed to the Empire far beyond what anybody dreamed was possible, thereby gaining the admiration of the whole world—we should not resort to compulsory service until every other resource has been exhausted and until absolute necessity arises.

The Prime Minister says that the crying need to-day is for infantry. What did he say when he came from England? He talks about the call from the trenches—a call which I doubt he ever heard. I doubt if the men in the trenches would feel it in accordance with the oath which they took to offer any complaint or make any representations with regard to what should or should not be done for them. But the Prime Minister made some very interesting remarks as to what he saw at the front. He is reported as follows, on page 1610 of Hansard of this year:

> I was particularly proud to have the privilege of seeing Courcelette, because the Canadians distinguished themselves in its capture, and in that attack and on other battlefields, no regiment bore itself more worthily than the 22nd French Canadian regiment, which did splendid work in every engagement in which it participated.

That statement ought to be remembered by those newspaper men who write those savage articles about Quebec and who speak about civil war and about its being a very good thing if our soldiers, while passing through Quebec on their way to fight the Germans, would have a little fight with the French Canadians. It ought to be a rebuke to hon. members like the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele), who, at a meeting of the Liberal-Conservative Convention held the other night at Mitchell, in his constituency, is reported in the Montreal Star to have said that the people of Quebec did not want to engage in this war; that they would sooner fight the people of Ontario than fight the Germans.

Mr. STEELE: I should have excepted the 8,000 who have enlisted from the province of Quebec.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member, I am sorry to say, admits the truth of the report made of the speech delivered by him on that occasion. It is language like that, coming from responsible members of this House; it is writings like that appearing in newspapers in Ontario, which incite racial passions and prejudices in Quebec. That is a course which should be frowned down by every hon. member who loves his country and who wishes to see his fellow countrymen of all races live in peace and unity. The Prime Minister says further:—

> The Canadian Railway Construction Corps is performing work of the most vital importance. As far back as 1915 it was, I believe, suggested to the war authorities that railways could be constructed behind the fighting line and utilized to great advantage. The matter was not taken up immediately; but it has been taken up since, and one of the chief requests that we received from the War Office while we were in England was for additional men for the Canadian Railway Construction Corps and for the Canadian Forestry Corps. What I have said of the Canadian Railway Construction Corps applies with equal force to the Canadian Forestry Corps The work of these units is not so impressive, but is almost equally important as that of the combatant forces. It is absolutely necessary, as things are at present, that Great Britain should cut down to the utmost the tonnage for the conveyance of articles other than food supplies, and timber takes up an enormous quantity of tonnage. Therefore, in Great Britain and France forests are being sacrificed to-day on every hand in order that the necessary timber for the prosecution of the war may be provided. It is universally admitted on the other side of the Atlantic that the Canadian Forestry Corps is most highly efficient, and the request to us is that we shall send men in as large numbers as possible to assist in the work which they are carrying on.

That, he tells us, when making his statement to Parliament, is the request that was made to him upon the other side. A few days afterwards, when he submits the Bill for military service, he says: Oh, it is in-

fantry that is required; the crying need is for infantry. The voice which he heard in regard to infantry is, I believe, not the voice of the Imperial authorities, but the voice of Toronto; it is the voice of those who do not want to see voluntary enlistment carried on; it is the voice of those who want a measure of conscription introduced; it is the voice of those who wish to raise racial cries and issues in this country. I am sure the people of this country will agree that by a vigorous effort the Government could easily secure in four months 100,000 men to engage in railway construction work and forestry work, and those are the very men that the military authorities on the other side say would be so useful to the Empire. Yet, when we are asked to pass this Conscription Bill, the Government tell us: We want young men to go into the trenches; we have more artillery men than we require. We have no word such as that from any military authority in England; the only word we have is to send all the men we can for forestry service and for railway construction work. I have seen a despatch from Mr. Stewart Lyon, special correspondent of the Canadian Press, dated the 21st of June, in which he says:

> The drafts from the Canadian depots in England to make good the wastage in the corps are of good quality.

This is sent from the Canadian headquarters in France:

> I hear nothing but praise for the new men, especially the artillery drafts.

The Canadian artillery men have covered themselves and their country with glory upon the battlefields. They are the very best men in the service, young men of great intelligence and skill. They have been of enormous benefit, and their ability has been recognized by the highest artillery officers in England. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) knows that one young man, Major Magee, from St. John, has done most magnificent work, which is beyond all praise, and that has been the case with all the artillery men whom Canada has sent to the front. The artillery requires great ingenuity, originative ability, executive skill and high intelligence, and these qualities are usually possessed by our Canadian boys, perhaps to a greater extent than by the soldiers of any other country. Yet when we have an opportunity to secure such men, when our boys are crying for an opportunity to enlist, when during the last month some 1,400 have enlisted for the artillery service, the order goes out from Ottawa: We do not want any more artillery men; stop recruiting for the artillery. Yet next week, I am sure we shall hear some hon. members saying: This is a battle of big guns and shells; this is a battle of engineers.

10 p.m.

Mr. ARTHURS: Has the hon. member read the synopsis of the men now in England wherein it is stated that on the 14th of May there were available for military service, 279 artillery officers and 3,700 artillery men who were apparently not required for the artillery?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, but does it follow that, because an officer or a man is in England available for service, he is not needed in France? Of course, he is not needed until men are killed, until vacancies occur, but those men are waiting in England to take the place of men who are killed or wounded or who become ill.

That is why 126,000 troops remain in England as reserves in training for the battle front till the call comes for them to go. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Are we to leave our young men, those splendid young men, for whom no word of praise can be too high, without support? Certainly not. The moment they arrive in England they become units of the Imperial army. They go under the command of the Imperial officers, and are sent to the front; their disposition and everything connected with them is under the control of the British army. If we fail to put into force this law of conscription but take steps to stimulate recruiting, and if the war continues for one, two, or even three years, and Canada cannot send quite enough men to fill up the gaps, is it to be said that the Imperial army officers are going to leave the Canadians to be hacked to pieces in the great work they are doing for the Empire? Why, it passes my comprehension how any one can suggest such a thing. Is this the time to take this great departure? Is this the time to introduce this extraordinary measure which, no matter how it is enforced, must necessarily be encompassed with great hardships, with much anguish, with bitter tears, and many a broken heart. Is this the time, when the great republic to the South of us has just entered into this momentous struggle; when they are raising money not by the million but by the billion; when 9,500,000 of their young men have registered for military service; is this

the time when, if they do their part as nobly as Canada has done her part, they will have between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000 men at the front. And, Sir, are they not bound to take a part equally as noble as that which Canada has taken? Is it not their war as much as ours? For three years the men of Canada have been fighting on the battle line for the freedom of the world, fighting for the safety of America as well as for the safety of Canada, fighting to overthrow Prussian aggression, fighting to prevent Germany obtaining dominant power over the world, which would mean over the United States as well as over Europe. Canada has been fighting the battle of the United States, and we have the right now that the United States are in the war to expect the United States boys to take their place on the battle line and fight as the Canadian boys have fought, fight, if need be, side by side with the Canadian boys. We have a right to expect that.

Hon. gentlemen ask: Will you allow the boys to be forsaken? Why, Sir, what will happen if the war goes on for two or three years and the right to levy this 100,000 men has been exhausted? Do you not think that the United States and the Imperial Army will back up our young men? Or are we to go on year after year draining the life of our country? Is it not only reasonable that we should do all that is humanly possible in order to win this war, by the sending of our men, by the husbanding of our resources, by stimulating food production, by marshalling the industries of the country into the service of our Dominion and the Empire? It is right that we should do all that we can, but there must not be expected of us more than it is humanly possible to do. In view of the entry of the United States into this world war, and in view of the figures I have presented to the House, there seems to be to be no reason for the extraordinary measure which is now being submitted for the consideration of the House. It is a step which, as I said at the outset, if it was to be taken at all, ought to have been taken at the commencement of the war, and which measure ought not to be resorted to now except in case of the direct necessity, and which ought not to be passed except by a parliament having a mandate from the people to pass such a law.

This Parliament was induced by solemn declarations by the leaders of both parties to pass a resolution asking the Imperial Government to extend the life of parliament—something which this Parliament would never have thought of for a moment if it had been suggested that during this extended life this great departure would have been taken. Why do I say that, Sir? What were we asking for last session? We were asking the Imperial Parliament to amend the British North America Act, which is the constitution under which our provinces came into this great Confederation. All our people depend upon the constitution, but more especially do the people of the neighboring province of Quebec, because it is the constitution which preserves to them their laws, their language, their religion, and their customs. They look with jealousy, and properly so, upon any proposal to amend the Constitution. It has been held by the courts of the country that the Act of Confederation is in the nature of a contract between the different provinces of this Confederation, and you know, Sir, as well as I do that the Imperial Government would not have thought for a single moment of altering that constitution unless it felt it had the consent of the people of every province of this Dominion. If there had been any suggestion last session of this measure being introduced by this moribund Parliament, there would have been intense opposition on the part of members of this House to extending the term of Parliament, and not even the far-reaching influence of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, if he had taken strong ground in favour of the extension, would have been sufficient to enable the measure to be passed. Some hon. gentlemen are talking of extending the term of Parliament again. I do not know what may be the view of this House, because I have not consulted with any one as to what should be done when the question comes up, but in view of what is taking place now, in view of the unreasonable, the improper and autocratic effort of this Government to pass this measure through Parliament under the circumstances I have mentioned and in spite of the pledges that have been given, I declare that I will not repeat the blunder of which I was guilty at the last session of Parliament. Never again, if this measure is pressed through, would I feel that it would be safe to have an amendment to our constitution if we had to rely upon the pledges made by the gentlemen at present occupying seats on the treasury benches.

To my mind we are right on the verge of the greatest crisis which ever faced this fair Confederation. It is well to be frank about

it; it is well to look matters right in the face. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) referred to the fact that the British Parliament in its wisdom had declined to apply the conscription law to Ireland because it was contrary to the general sentiment of the people of that country. There was one reference which he might have made as to the undesirability and impossibility of imposing any law upon an unwilling people.

In the case of great communities living together, they judge the law by the common sentiment; and the truth was laid down centuries ago: vox populi, vox Dei. What most of the people believe, they think, is the law that ought to be observed; and any law which gives you the common sentiment of the people, and particularly the common sense of the people, is, they are apt to think, the law which ought to be obeyed. What happened when the British Government proposed to impose the law for Home Rule upon Ireland? The people of Ulster, comprising I think, only about two millions of people —hon. gentlemen will correct me if I am wrong—no more people than in the province of Quebec, showed signs of resistance. They even formed armies and the leader of the army formed to resist the enforcement of the law for Home Rule, was Sir Edward Carson who is now the First Lord of the Admiralty. Most people would say, who are not familiar with public sentiment, that it was strange that loyal people like the people of Ulster, famed for centuries for their devotion to the British Crown, should propose to resist a law passed by the British Parliament. And yet these people were determined to fight that law if the attempt was made to impose it upon them. You may say they were wrong; I may say they were wrong. At the same time, the gentleman who led them along these lines was not condemned very much by the Imperial authorities, for as I have said, he is now in charge of one of the most important departments of the Imperial Service. And so, to compare small things with great, in my own province, when I was a comparatively young man, a law was passed with regard to education in the common schools. Those who thought like myself and who are of the same religion with myself, thought it not an unreasonable law which took away certain alleged rights from a portion of the people of the province. The people who framed it never thought that the law would not be loyally accepted. It was put in force, and in one section of the country, the very first time an attempt was made to collect taxes by the arrest of one of the ratepayers, three men sacrificed their lives. That shows that when racial passions are aroused there is no saying what the end will be. Hon. gentlemen opposite have lighted a fire that may attain proportions far beyond what they expect. I trust it may not; I pray God it may not. There is a way to stop it, and that course the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) can take if he wants to, in the interests of harmony and good will and the happiness of the people. He can persuade this Government to agree to this referendum. It does not declare for or against conscription; all it says is that the further consideration of the measure shall be postponed until the judgment of the people has been obtained upon it by means of a referendum. It will only mean a delay of three or four weeks at the most. Parliament can go on with its work—there is plenty of work to do—and before the time for prorogation comes around in the ordinary course a return of the vote will be made, and Parliament will know whether the people approve of conscription or disapprove of it.

It has been said by some hon. gentlemen opposite that this is contrary to the British constitutional system. That is absurd; it is such a statement as men make who want to becloud the issue, who, though they are carrying through a measure, want to go to the people, and, by means of appeals upon questions of personal popularity, upon all kinds of other questions besides the one at issue, hope to so divert public attention that there will be no decision upon the question. If this question be left to the people on a referendum it will be stripped of all other considerations. The question whether this Government have, during the last three years, been guilty of wrong-doing and blundering, or whether they have been right and are paragons of virtue—it will be deprived of all these considerations, and will be brought down simply to this: Are you in favour of the principle of the Bill establishing conscription for Canada, or are you not?

Something has been said about taking the vote of the soldiers. Of course, take the vote of the soldiers; no vote would be worthy of being considered unless it included the vote of the soldiers. In the case of a general election it was proposed to take the soldiers' vote. I would not surround this referendum vote even with any very great

safeguards, for it is simply a referendum. The mails could be utilized to send the questions to the soldiers at the front. Let them sign their votes before their commanding officers and return by letter to the proper official at Ottawa. In this way you would get the votes returned from the soldiers as soon as you need them. And you will have their vote, recorded, as it ought to be recorded. As to the idea that this is contrary to British principles, how do they happen to have it in Australia? That is one of the great oversea dominions, and the constitution of the commonwealth was the Act of the Imperial Parliament. In the case of many municipal bodies, even a small proportion of the electorate can demand a referendum on any question. They have a right to do that instead of waiting until the time of election comes around. The referendum has grown in favour among the progressive communities of the world. I know no better way to obtain the declaration of the will of the people on this question than by leaving it to them by a referendum.

As has been so well said in this House, the people ought to be regarded as the governing body. They are the court of last resort. The Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) said that we ought not to leave it to the people, we ought to lead the people. Possibly, the people may not admire the way in which they have been led during the last three years. They have been led through the mire of scandal, and graft, and bungling, and mistakes of all kinds—bungling in connection with horses; graft in connection with the purchase of drugs; graft in connection with the manufacture of fuses; bungling of the worst kind in connection with the production of shells. The people may not want to be led. They may prefer to have this question left to them stripped of all other considerations so that they may decide for themselves, yea or nay according to their own judgment. They are just as capable of forming a judgment as to what will be in the best interests of the country as this Government is of forming it for them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have kept the House so long, but entertaining the view which I do that this Parliament has no right, no mandate, to pass this Bill, that the attempt of the Government to do so is simply an autocratic attempt on its part to disregard the wishes of the people, having in view the fact that this Parliament does not represent the people of this country, that we are not here by the votes of the people but by our own vote which extended our life for the period of a year, I am utterly and unalterably opposed to this Bill and opposed to it going to its second reading. I shall vote for the referendum because I want the question to go to the people. If the amendment for the referendum is voted down, there is no other logical course for me to pursue than to vote against the second reading of the Bill. I repeat, there is no other logical course open to me. I feel it is my duty to vote against it and I intend to discharge my duty. If the Bill goes to the third reading, I shall feel that it is only consistent for me, in the performance of my duty, to vote against the third reading.

I say that, coming as I do from the grand, loyal city of St. John, the city to which more than one hundred and twenty-five years ago thousands of people came, although in the midst of great hardships, in order to live under the British flag. If there is any constituency in this country that is loyal to the core, it is the city from which I come, inhabited as it is by people who were and are prepared to make every sacrifice for the defence of the flag and the Empire. But I shall take the responsibility of the course that I have decided upon. I shall do my duty as I see it clearly before me, and then I shall leave it to the people of my constituency to exercise their judgment as to whether I have done right or wrong. I take the course which I do in the full confidence that I am doing what will be most effective towards producing peace and harmony in this country, towards increasing the happiness and prosperity of the people and which will be to the lasting advantage of the country to which I am so attached, a country which, through these two great races, we want to see united forever in peace and harmony, and a country which will become the greatest of the overseas dominions of the Empire and one of the brightest jewels in Britain's Crown.

On motion of Mr. Arthurs, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Crothers, the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

Tuesday, June 26, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

SENATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 104, respecting The Vancouver Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 105, to incorporate The English Valley and Hudson Bay Railway Company. —Mr. Webster.

Bill No. 106, for the relief of Rozilla Lamb. —Mr. Douglas.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT BOARD.

Mr. ROCHE moved that the House on to-morrow take into consideration the following proposed resolution:

That the resolution of April 23, to establish a Board to be called the Soldier Settlement Board and to effect the other objects set out in the said resolution be amended and that the maximum amount that the Board may loan to settlers be increased from two thousand dollars to two thousand five hundred dollars.

Motion agreed to.

LABOUR STRIKE IN WESTERN MINES.

DIRECTOR OF COAL MINING OPERATIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) a few questions on a matter of urgent importance. Yesterday there was laid on the table of the House an Order in Council appointing Mr. Armstrong of Vancouver to look after the operation of mines in western Canada. As I understand it, he is first to make inquiries and investigations which will delay the operation of the mines. I had understood that the Government had fully decided to take over and operate the mines and that Mr. Armstrong had been placed in charge of this work. I want to know whether these investigations and inquiries are to be made and whether the operation of the mines is to be delayed. I would think that the Government had sufficient information now to decide what is the best policy to pursue.

I am also advised that the gentleman who has been appointed is not a friend of organized labour, but that, on the contrary he has been opposed to organized labour. If that is the case, I would suggest that it is a bad appointment to make in dealing with a labour problem in western Canada. I would also ask the minister, in fairness to the House and the country, to make a complete statement in regard to the negotiations and efforts to bring about a settlement of the strike. I think Parliament and the country are entitled to a full statement especially when the Government has in view such drastic action in connection with the operation of the mines.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): The statement of my hon. friend about the Director of Coal Operations in district No. 18 being opposed to organized labour is the first intimation of that sort that I have had concerning Mr. Armstrong. Mr. Armstrong reached Calgary yesterday, and his instructions are to have operations resumed at once. No inquiry will be necessary further than to ascertain the general condition there before the men will go to work. I had a wire from him to-day to say that he would wire me to-morrow definitely. I expect he will succeed in getting the men to go to work at once, and he will make whatever inquiries are necessary afterwards. As to the full statement that my hon. friend desires, I may say to him that the House has made an order for a return of all the correspondence concerning this matter, which is very voluminous. It is being prepared now, and when it is laid on the Table he will have the disclosure of the negotiations which he desires.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I would like to ask the minister if, in ordering the men to return to work, they are to have their demands complied with by the commissioner representing the Government. Are they to be paid what they have been asking for?

Mr. CROTHERS: I expect that the director will settle that matter. I do not know the terms upon which they are returning to work, but I am satisfied they will return to work right away.

Mr. OLIVER: I notice in the Order in Council that was laid on the Table yesterday that authority was conferred on the gentleman appointed to control mines in southern Alberta and southeast Kootenay. I wish to know just what is the condition in regard to the mines in Northern Alberta.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have not the Order in Council before me, but my recollection is that it takes in the southeasterly part of British Columbia and the southwesterly part of Alberta, covering what is generally known in that part of the country as district

No. 18. I am not quite certain how far north that extends.

Mr. OLIVER: I would respectfully ask the minister to inform the House at the earliest convenient date how far this Order does extend. It is probably the most remarkable Order that has yet been issued in Canada, and there is a very great difference created between those mines that are under it and those that are not. It is of great importance that we should know which mines are under the Order and which, if any, are not. In view of the importance of this Order and of the action that necessarily follows it, it is essential that this House and the country should know, not by a return laid on the Table of papers which do not carry their own explanation, but on the responsibility of the Minister of Labour, what the negotiations between the parties were, and why and how those negotiations failed to come to a satisfactory conclusion. This country is going into a tremendous experiment, and we have a right to begin at the beginning and know why.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Consideration of the motion of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto, and the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barette, resumed from Monday, June 25.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to take up the time of the House at any length, but I believe it is due to myself, in justice to those men whom I took overseas and the men with whom I have been associated more or less in France, that I should say something concerning the matter now before this House. It has been said, I believe, by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), that members of this House who were in the military service were not in a position to give an unbiased opinion upon this matter. I take issue with the hon. gentleman and say I believe that the men who know the conditions, the men who have given their services, the men who have engaged in recruiting in Canada, the men who have raised battalions under the voluntary system, the men who have taken these battalions overseas, and in some cases at least have had an opportunity of seeing actual conditions in France, are in the best position to decide this matter, or at least to give an opinion upon it. There are no two opinions among the men actually at the front, and I honestly believe that if every member of this House had had an opportunity of viewing the battlefront in France and along the western front, there would not to-day be a single voice raised against the passage of this Bill, or a vote against it. Personally I do not care, nor do I think the man at the front cares whether the reinforcements which he needs are raised under the Militia Act, under this compulsory service Bill, or under any other Act. The only condition that he demands is that these reinforcements be sent forward at the earliest possible date. In this matter I think it is absolutely idle to discuss other than the present and future conditions. The men whose interests in this Bill are greatest do not care what the Prime Minister said or what the leader of the Opposition said or what any other man said in 1914 or at any other time in regard to conscription, nor does he care to have any discussion as to the constitutionality of this Act or as to the feelings of any part of Canada, introduced for the purpose of delaying the passage of this Bill. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) last night said that this was a partisan measure. This measure is supported by the best elements of his own party. It is opposed only by those who expect to profit politically by that opposition, and in that respect only is it a political measure.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: From your own party.

Mr. ARTHURS: That may be so. There may be members in the Conservative party in the past who oppose this for the very same reason and other reasons which I shall explain to the House later on. The chief arguments of the opponents of this Bill are absolute threats against the balance of Canada if this measure is carried to its logical conclusion. I wish to contrast for a moment the speeches of two members, both of whom have always been political opponents of my own, but who have been political friends of one another for many years, both members of the party of which the hon. member for St. John has been and is a member. I refer to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) and the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier). I shall quote first a few words from the speech of the hon. member for Lambton, a speech which I think every man in Canada should hear:

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 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. Now that they have gone, now that they are there, dying, bleeding, sacrificing themselves in this greatest war for principle, honour, and liberty, is it not 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?

I want to contrast that for a moment with the closing words of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier), who said:

Before resuming my seat I shall be very frank with the House. I want to make a few remarks in the name of my people.

His people—not the people of Canada, but his people.

This is one of the most solemn hours of my life. It may be the last opportunity I shall have of addressing the House of Commons and my country. I say to the Government: If you press this measure through, my people, declaring that this Government has no mandate, will use the very Bill itself to fight the matter out. We acknowledge that in this fight there will be pain and suffering. We may have to go to the direst consequences.

If that is not a threat I do not know what a threat means.

My people are willing to go to the limit if you impose upon them such a piece of legislation; I believe they are right and I will do as they intend to do.

The Liberal members who are opposing this measure in this debate, as a rule, it appears to me, seem ignorant of the true state of this war and of its importance so far as Canada is concerned.

In the early stages of this war many of us, perhaps all, were of the opinion that we were in this war as a part of the British Empire, to help the Mother Country. Many of us believed that the war was entirely, so far as Great Britain was concerned, to fulfil her treaty obligations, and to vindicate the right of the smaller nations. Those who have had the privilege of seeing the war as it is are no longer of that opinion. It is borne in upon them that this is a fight to the finish, a fight for life and death for all the democracies concerned in it, and that Canada is just as vitally concerned in the issue as France or Belgium. It is idle for any one in Canada to say that Canadians are doing their duty if they defend Canada when an invasion occurs, or that they are not afraid of invasion. If this war is decided against the Allies, it will not be necessary for Germany to invade Canada, in order to attain her object, and, even if it were otherwise, Mr. Speaker, what could these men who now profess to be so willing to defend Canada do if invasion occurred? The hon. gentleman from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) speaking in the House the other day, made the boast for his province:

We want the men from Ontario to feel that their fellow-citizens in the province of Quebec are prepared to defend their country. We want the people of the west to realize that if the Hun ever came to Canada it would be up the St. Lawrence river and the citizens of Canada would be the first to meet him. The citizens of Quebec have been called upon to meet the invader before.

Expressions of this kind, Mr. Speaker, only tend to show how little some members of this House realize the situation. The question before the House at the present time appears to me to be whether or not this compulsory service Bill is necessary, in order to provide the needed reinforcements for the men in France. There appears to be no question regarding the desirability of reinforcing the men now at the front. It is agreed, perhaps by silent consent in some cases, that we are morally bound to support the men who have already honoured themselves and gone forward. We have boasted, with good reason, that our Canadians blocked the way to Calais, that they were in the forefront on the Somme, that they took the famous Vimy Ridge. Are we going to quit now? Every man knows the answer. The answer is the words, Mr. Speaker, of the old song we hear so frequently in France, "We are going to see the whole thing through."

Every Canadian is proud of the voluntary system. It worked well for a while. We were proud of the results achieved by it. It did more than was ever expected of it. At the commencement of the war, during the short session of 1914, every member of this House thought Canada was doing exceedingly well when we sent forward 30,000 men, and, when a second contin-

gent was proposed, many of our people thought it was entirely unnecessary. This number has been increased from time to time, until, according to the figures that we now have before us, 420,000 men have enlisted. During the fall of 1915, and the beginning of the spring of 1916, an extraordinary effort was put forward, through most of the provinces of Canada, for recruiting. Hundreds of men and women gave their services voluntarily and freely to help this cause. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were subscribed by private parties to this end. Meetings were held in every city, town and hamlet in Ontario, and many other provinces, and the result was that we raised many battalions in a very short time. But the number of men willing to enlist decreased, and eventually, it became very difficult to secure recruits. Some people say that politics was the reason why voluntary recruiting failed. There may be something in that, Mr. Speaker, but if there is, the blame lies, not upon the party on this side of the House, but upon those on the other side, who repeatedly went round, declaring that the whole game was run along political lines. However, the real reasons for this falling off were; in the first place, in some parts, particularly the province of Ontario, that every available man had gone to the front. It was not thought possible to secure more recruits, because they were not there, and, in the other case, the only men who were left were men who were absolutely essential to the workings of the farm and the industries in that part of the province.

An hon. MEMBER: The same in Quebec.

Mr. ARTHURS: The recruits from the portion of Quebec province from which my hon. friend comes, were not very great in number. But the principal cause was, Mr. Speaker—and there is no use beating about the bush—that the man who was available refused to go until he saw the slacker enlisting. In my riding hundreds of able-bodied men, French Canadians mostly—I am sorry to say this, but I have to say it in all fairness—were brought in to take the places of men who had voluntarily gone to defend the Empire, and when the recruiting officer asked others to enlist the answer he received was: "When you get these slackers to do their duty, I will certainly go also." It was not because these men were afraid to go forward, but they saw the absolute unfairness of the system whereby the slackers could stay at home, and their brothers, fathers, and cousins went forward. While we were proud of the voluntary system, I might say that it is always unfair, and its unfairness became more marked as the long war dragged along. Under the voluntary system, a father enlists, leaving in many cases, a large family, which is a charge upon the country, while the able bodied slacker remains at home. Under this voluntary system, the only son of a widow goes forward to do his duty, while three, four, or five sons on an adjoining farm remain at home. These are conditions which are inevitable under the voluntary system. But, Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of men in Canada who, to-day, could go forward and do their duty. These men are not engaged in agriculture, or in trades essential to the prosecution of this war, and they are, to-day, perhaps, frequenting the pool-rooms and other places of amusement. These are the men at whom this Bill aims.

I might say, however, that if the province of Quebec had done its duty, this Bill would have been entirely unnecessary, and the required 500,000 men would have been raised. Why did Quebec not do its duty? Some of the reasons given, I may say, are very childish. The leader of the Opposition stated, as one of his principal reasons why the men of the province of Quebec had not enlisted as freely as he would have desired, that some men were disarmed in 1760, during the continuance of a war then existing, and a few days after the surrender of Montreal to the British. He did not say that this ancient law—which as a matter of fact was a mere regulation—continued to exist, or that it had any effect afterwards. He also stated, in contrasting the enlistment of the British born, the English Canadian born, and the French Canadian born, that the English born enlisted more freely because they had not been so long in Canada. He also said that the English Canadian born had enlisted more freely than the French Canadian born because they had not been so long in the country as the French. I cannot see how a French Canadian of eighteen, twenty, or twenty-five years of age can possibly have been any longer in this country than an English Canadian born at the same time, but that is the kind of reasoning which we have from some hon. members. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) says: While the French Canadians have not enlisted—and he is quite willing to admit that they have not—wait until the Hun arrives on the shores of the

St. Lawrence and they will be on hand to do their duty. He also states that the French Canadians did not enlist because the right men were not sent to ask them to enlist. I noticed from a statement made in a speech the other day that a decided effort had been put forward by the one man who, the hon. member for Rouville said, was necessary in order to conduct a successful recruiting campaign in Quebec. Col. Blondin and Major General Lessard conducted a campaign in Quebec, and while somebody was good enough to say that they had recruited 211 men, from an analysis of the figures we find that in all this campaign only 92 of those men enlisted from Quebec. This took place before the Conscription Bill was brought down; it was during the time when my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) said that recruiting was going on well under the voluntary system. In spite, however, of the fact that the people of Quebec had General Lessard, the most acceptable man who was available for that province, and that his efforts were backed up by those of a member of the Government, who undoubtedly tried to do his duty, during that campaign the total enlistment from Quebec was only 92.

Mr. GAUVREAU: The hon. member is giving the lie to the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) himself.

An hon. MEMBER: He was sent too late.

Mr. ARTHURS: If he was sent too late, how is recruiting under the voluntary system good at the present time? The real reason why the enlistments from Quebec are not in proportion to the enlistments from the other provinces is because the Liberal party in Quebec have been playing the political game, and the political game only. It was said openly in Quebec: This is the Englishman's war; let the Ontario man go, so much the better for us.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: That is similar to what was said in 1911 by the Nationalists.

Mr. ARTHURS: It was said and published in Quebec that: Unless the English-speaking people give us what we want, we will not enlist. What the French-speaking people wanted was the right to defy or to alter materially a law of Ontario. There is no question about that. The other night the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was making an appeal to hon. members from Quebec to go home to their province and carry on an active recruiting campaign for a couple of weeks in order to see if this matter could not be settled by a last effort to secure, under the voluntary system, the needed reinforcements. The hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) interrupted him with this remark:

> Mr. Lafortune: If we in Quebec do as the hon. member from Brantford suggests will the Government repeal the School Act of Ontario?
>
> Mr. Cockshutt: I am hardly ready to discuss the bilingual question on the present occasion.
>
> Mr. Lafortune: And we are not ready to go.

This is the true secret why Quebec has not done her duty. According to a return brought down in this House, the number of French Canadians enlisted in the province of Quebec is 6,979.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: 14,000.

Mr. ARTHURS: I will refer to the 14,000 later on; I am speaking of enlistments in Quebec province. The total French Canadian population of Quebec is approximately 1,600,000, so that the rate of enlistment is rather less than one-half of one per cent. The total enlistment of French Canadians in all Canada amounts to 14,100. This is the official list and I believe it to be correct. In my battalion I enlisted a number of French Canadians, many of whom after enlisting were transferred to Quebec battalions, either upon their own request or upon the request of the militia authorities at Ottawa. Many made all sorts of excuses in order to procure their discharge, and in some cases evidence was produced that the same man had previously pretended to suffer from every disease from lunacy to housemaid's knee so that he might procure his discharge. Many deserted. Desertion was rendered easy because, as a rule, these men were well behaved soldiers, and I know that in my battalion when leave was requested, there was no reasonable excuse why a soldier from Quebec should not receive exactly the same treatment as a soldier from Ontario, and the soldier would go to visit his friends in Quebec, but he never came back. In the majority of cases, I honestly believe that these men joined some Quebec battalion; I think they were too brave and too good men absolutely to desert in the ordinary sense of the word, and I do not think they did. If, as I presume, they joined some Quebec battalion, they would thereby double the number of so-called French Canadians enlistments.

Mr. ROBB: Is the inference we are to draw from the hon. member's remarks, that the French Canadians in the batta-

he raised were men who originally came from Quebec?

Mr. ARTHURS: I do not know whether they did or not; I presume they did. In my riding, there is a large French Canadian population, and we are glad of it.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member has just stated that French Canadians left his battalion to go home to Quebec.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is quite true.

Mr. ROBB: Then they must have come from Quebec.

Mr. ARTHURS: In some cases they went to visit their friends in Quebec, and in other cases they went to Quebec to join battalions in which their friends were. These men work in the mills; they are not all permanent residents of the district which I have the honour to represent. The majority are voters in my riding, although they may have friends and relatives in Quebec, and if they had enough money coming to them, I saw no reason why they should not visit their friends in Quebec, just as any soldier from my county might visit his friends in Ontario. I endeavoured to treat every man in my battalion in an equally fair manner, and although I had experience of men deserting in this way, I still gave men permission to visit their friends or relatives, because I saw no reason for detaining one well conducted man because another man had not done what was right. Personally, I have nothing to say against those men; I believe in the majority of cases they were honest, conscientious men. The French Canadians who went overseas with me and who fought in France, were as good as any other soldiers and were true Canadians. The unfortunate thing is that we have not enough of them.

Mr. ROBB: The inference we must draw from the hon. gentleman's reference to the Quebec men who joined his battalion at Parry Sound is that Quebec men were credited as residents of Ontario.

Mr. ARTHURS: The Quebec men who enlisted in my battalion were credited as French Canadians enlisted in Canada. I made more than one return. While the ex-Minister of Militia was minister, the military authorities requested me to give them week by week the number of French Canadians who enlisted in my battalion. I was also requested to transfer to Quebec battalion French Canadians who enlisted in my battalion. I did so for a time, but later on I refused to do so, and the balance of the French Canadians in my battalion went over with me to England or France. That is the exact situation; I do not wish any misapprehension in the matter.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: How many French Canadians went to war with you to France?

Mr. ARTHURS: Very few.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: I am asking for the number.

Mr. ARTHURS: I suppose there would be about 20 or 25. I can let my hon. friend know the exact number later, if he wants to know. There were also a couple of cases in my battalion of French Canadians who had enlisted no less than four times in different regiments. This is another reason why the enlistment figures for French Canadians are abnormally puffed up. These two men had enlisted as early as in the 22nd Battalion from Quebec; they deserted and eventually drifted into my battalion. They deserted again, and I had the honour not long ago of arresting one of them in the city of Ottawa; and I think he is still behind the bars. The fact remains that the province of Quebec with its 1,600,000 French Canadian inhabitants has sent to the front to-day only one battalion, the 22nd, comprising in round figures 1,000 men. I have nothing but praise for the 22nd Battalion and the other battalions who are engaged with the Canadians at the front at the present time, but I think it is a shame that hon. members from the province of Quebec should oppose this Bill instead of being actively engaged in securing the men that are required to reinforce the 22nd Battalion.

There is in England one reserve battalion composed entirely of French Canadians. I was in close touch with them for a week or two when I was in England, and I know that the battalion is largely composed of officers and n.c.o's; there are very few privates in the battalions.

Mr. CARROLL: What has become of the rest of the 8,000 men who enlisted in the province of Quebec?

Mr. ARTHURS: The hon. member will remember that I have stated that according to the figures I have, only 6,900 enlisted in the province of Quebec.

Mr. CARROLL: What has become of the balance anyway?

Mr. ARTHURS: Probably they deserted too. It must be remembered that the enlistment of 6,900 men does not necessarily mean that number of men at the front. Many men after enlistment become unfit. They are subject to sickness, accident, disease and death just as are men who have not enlisted, and the forces are continually being depleted from these causes, if from no other. Desertions also account for a considerable number.

According to the figures given by the Premier the other evening, 325,000 in all have been sent overseas. About 126,000 are still in England or were in England on the 14th of May, and of these, 27,000 were available for immediate service in France. In his speech last night the hon. member for St. John, using suppositious figures, placed the number of men in Canada at 17,000, and the number who could be obtained under the present system at 80,000. He then said, "Here are sufficient reinforcements in Canada to last for a whole year." That is an absolute fallacy. The 126,000 men in England are not 126,000 men newly sent over from Canada. They are what is left of the 326,000 men who have already gone forward, and include the staff, which is quite large in England, those in hospitals, amounting to between 18,000 and 20,000, and the Army Service Corps, which must be maintained in England, and which numbers many thousands. The various noncombatant units have also to be kept up. So the actual number of men fit to fight must necessarily be small as compared with the total number in reserve in England at any particular time.

There are in England about 12,900 men who should be returned to Canada. Personally I do not believe that any man should be kept in England who is unfit to fight in France, or about to become unfit. Every man in Class B now in England should be returned to Canada in order to provide the necessary labour required on our farms and in our factories. These men are perfectly fit in the ordinary sense of the word, but unfit for service in France simply through some minor defect in their eyesight, hearing, feet, or something of that kind, and which probably has been discovered after their enlistment. To my mind there is no earthly reason why these 12,900 men should be kept in England, except that if our losses should be as large in the future as they have been in the past, it would be absolutely necessary to send these men to France unless the needed reinforcements went forward from Canada.

Just a word about the referendum. I did not intend to say anything about this, for I do not think it is necessary. To my mind the referendum is a farce. We have only had one referendum in Canada, and that was on the prohibition question. On that occasion the leader of the Opposition in words just as eloquent as he used the other day, said he would give the country a referendum and if the people decided in favour of prohibition, prohibition they should have. The referendum was held and the people decided in favour of prohibition by a considerable majority. One of the provinces of the Dominion of Canada, however decided they did not want prohibition, and the result was that the right hon. leader said: "We cannot pass this Act because all the provinces are not in favour of it." That situation is exactly the opposite of what we have to-day. I can see no reason why we should get any further ahead by having a referendum to-day, than we did on that occasion. After all, what is the referendum to decide? We are all agreed—I think the leader of the Opposition and every man behind him are agreed—that it is absolutely necessary to send forward reinforcements for our men at the front. The hon. member for St. John last night very eloquently said that this Bill would tear the child from its mother, the husband from his wife, and the lover from his sweetheart. This Bill is for the very purpose of preventing that. We believe that under selective conscription we shall get the number of men required, and they will be the men who can most easily be spared. The Compulsory Service Act will avoid the very trouble that was in the mind of the hon. member for St. John. There is not a man within sound of my voice who does not know of hundreds of cases where it was an absolute shame to have men go to the front leaving their wives and families a charge upon the public. It is to avoid this very condition that the Conscription Bill is brought in. Both sides of the House are agreed that it is absolutely necessary to get the men, and I say quite frankly that all a referendum could decide would be what class of men should go forward.

In order to prove the absolute necessity for reinforcements, I will read a short extract from a letter sent by General Currie the other day to the Prime Minister of this Dominion. General Currie is the greatest Canadian soldier to-day. He is the man who has charge of all our Canadians at the front, the man who is responsible for their well-being, for their leadership and for

everything connected with them so far as France is concerned. This is what he said:

> I note with special gratification your assurance that the troops in the field can rely upon Canada giving them all necessary support. They have given of their blood freely to maintain their nation's honour and now confidently expect that the full fruits of their sacrifice will not be prejudiced. It is an imperative and urgent necessity that steps be immediately taken to ensure that sufficient drafts of officers and men are sent from Canada to keep the corps at its full strength.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill is necessary because many men at the front have been without a day's leave for over twelve months, some of them for over eighteen months. Men are in the line in France who should have medical attendance for diseases and minor ailments and who are compelled to take their places in the trenches without such attendance, as the officers cannot afford to allow them the necessary time. Platoons and corps go up into the line far under strength, which makes the work much harder for those who go. There should be reserves right at hand, and I agree with the former Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), who said in his recent speech that it would be far wiser to have our reserves close behind the lines in France rather than in England, for various reasons. I have spoken to hundreds of our men in France, and I did not meet one who did not ask for conscription, not because they were afraid for themselves, but because they see the absolute unfairness of the voluntary system. Their fathers are working overtime on the farm while others on adjoining farms keep their sons at home. Slackers are taking their jobs in factories at from $4 to $8 a day, while they are working hard in France, risking their lives, and are paid the magnificent sum of twenty cents a day—that is all that the soldier gets to-day in France. It is absolutely unfair to the Canadians in France that they should not be supported, that they should not have the necessary rest, or that they should not know that every man in Canada is doing his duty as they themselves are.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I know the hon. member (Mr. Arthurs) does not wish to leave a wrong impression. A soldier in France gets more than twenty cents a day—the balance over that amount is credited to him.

Mr. ARTHURS: The soldier is paid thirty-five francs a month. The balance, as stated by the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) is placed at his credit. If the poor fellow lives long enough, he gets it when he comes back. But all he gets in France is approximately twenty cents a day.

I have been quoted by some newspapers in the province of Quebec, copied, I believe, by the Toronto Star, as being opposed to conscription. I have always been in favour of compulsory service, and I am now. I am in favour of this Bill, and I will support it regardless of political or any other consequences, because I feel that in doing so I am voicing the opinion of the great majority of loyal Canadians, and I am doing what ninety-nine per cent of the men at the front wish me to do. I have been requested by all I came in contact with in France to support compulsory service and make all do their fair share.

I have seen our boys enduring all sorts of hardships at the front. I have seen a battalion of our men twelve days in the front line, in mud often knee deep, standing in mud and water all night without relief, every night for that time. I have seen our brave boys wounded, thousands of them, and never heard a groan or a complaint. I have seen them die, bravely, cheerfully facing the enemy, and cheering for Canada. The cemeteries of France shall always be dear to Canadians. I should not be doing my duty to these men; I should not be worthy of my place in this House if I did not vote for this Bill which is necessary to give our boys the support now needed and to ensure that those who have died shall not have sacrificed their lives in vain.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my views upon this question have received so much publicity that I trust that I shall not need to trespass upon the time of the House at too great length. I do not think that there is any doubt anywhere as to where I stand. I shall support the Government's measure; support it with a clear conscience and a stout heart, believing that it is absolutely in the best interests of the country, of the Empire, of the world, and of the cause of civilization for which we are fighting.

I desire to approach the consideration of the question in the cold light of facts and reason, and to avoid altogether the language of passion or recrimination. There is no man in this House or in this country who is more opposed by nature and by training to compulsion—unnecessary compulsion—than I am. But I think that if there is one lesson which every sensible man has learned in the last three years it is that in the course of a war like this no

one connected with it can afford to cling to his previous predilections and to refuse to adapt himself to the circumstances and exigencies of the time. I heard my right hon. friend and leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) criticise, or rather oppose conscription, as I understood him, on the ground that the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) had said we would never resort to it. Well, I do not know whether the Prime Minister ever said any thing so strong as that. If he did, and is resorting to conscription, I am grateful, Sir, that he is greater in his gifts of patriotism than in his gifts of prophecy.

Think of what we have seen in the course of this war. England, that true home of freedom and of individualism, has been turned into a State-run bureaucracy. The Government has taken hold of mines and forests, of farms and factories, and the war is being better prosecuted because they have done it than if these things had remained in private hands. We must distinguish very sharply on the question between peace and war, and between conscription in peace and conscription in war. Conscription in peace is part of the machinery of a militaristic state, it is part and parcel of that militarism which—we are told on all hands, as we have been told by my right hon. friends on both sides of this House—it is the object of this war to put an end to. Conscription in war is the expedient of a country which is in dire extremity and must take the steps necessary to put forth its greatest efforts. I take it that that distinction is perfectly clear. I take it that the fact that we were not in favour of conscription before the war measures that we were not militarists before the war; but being in a war like this, and every man being in it, I believe it becomes the part of common sense to adapt ourselves to the needs of the moment. That is exactly the case with Mr. Lloyd George. There is no man in this House who is a stronger anti-conscriptionist that Mr. Lloyd George was; there is no man in the world who is a stronger anti-militarist than Mr. Lloyd George is at the present moment, but, he has put aside all his previous predilections and become the chief advocate of conscription because he realizes that this is a war to end war, and so a man may be thoroughly logical and true to his previous convictions if he adopts conscription to put an end to conscription.

Exactly the same thing is happening in the United States. Does any one contend that the United States is turning its back on its whole pacific history? Does any one contend that the people of the United States to-day are more in favour of the war than ever they were? We have noted the reluctance with which they went to war, the slow steps by which the President led the people up to the inevitable decision. I contend that the United States is in exactly the same position as Mr. Lloyd George at the present time. They are as pacific as ever they were when they adopt conscription, and the procession of men on the day when registration took place must have filled every impartial and thoughtful mind with admiration for that great people. If there is anything that should inspire us it is to see those 10,000,000 young Americans who left their homes under compulsion—or under the President's call, shall I say?—to register their names as citizens of a common country, and soldiers, if need be to fight and die for that country.

Conscription is the only fair method in the last analysis under circumstances such as those we find ourselves in now. It is the only method under which we can fill up the gaps in our ranks. Who can go on the platform in this country and plead that it is fair, that it is even decent, that one family in one district, or one province—and I do not name any province—should be able to shelter in comfort and prosperity beneath the flag, that other people, other provinces, and other men are fighting for? It is the only practical method. In Britain it is notorious that whole battalions which had enlisted under the voluntary principle had to be brought back from France to Lancashire because it was found in the course of the war that these men were more useful in Lancashire than in France. That is a very important consideration. Conscription is necessary at this stage of the war to say who shall stay at home as well as to say who shall go. It is the method by which you are going to organize your nation and get the last ounce of strength out of the nation either for service at home or for service abroad as the wisdom of those making the choice shall dictate.

It is said in some parts of the country, and my right hon. friend and leader rather indicated a predilection for that doctrine, I think, by the quotations he made from the Militia Act: that the proper place for a Canadian to fight is on the soil of Canada. In the same quarters of the country where this is said, it is called England's war. As an Englishman with a vein of Scotch in

me--Scotch logic I mean—it surely is permissible for me to ask the question: Is England fighting her battle on England's soil? England, Sir, is fighting this war wherever she sees the turban of a Turk or a helmet of a Teuton. She is fighting it in Egypt, in Mesopotamia, in Macedonia, in Belgium, but she is fighting it most of all in France. It is there that she is pouring out her blood in small rivers. My friends will forgive me—I know they will forgive me—when I say to them that if there is one consideration that should have made every drop of French blood in Canada course more rapidly, it is the consideration that Englishmen by the million are on the soil where the language of France is spoken and where the literature of France is produced, of which literature we have men as proud in Canada as they are proud of it in France herself.

Talk about not sending the right recruiting agents to one part of the country or the other! Who was the recruiting agent that the led the sons of the Empire to leap to the colours in every portion of the world and to come trooping across the seven seas? I will tell you in one word—it was Belgium. That was the recruiting agent. Belgium, guaranteed her neutrality and independence by Britain, and therefore by the British Empire—guaranteed it also by Germany—Belgium was trodden under foot by Germany and to every full-blooded man under the flag that meant that there was only one course for him to pursue. They felt: If the Huns trod Belgium under foot we must meet them with our last man and our last dollar, fight on the opposite side of the ditch and see that Belgium was restored to all that could be restored to her. And, if Belgium needed no assistance in the way of a recruiting agent what shall be said of the north east of France? Those who have been on the spot know what is happening in that country—the beautiful fields turned under, the very inside of the earth turned up, the villages desolated. These things have happened and what is happening there to-day?

I wonder if those who hesitate about what they should do on this Bill reflect that the present moment in France, as the Teuton is compelled to retire, he is taking with him every French female above the age of 14 years to work, to suffer, and God knows what else. These are the recruiting agents that appealed to the wide dominions of this Empire. May I add, not uncharitably, I hope, that if men will not listen to this, neither would they listen to one risen from the dead.

I have referred to Germany's methods of war at the present moment. Do I need to impress upon this House that the events of the moment on the battlefront, demand this Bill. Have we all read the figures on the bulletin to-day of the casualties in the last raid on London—150 dead in the heart of the Empire where the flag floats that floats over us—and, we are as morally bound to act as men in support of the flag as they are in London.

One hundred and fifty killed and four hundred and thirty injured in the last German air raid, most of the killed women and children, little children going to school! That is going on now. Cargoes of Canadian produce going to Britain are being sent to the bottom of the sea at the present moment by the thousand tons. That is going on now. That cargo which we sell now is as important to us as to the British who are going to buy it, as a commercial transaction; it is more important to them from the eating point of view, of course. That is how close the war is to us at the moment. Those are the circumstances that we are living through.

And watch the diplomacy of the Huns to-day, following exactly the traditions that came down from that old blackguard —whom I could never understand God Almighty letting die in his bed, Frederick the Great, called Great because, as we all know who have read anything of his history, he was so great in defeat. At the end of the Seven Years War, beaten on the field past all hope of redemption, he tried to win his way by diplomacy, and, unfortunately, by his diplomacy he fooled Great Britain at the moment. History is repeating itself to-day. There is no doubt that we are gradually getting the better of them on the field, very gradually and very slowly, and what do they do then? The powers that be in Germany use the very socialists whom they hate, and whose views they hate, and try to get them into Russia and into Stockholm and into other places to mix with their fellow workmen, and so to win by diplomacy what they can not win by arms. That is going on at the moment, and if we removed our hand from the plough in this matter we would be faced by the danger, one of the greatest that could possibly threaten the world, of an early and therefore an inconclusive peace. That is the greatest danger to the world at this moment: that the war-weariness of the

nations will compel the people to come together, and that an inconclusive peace will be arranged. But from all I have seen of Canadians, I do not think they will take any part in that business.

And if we had an inconclusive peace, what would it mean? It would mean that the Romanoffs would be replaced upon the throne of Russia; that Constantine would probably go back to the throne of Greece, that the Hohenzollerns' hold upon the necks of the German people would be tightened and renewed, and that of the Hapsburgs upon the people of Austria. And for ourselves, what would it mean? It would mean that, just as surely as the next generation of men come around, this would have to be done again by our children or our grandchildren. May I make a personal allusion? I have a little toddling grandchild on my farm out West to-day, whose father was stricken with a gunshot wound in the neck two weeks ago. I say to you, Sir, that on my soul and conscience, I support this Bill because I believe it is part of the necessary machinery which will save that little fellow, a born Canuck, and thousands of others like him, from ever going through what his father and his uncles are going through at the present time.

I was surprised at so astute a gentleman as my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) using an argument last evening which appears to me to be the very weakest argument that could be addressed to the Canadian nation. I am only talking about his argument, I never talk personalities at all. The hon. member for St. John said that there was no need for hurry—as I understood him, although I have not Hansard by me—now that America was in the field. Well, I am proud that America is in the field. There is a nation in this world which has never fought except to conquer or at least to come out of the contest with the honours divided, except in one case, when she was not conquered, but withdrew her troops from the field, and that is the little nation of Great Britain. But America's record in regard to wars is even greater, because in the beginning of her history, much against her will, she resisted what I consider were the false fiscal proposals of British statesmen of that time, and won her independence from the Mother Country. In the middle of the last century her sons waded in their own blood to keep the unity of their nation and to free the slave; and it is a magnificent spectacle to see that great nation, at the beginning of the twentieth century, coming at last to be possibly the decisive factor in this greatest of all world wars. A splendid history, the spectacle is grand to look at. But it is only half the spectacle. The other picture— the old mother who lost the great colony by acts of statesmen's folly at the time, reunited once more to her heart and in spirit and in soul and in purpose, and the two great empires marching out together with our Allies to save the world's civilization. Is that the moment that I as a Canadian am to be told that we should go a little more easily? The majority of Canadians, Sir, are not built that way. A great example never deters a well set up man from doing his duty, it leads him to do it more strongly and better. Where should Canada be when the British Empire and the United States are marching side by side? She should be where she has been from the beginning, in the front of the battle—she will be there. The glories of this little people were not exhausted at Courcelette, at Vimy Ridge or at any other of the battles where they have won immortal glory for themselves—the glories of this little people are going to be extended, but not, by taking advantage of the entry of the United States into the war, to go a little more slowly.

We are told that organized labour is against this Bill. Well, I do not think so; I do not believe it; I think it is a slander. If it were so it would be a very unfortunate thing for organized labour, and I agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) on this point. We approach our way of thinking from different points. I do not know that he was ever a radical in the English sense of the term, but in the school of politics in which I was raised, I did not believe in calling a lord by a big "L;" neither do I believe in pronouncing labour with a big "L." Either labour or lord, or anything between the two, is just as good as he is himself; I value a man for what he is and what he is capable of. And organized labour, after all, has only 65,000 enrolled members in this country. A great many of those thousands we can say are not opposed to this Bill, because we have had the evidence of the gallant gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Arthurs) that nearly every man at the front wants the Bill, wants conscription, wants compulsory service, and there are thousands of organized labourers in the trenches in France and Flanders.

But to the extent that that view has prevailed with the leaders of organized labour,

it is a most unfortunate, and, I think, indefensible viewpoint—indefensible, in the first place, because, if Germany won this war, it would be bad enough for all of us, but there are none for whom it would be so bad as the organized labourer. He would then get conscription with a vengeance, morning, noon and night, every day in the year. In the second place, I cannot understand how organized labour can be opposed to compulsory service, because they are themselves, as members of trades unions, very considerable conscriptionists. If a man in their trade does not join the union, does not work the hours of the union, or if he works when the union does not want him to work at all, he is called a black-leg. I do not want to use that term in regard to anybody in Canada, least of all to the leaders of organized labour, but I will permit myself to say that the national blacklegs, if there are such things, are not in France and Flanders to-day. They must be somewhere else. Organized labour should be the easiest people in the world to persuade that conscription for national purposes is a good thing. Surely, according to their own tenets, if they conscript in the interests of their trade—using the very considerable compulsion of trades union rules in the interests of their trade—the greater includes the less, and we must be logical, and we must really have taken up their position when we propose to conscript in the interests of the nation.

On this head, however, I have endeavoured to learn what labour men are thinking, and what I think is that they are opposed to this Bill, as if it were the only thing that the Government were going to do in the coming months to bring about that, after all, we need at the moment, and that is an organization of the moral power, an organization, and a mobilization, shall I say, of the moral power, material power, and the man power of Canada. That is what we need at the present moment. I told the Government a few months ago that their strength in regard to this measure is that it is aimed to put Canada on all fours with Britain and the United States, and practically every other belligerent country, and that is a very great strength. The weakness of the Government is in this, if I may say so, that, while they copy the United States and Great Britain in bringing in this Bill for the organization and mobilization of our man power, they have been tardy and backward in regard to what I consider the proper methods of taxation for such a time as we are passing through. I was not long in placing myself on record on this question. In the first short war session, lasting five days, I expressed regret that the Minister of Finance did not introduce an income tax. The value of such a tax, and the absolute duty of introducing it has been impressed upon the minister every session since the war began, and the reason is obvious. We cannot fight this war on the principle of limited liability. We are in it to the last man and the last dollar, and we must not stop. We must get the dollar. The other belligerent countries are taxing themselves until they suffer, and no one has suffered, sacrificed and served more freely and more splendidly than the very richest people in England. Many of them are sitting up nights in the House of Commons to vote the heaviest taxes upon themselves which have ever been placed upon the shoulders of human beings, and that is an example of patriotism that falls only short, as, of course, it must fall short, of the sacrifice which is made by the man who goes into the trenches and lays down his life for his friend, his flag and his country. These heavy burdens are being imposed on the people in England, and we should follow suit.

While I am speaking in regard to organized labour, I would suggest very seriously, and in a friendly spirit to the Government, that they will make their passage through the country much smoother, if they give due weight to this proposition: Sweep all patronage out of the military service.

The Government has done an excellent thing in appointing food and fuel controllers. That is along the line of the organization of material resources. From my point of view, I say to the Government: You would do a still better thing if you gave fuel and food free of customs duties, and then you would give these controllers something to organize about? I am afraid, Sir, that the doctrine of free fuel would not find absolute acceptance, even on my own side of the House. Do some of these things, do anything else that you can, following the example of the countries with whom you are in alliance, and beside whom you are fighting, and you will disarm a great deal of the opposition of organized labour, such as it is.

I listened to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Arthurs) who preceded me, with very great pleasure. He referred to the number of men in England not needed there. If they are not needed there they should get back to the habits of their early boyhood, and go on

a farm. I could do with some of them out in the West. I would put a very fine comb very liberally through the men in khaki both in England and in Canada, and see that every man wearing khaki and drawing pay is giving services to the country, or I would get rid of him.

I have indicated, I think, in a way that will be understood, that I am supporting the Bill. It follows, of course, that I am not in much sympathy with the referendum. I was taught not to be in sympathy with referendum for I have been a very good follower of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, perhaps a little skittish, as he might call me, and difficult to control at times, but I will remind him at this moment that, when he came back to the old House defeated, I was one of the first of his followers in the Chamber to tell him I never received anything from him, and never wanted anything, but I was prouder of him in defeat than I had ever been before, because he stood for a principle and died politically for a principle. That was not an attitude of unfriendliness on my part. We had a naval debate some years ago, and if my memory does not fail me, there was something in the nature of a referendum moved at that time. Referendums seem to take origin in Quebec. The hon. Mr. Monk moved a referendum, and my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had not much use for it.

Mr. MACDONALD: That was in 1910.

Mr. CLARK: It does not matter if it was in 1019; I am not giving lessons in history; I am trying to deal with a serious problem. If my memory is wrong as to dates, it is nevertheless all right. My right hon. friend indicated then very scant respect for a referendum. He called it un-British. But now he will not forgive the Prime Minister for changing his mind on a more important point: conscription of men for the trenches. I consider that, after all, the clear cut policy of this Bill. The referendum idea, it will be seen, follows some rather remarkable passages in the history of the country.

I am honestly very much put out, because I think my right hon. friend, towards the end of a career which, in my humble judgment, has made him the greatest Canadian we have ever produced in politics, is taking a position in which he will be misunderstood by numbers of those who have walked with him, fought with him, won with him, and been defeated with him. My right hon. friend says: My policy is the same as that of the Premier—Win the war. Well, so say we all. At a certain point in the history of Canada, just as at a certain point in the history of nearly all the other portions of the Empire, a proposition, which seems to have been of the most generous description, comes for a coalition Government, so that we can make better progress towards the winning of the war. The impartial historian of the future will record that the offer was magnificent, and therefore, I am afraid the declinature of the offer will be described as not quite in that moral category. "Win the war" is the common policy of both sides of this House. The Prime Minister, having failed to get the coalition he wanted, brings down a Conscription Bill, and we must remember that conscription is in force in nearly all other countries.

Mr. MARCIL: The Prime Minister brought down the Conscription Bill before proposing a coalition Government.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: When was the Bill brought down? My hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) is a former Speaker of this House, and he ought to know when a Bill is supposed to be submitted to the House.

Mr. MARCIL: The condition of coalition was to carry conscription.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Yes, to win the war. How does my hon. friend from Bonaventure expect to win the war? Not by orations, however eloquent. You can win the war only by putting men on the firing line. Again my right hon. friend runs what I consider a very grave risk of being misunderstood, because when it comes to something practical in the way of winning the war, he speaks in opposition to conscription. He made no bones of his position, and I admire him for his honesty. His speech was a speech against conscription; we all know where he stands in the matter.

I suppose, one of these days, the Government, if it lives up to its programme, will bring down—just as it did last year, with the idea of preserving the unity of the nation—a proposition for the extension of Parliament. According to the morning papers, when that happens, my right hon. friend indicated the way he will go when he applauded the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) last night, who said he would not repeat the mistake of last year and vote for an extension of the term of Parliament. If my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) repeats the mistake of last year and if he

accompanies his action by as eloquent and persuasive a speech as he made on that occasion, he will do something that will make all the people of Canada proud of him. But he is not going to do that. If it is a question of getting men for the trenches, or of a coalition Government, or of winning the war by keeping the people united and, if possible, avoiding an election during the acute stages of the war—it does not matter what the question is—my right hon. friend takes a road opposite to that of the Government. I want to be quite candid; I do not believe it will be possible to persuade a large number of our fellow citizens that those who are responsible for such a policy are thinking more of winning elections than of winning the war.

I want to come a little more specifically to the referendum, and to give my reasons for being absolutely opposed to it. The first ground of my opposition to a referendum is that there is something deplorable and indescribably mean, as it appears to my mind—I am not characterizing the action of any one else—in the idea of taking a referendum from the people at home as to what is to happen on the firing line, when you cannot by any device you may conceive get the full opinion of the men on the firing line. My objection to a referendum is exactly my objection to an election in war time. Of course, I know we had a soldiers' voting Bill, and when it was brought into Parliament I spoke pretty frankly as to what I thought of that being of any use. You cannot conduct an election at Vimy Ridge; the soldiers are engaged in too serious business there. It is impossible to secure a full vote of the men at the front. And, that would be equally true of an election or of a referendum. I have been consistent in regard to the matter. As regards an election, I think at one time or another I have had almost every hon. gentleman in this House in agreement with me. For about five minutes after war broke out we were in good agreement. Sometimes one side has been more opposed to an election than the other, and sometimes the other more than the one. There has been a little politics in more than one quarter of the globe. My first objection, therefore, to a referendum is that you cannot possibly do justice to the best men and the best voters you have. I say that without fear of successful contradiction. You cannot do justice to that section of your electorate who are fighting for us; they will be debarred from having a full voice in the proceedings of an election. There is a collateral thought in connection with that, that, by this proposition you absolutely put a premium on neglect of national duty, because you enhance in value the votes of those who stay at home, and you enhance in value the votes of those parts of the country which have recruited the least number of men. Is that, to upstanding Canadians not a strong objection to this proposition? My hon. friend (Mr. Arthurs) said: The greatest objection to a referendum is that it will get us nowhere, and I agree with that. By the way, this referendum is very interesting to me on the grounds of its parentage. It has a very dubious parentage. The mover of the referendum amendment—shall I say the father of the referendum—is my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who is frankly opposed to conscription. But the mother——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: —or rather I should say, the stepfather of the amendment is absolutely a fierce conscriptionist. Therefore, I venture to repeat that the parentage of this referendum is a little dubious. We will suppose that the referendum is taken, and that according to the views of the father and the foster-father of the amendment, a general election follows. What is going to happeen? Suppose my right hon. friend is returned to power with a majority of Liberals at his back; where would he be in regard to conscription? I suppose my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) would sit down in a Cabinet with my right hon. friend, and on personal grounds, I should be glad to see him there. The first question that comes up is: What are we going to do about this policy of winning the war? I have no doubt that my right hon. friend will be able to get along better with the hon. member for Edmonton than he did with the Prime Minister; but where are they logically in the matter? Suppose, during war time, with our boys dying at the front looking to us for reinforcements, you have a Cabinet in power whose father is a strong anti-conscriptionist and whose foster-father is just as fierce a conscriptionist; where would be your effectiveness in bringing in conscription or any other measure for the successful prosecution of the war? A Cabinet constituted on such principles would be no good for Armageddon—they would really be the first promise of a millenium. The lion from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) would lie down with the lamb from Quebec (Sir

Wilfrid Laurier), with a little child, perhaps from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), to lead them.

I do not want to forget before sitting down that with the majority of the people of this country this war is a serious business, much too serious to be committed to two opposite lines of policy in a general election. I shall support this measure on its second reading, and I shall vote against the referendum, because I believe this law is one more step in the long series of events, bcoming very long now, which have been marshalling Canada into her proud place in the front rank of the nations of the world —another of that necessary series of events by which Canada is moulding her own destiny at the moment that she is helping so mightily in moulding the destiny of the world and the future of the world's civilization. The greatness of the cause, the gloriousness and the certainty of the coming triumph, the honour of our country, and above all the needs of the boys make me feel sure that in this House and in this country not only this step but every other that is needed and that will be provided, as I believe, by my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) until the war is won, will be supported up to the hilt.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, I might perhaps be permitted to say before proceeding with the remarks I have to make on this Bill, that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who has just sat down has perhaps never had a more sincere admirer of his policies and eloquence than I. In order not to delay the House I shall be as brief as possible. I shall have nothing new to say, no principles that I have not enunciated before—principles which, notwithstanding the eloquent address of my hon. friend from Red Deer, are as dear to me to-day as ever before. The hon. member from Red Deer looks at this question from an international standpoint. If he had been with us for thirty or forty years more he would perhaps have given us different counsel. He might perhaps have inspired us with a love for our constitution and for the traditions of this country.

I come from the largest Acadian constituency in the Maritime Provinces. The French population of Canada has not received many eulogies since I have been in the House to-day, but let me tell you, Sir, that I was perhaps the first person in Gloucester county and northern New Brunswick to call on my compatriots to fight in the cause of humanity and for the Empire. Gloucester county is entirely an agricultural constituency, but I am proud to say that nearly 1,000 of our young men have responded to my appeal for recruits, ninety per cent of them Acadians. In the first year of the war I went from district to district, from parish to parish, urging our young men to join their fellow Canadians from the West and East, and to sacrifice their lives, if need be, in the sacred cause of humanity and civilization. I told them when they came back they would be the idols of the nation, and that if they should not come back, their names would be written in letters of gold in the roll of Canadian heroes, while the gates of Heaven would open to their soul. Many of the Acadians of Gloucester county who have enlisted have been recruited in other parts of Canada, in Ottawa, for instance, Quebec and Valcartier. Some of our young men, wishing to avoid the sadness of parting, would leave their old fireside telling their parents they were going to other cities to find work, and would then enlist in a different part of the country. They had enlisted in the 165th Acadian Regiment, but hundreds of them had enrolled before that regiment was started; they have enlisted in the 26th Battalion under Colonel McVeity, whose name has been famous in Canada for a long time, and they have enlisted in the 104th and other battalions. The English battalions have in their ranks hundreds of Acadians from the county of Gloucester and other counties in Northern New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In the English battalion which was recruited from the counties of Restigouche, Gloucester and Northumberland, and which was fully equipped last December, there are 740 Acadians. So I think I may say that the Acadians of Gloucester county and the other counties of New Brunswick have done their duty in a most noble manner. Every Acadian family in Gloucester county is represented at the front. I have moved among the Acadian people for the last 46 years, and I look upon them as my own brothers and sisters. Letters come to me every day from mothers whose sons have gone to the front, perhaps at my special instigation, asking me for the assistance that they greatly require and asking me also to look after the modest estates of their boys.

The blood in my veins is French, and I am proud of it. I am proud also of being a Canadian. But while I am proudest of this great Dominion and all that it is and

all that it has done, and of my citizenship as a Canadian, I am proud no less of being a British subject. I know that, even in the time when there seems to be danger that the harmony of our races will be broken, that days shall come to us of grief or pain, depression or distress, we may look to the British Crown, under which freedom is assured to all subjects of that Crown on all the shores of the seven seas. Upon that Crown we rely for the maintenance of our constitution, and for our rights and privileges now and in the future.

Our boys are fighting at the front for the great cause of humanity, for the maintenance of the Empire, for the existence of the democracies of the world and the spread of democracy throughout the world. We all agree with the lofty ideals and aims so eloquently expressed by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), and for these aims and ideals it is that we are ready to sacrifice the last man and the last dollar. But the permanent good of democracy in any country will never be achieved save by the application of democratic principles and under the guidance of democratic statesmanship. This applies to Canada as it applies to every country.

I wish to make my remarks as brief as possible. And when I have finished I think you will agree that what I say is logically in keeping with my career from the beginning. I was but a young man just out of college when I had to take part in events arising out of the school trouble which agitated the province of New Brunswick. I was the first man, perhaps, among the minority to call upon our people to keep the peace, to stand by the constitution, to do the best possible under the circumstances. That advice was accepted, and we have prospered and done well in New Brunswick ever since. Had we stood only on what we believed to be our rights, had we carried out the resolution which our people had first formed, the history of New Brunswick might not have been so happy as that which has been written of the past forty years.

To-day we have two propositions before the House. The first is that of the Prime Minister, a conscription measure—give it whatever name you like. The other is the proposition of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, suggested by him, not with the aim of having his people in Quebec take no part in this war, but with a view to reaching a solution of this question which will be a real solution, and in the hope that we maintain the system under which we have lived, and which is certainly the more noble, as the soldier who goes to the front voluntarily is more noble than the one who must be dragged there by the neck. That is what I have asked our people at home. I have told them we do not want conscription in Canada and we are fighting against it. I wanted them to go to the front in order to avoid the bringing in of conscription in the British Empire, and more particularly in Canada. And they have gone, as I have said, in response to my word. That is the motive of my right hon. friend. As I have said, we have a constitution in this country, and things can be done in accordance with that constitution. Though the leader of the Opposition has proposed this plan of a referendum, rather than change at once our traditions and our laws, which have been in force for a century or more, some of our friends, like the hon. member for Red Deer, have not thought proper to follow their leader in this matter. The plan of a referendum which these hon. gentlemen oppose, I will try to prove, is the best means to assist our boys at the front and to strengthen our prosecution of the war, while at the same time securing at home for the future the harmony which we have enjoyed in the past. My hon. and respected colleague, the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), has not seen his way to stand by his leader on this occasion. We hear him say, however, that that leader had directed the policy of the country on many an arduous occasion, and has succeeded in advancing the country's interest while maintaining harmony among all classes. More particularly was this true in 1896, when against storm threatening in the country, he stood for provincial rights, and won the support even of men who had up to that time been his opponents. In 1905 he created two provinces of the West and gave them constitutions under which they have prospered and advanced, and under which the future happiness of their people seems secure. Again, in 1910, he entered upon the work of creating a Canadian navy which would not only defend the shores of Canada, but, in case of urgency, would be at the command of the British Admiralty to assist the great work of Empire defence.

It has been my pleasure to hear my hon. friend recite all these great achievements of my right hon. leader, his efforts in behalf of the country and the benefits which would have accrued to Canada if reciprocity with the United States had received the support of the people. My hon. friend from

South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has accorded to the French Canadian people the virtues of chivalry, bravery, truthfulness and logic. As I heard him laying down his premises I was indulging in the hope that his logic would bring him to a different conclusion from that which he reached. However, this is a matter of conscience. His conscience is not my conscience; nor is it the conscience of my right hon. leader, and therefore we have nothing further to say on that question. Any pilot is good enough in calm weather and smooth water, but the pilot who, through many storms and against the madness of the waves and the fury of the elements, has always brought his ship in safety to port is the pilot to whom we look hoping and trusting that he will again, notwithstanding the storm that is brewing to-day, bring the ship of Canada to safety, thus promoting the harmony of races, the prosperity of the country and the glory of the Empire.

I am not standing alone with my leader. I appreciate that I am in company with my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), a pioneer of the West, with my hon. friend, the generous Scotch Presbyterian from North Sydney (Mr. McKenzie), with the learned men from Russell (Mr. Murphy) and St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and again, although I regret not to see him here, with my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German), the great exponent of true British Liberalism, the advocate of the maintenance of our constitution, working and speaking for harmony of the races, and a faithful disciple of the late Sir Oliver Mowat, who, like many other of the distinguished men of Canada, has now passed from the scene.

We have a constitution, and I maintain that everything we do in this Parliament should be done according to this constitution. We talk of losing time and of not having time to do certain things. Since the Prime Minister has come back from the front and from England, and since he gave his address on the 18th May, we could have had an election with the result that this would not be a rump Parliament, but a Parliament with a mandate from the people. To-day it has no such mandate. I have stated when addressing my constituents and the people of neighbouring counties, that the law of the country was that our troops should go under the voluntary system and I have always maintained that that was the only constitutional way in which they could go. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but in order to place my position properly before my people, the soldiers I have sent across and the parents of those soldiers, I will cite the Order in Council, which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has read in the House, and which is dated August 1, 1914, when war had scarcely yet been declared by England. It is as follows:

> 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.

That was the construction given to the Militia Act of that time. This question has been elaborately discussed in this House but that was the interpretation of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General. If that was their interpretation, it is my right to stand by that interpretation while it is also my own. I need not go any further. I believe that will be sufficient. The question of compulsion was discussed in this House. I shall not take up the time of the House by referring to Hansard to confirm what I am about to say, although I could do so if necessary, but I have always said in this House that I was opposed to conscription because it was not constitutional and that it could only be adopted by constitutional means. I have often said that in this House and I am perhaps not the only member who has said it. When, in 1916, the question of the extension of Parliament was under consideration, I laid before the House my objections to the proposed extension and I emphasized the comparative uselessness of a Parliament re-elected by itself instead of by a proper use of the constitution. I claim that this Parliament is moribund because its term of office has been extended by our own will. We may say it has been extended by an Imperial Act. It has been extended by an Imperial Act but that Imperial Act has no right to exist because, as I stated at the time, the only possible way to amend the constitution in order to extend the term of Parliament is to have a conference of the provinces of Canada and to obtain their unanimous consent.

The British North America Act may be likened to a treaty between the provinces of Canada, between the people of the East and those of the West. One of our great

constitutional establishments is our representation in this House; that was the question of most vital concern at the time of Confederation, more particularly to the provinces by the sea, the smaller provinces, who were afraid of meeting a preponderance of representatives from the West in the near future, to their possible disadvantage. So it was provided that no amendment could be made until that first step had been taken. It is not the duty of the Imperial Parliament, when asked to extend the life of this Parliament, to inquire from this Parliament if that step had been taken; it was their natural inference to presume that it had been taken by this Parliament. Although I am not a lawyer, I have given a great deal of thought to this question of the only mode of amending the constitution; I have studied it all my lifetime, and I say that if to-day the position of this Parliament were to be referred to the Privy Council, the Privy Council would dismiss us to-morrow morning.

Mr. GRAHAM: It might not be a bad thing.

Mr. TURGEON: It might not be a bad thing, and I wish we could do it with as much expedition as our friends opposite desire to pass this measure. I say that we have no mandate to be here, our position is ephemeral; this Parliament really has no existence. And so, when we ask for a referendum, we ask for it because we know that the people of Canada to-day are aware that we are here without a mandate. When, in January, 1916, the question was debated, public opinion had not yet settled upon our position. A great class of people in Canada, especially those engaged in the manufacture of munitions, who were earning thousands of dollars every day, did not want an election; everything was going on well, they said, do not disturb us. Others, influenced also by a desire not to be disturbed, said the same thing. But the country would have been less disturbed by an election eighteen months ago than it may possibly be disturbed to-day by this measure, however reluctant we may be to create any disturbance.

I do not see the great objection to an election or a referendum in this country; I do not see that it would be a calamity in time of war. I have more confidence in the sober judgment and the sober qualities of the people of Canada than to think that to-day, because it is war time, the war being fought out on battlefields remote from Canada, we would not be able to conduct ourselves like men, like Canadians, like British subjects, on the day of an election, just as we could on the day before and the day after. In my opinion it is an insult to the intelligence and the morality of the people of Canada to say that they could not, on one day, go to the polls as they have gone for the last one hundred years, and as they will have to go for all time to come. An election is the only possible means of clearing the minds of the people, who know that we are here without a mandate, and may perhaps attribute unworthy motives to us in sitting here drawing our indemnities and paying the salaries of ministers and all the expenses of this Parliament without the authority and consent of the people, which is the greatest crime against British precedents and policy.

I do not say that we should look solely to the conscription of blood to-day. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) said that he had asked from the first session after the outbreak of war for the imposition of an income tax. I have been as loud as he or any other member in urging an income tax; I did so only a month ago when speaking on the Budget of this session. Every time we have asked for the imposition of such a tax, the Minister of Finance has smiled away our proposal; and even to-day, when the Government can hear the voice of the people as expressed at various meetings and through newspapers, and know that they cannot avoid the establishment of some kind of conscription of wealth or some form of income tax, he tells us that there are a great many difficulties in the way, that perhaps later on they will impose an income tax. We have told him all the benefits that could be derived from it. I cited to him the advantage of the large increase in the income tax recently made by the Congress of the United States, under which those in receipt of a million dollars a year are taxed to 40 per cent or 45 per cent. The hon. Minister of Finance has replied to the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that it was a costly way of collecting taxes, and that perhaps he would not derive enough revenue from the tax to pay for the cost of administering it. I claim that if the minister would only look amongst his colleagues in the cabinet, among the millionaires of the cabinet, he would see that we could raise enough money by such a tax on them to pay the expenses of collecting the income tax throughout the country.

In 1915 the Prime Minister came back from England and from the front, and in a very eloquent speech in England before returning to Canada he declared to the people of the British Empire and of Canada, that, so far as Canada was concerned, the whole power of the nation would be consecrated to the task of winning the war. From that day on we have been asking for the conscription of the whole strength and power of the nation in these matters, yet nothing has been done. To-day my hon. friend comes with another message from the front, to fill the gaps. We are bound to fill the gaps as strongly as Canada can possibly do it to-day. They tell us that, failing reinforcements from Canada, our friends may be decimated in such a way that the British authorities would allow our Canadian army corps to be disbanded, and would not replenish their ranks by soldiers from England or other parts of the Empire. I say that to put this argument before the country is an injury to the British name and to the British fame, and to the British military authorities on the other side. We want to send all the men we can, all the men we can spare, and when my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) asks for a referendum he says that, if the majority of the people of Canada vote in favour of conscription, he will submit to it, and the members from Quebec will go willingly into their constituencies, and advocate abiding by the law. Everybody in Canada knows that there is no more law abiding people in the country than the French Canadians. If the Minister of Militia and my colleague from New Brunswick were here to-day, I would make the same statement to them. I will go to the county of Gloucester, and take the same position, and I think my voice in that county would amount to something. But, Mr. Speaker, the action which this Government is taking is not the proper one. For the last three years we have asked them to conscript the wealth. People say, "We do not understand what is meant by conscription of wealth," but put it in any form you like, call it income tax or anything else, it comes to the same thing. I believe my right hon. friend to-day is commencing at the wrong end in calling for conscription of manhood, before first conscripting wealth and incomes. We are told that England has passed a conscription law, but England is not in the same position. She has raised an immense army, comprising millions of men. Lord Roberts wished to raise a voluntary army, and it was thought it might not be necessary to establish conscription of manhood. I do not believe the army of Britain has benefited a great deal from the conscription of manhood. The recruits would have come later, under the voluntary system which is adopted in other places. I think we should commence by the conscription of wealth, resources, and utilities. One of the best informed men in the industrial line, Lord Rhondda, was sent out here in 1915, to suggest to this Government the conscription of wealth and nationalization of the services of the country. He advocated the nationalization of the large shops at Winnipeg and other places in order that they might be converted into munition works. Our authorities did not listen to the suggestion made by Lord Rhondda. Conscription has been adopted in England, but let me tell hon. gentlemen that this Government has had advice very recently from a great authority, Sir Joseph Ward, the former Prime Minister of New Zealand. Speaking at Winnipeg a few weeks ago, he said:

> Let me tell you, gentlemen, that you will have to do more than make up your minds to conscript the man power of the country—you will have to conscript the wealth also.
>
> Britain would never have been able to introduce conscription of her men if she had not first practically conscripted the wealth of the country. She could never have put it through. If you are going to call upon certain men in this country to go out and sacrifice their all—their lives if need be—you must be prepared, you men of wealth, to see that they are properly pensioned, to see that your money is employed in the country's behalf where you cannot give yourselves, to provide the wherewithal. Canada has done magnificently, but she must go on; there must be no turning back.

That is the advice given to the Government of this country. We have the advice of the labour element. They are calling first of all for the conscription of wealth, and, if required later on, conscription of labour. We are told that the labour element is not of one mind. Resolutions have been passed by a majority of the members of these labour unions, otherwise they would not have been forwarded to Parliament. Therefore, the majority of the labour men view the situation with the same seriousness as we view it. Not merely members on this side of the House, but members on the other side, and particularly members from Ontario, advocate conscription of wealth to-day, no matter what the result may be, so far as the present and future generations are concerned.

Last night in the great loyal city of Toronto the council met to discuss this matter and to send resolutions to the representatives of the people. A despatch, dated 25th June, from Toronto to the Ottawa papers reads as follows:

Toronto, June 25.—The Toronto city council showed itself to be anything but unanimous for the present Military Service Act of the Borden Government when this afternoon it defeated by a vote of thirteen to two a motion to force conscription on the eligible man power of the civic service, and listened without protest to vigorous speeches by two leaders of the council denouncing the conscription of flesh and blood without the conscription of wealth.

The motion under debate provided that all single employees of the permanent staff of the corporation or those married since the beginning of the war eligible for military service be given until July 9th to enlist or forfeit their positions. Ald. S. Ryding, the mover, and Ald. H. H. Ball, the seconder, were the only two members of council who spoke in support of the motion.

Increase Soldiers' Pay.

At an earlier stage of the meeting Ald. J. G. Ramsden, chairman of the works committee, had introduced a motion urging the Dominion Government to increase the pay of the men at the front and this motion had carried without discussion. In speaking to the conscription of civic employees motion Ald. Ramsden took occasion to combine the two motions in his argument by declaring, "It is said if we pay the men at the front as they should be paid that the country will be bankrupt. Bourassa has said so, I presume he means bankrupt as far as cash is concerned. Bankrupt be damned.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. TURGEON: I am quoting from the newspaper. The article continues:

As far as I am concerned let it be bankrupt in cash three times over rather than bankrupt in honor, integrity and justice.

I have always advocated in this House increasing the pay of our soldiers and increasing the pensions. We are to-day paying men working on munitions and on almost any other kind of work two, three, five to ten dollars a day. Any man who works in the streets of our cities is to-day receiving from $2 to $2.50 a day, and we ask that the pay of our soldiers be increased from $1.10 to $1.75 or even, if you like, to $2 a day. We are told, however, that the sacrifices incurred by our boys cannot be compensated in cash. We know quite well that the wealth of the country will not be sufficient compensation for the sacrifices incurred by one soldier who goes overseas with the true sentiment of fighting for civilization and christianity. The valour of the soldiers is his own; the duty of the State is to recompense him and his dependents to the full extent of its power. We are told that we have a debt of $2,000,000,000, and that we cannot afford to increase the pay of our soldiers. What difference will it make if, at the end of the war, after having paid our soldiers as generously as we can, our debt is increased by a few hundred million dollars? Let us increase their pay and their pensions so that when they come back they will feel, as we told them when they went away, that they are the idols of the country. We give a pittance of $480 a year to a soldier who comes back totally disabled and unfit to earn a living. The non-commissioned officer who comes back in the same condition receives a pension of $610, and a lieutenant, $720. We should give the rank and file a pension of $720 a year and have only one class; and if that pension be not enough, let us make it $800 a year. The pension to the commissioned officers could remain as it is, because although we value their services, they will possibly be able to live in comfort on the amount allotted to them. It is the man whom we want to send overseas whom we should encourage and assure that when he goes overseas those dependent upon him will be looked after. I suggest also that the separation allowance for a dependent wife or mother should be increased from twenty to thirty dollars a month, so that our people will see that the State, in asking large sacrifices from our soldiers, is also willing to make every possible sacrifice in return.

Not only has Canada to supply reinforcements for the men at the front, but she has to supply foodstuffs not only to our own soldiers, but to the soldiers of Great Britain and of the Allies. To-day, England, France and Italy, depend upon the United States and Canada for the maintenance of the lives of their civil populations as well as of their immense armies at the front, and if by misfortune, Canada cannot do her share towards meeting the demand, there will be hunger and famine in those countries. What would happen should the war last another year or two and should the crop this fall and next be not what it should be? We know that the acreage sown this year is smaller than it was two or three years ago, and we shall therefore not be able to send as great a quantity of foodstuffs as we sent last year and the year before, and in the United States, owing to the mobilization of their army, immense as it will be, although in comparison with the populations of the two countries it cannot compare with the army which Canada has sent, there will probably be a smaller

surplus crop available. Lord Rhondda, who two years ago appealed for the nationalization of the resources of the country for the winning of the war, is to-day appealing to Canada for production, without which the people of England and France will suffer misery and famine. This is the report of an interview with Lord Rhondda in London on the 19th of June. I will read only what refers to Canada:

> I hope I shall not be misconstrued or thought impatient if I say that the sooner your food administration measures are enacted, the sooner we shall breathe more easily.

He is pressing to have these measures put in effect in the United States in order that he may be able to breathe more freely for the safety of the English people. He goes on to say:

> At present our policy and the practical details of our buying are rendered more difficult, more complex, by the uncertainty regarding the future. My experiences in America before and since the war have given me an unusual opportunity of appreciating the vastness of her resources. If these are organized to their full capacity, I am confident that the German hope of starving the Allies or of causing civilians unrest by the scarcity of food or high prices, is doomed to failure. 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."

That is the appeal made on the 19th of June last in London by Lord Rhondda, the food controller of Great Britain, and we must therefore, take steps to render all possible assistance to the Empire in supplying not only men but foodstuffs.

I cannot agree with the statement that voluntary recruiting is dead. Canada's achievement in the way of recruiting from the beginning of the war until a month or six weeks ago has been the admiration of the world outside of Canada. We have enlisted over 400,000 men out of a population of, say 7,000,000, scattered over a country stretching a distance of over 3,000 miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a population, a large part of which is engaged in farming and with so many young men required for work on the farms. Yet from east and west, men have enlisted in large numbers, and every province has subscribed large sums of money to assist in the prosecution of the war.

During the last three months enlistments in Canada have not been so bad as reported. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) gave figures the other day showing that in the months of March, April and May there had been an average enlistment of about 6,000 a month. That is a very creditable record when we remember that at that time the Government were discouraging recruiting; these recruits were obtained in spite of the authorities. I believe that a government fresh from the people could appeal successfully not only to men for the front, but to our industrial and commercial men, and that we should then be able to get the 100,000 men required, and an organization that would ensure a constant stream of supplies for the front. A government with a mandate from the people would be able to form a coalition government, if need be, which would certainly be able to draw up a programme that would make conscription unnecessary in Canada. I am sure that such a government would be welcome to the people of this country.

Some hon. gentlemen have said that we are wasting time talking about the constitution. Why, only a few days ago the most eloquent orator Great Britain has produced, Hon. A. J. Balfour, told us in this very chamber to trust democracy, and the words of that great statesman were re-echoed by my right hon. leader when he asked that this question be submitted to the people in the form of a referendum. Hon. gentlemen may say what they like against it, but the referendum is certainly becoming more popular among British people all over the Empire. The western provinces have adopted it in provincial matters; it is of the very essence of democracy. It has been said that because the hon. member for Edmonton is a supporter of conscription, he is against the constitution, but he has too logical a mind not to see the difference between conscription with a mandate from the people, and conscription without; there is as much difference between the two as between democracy and autocracy, as between liberty and freedom and the militarism against which we are fighting to-day.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, always logical and eloquent, has made light of the constitution. He knows my feelings on the constitution, and therefore I hope he will not be offended if I tell him I resented his remarks. The constitution comes first all the time, and with all people. What did Thomas Jefferson say?

> The will of the majority should prevail. If it does not, then the Constitution in any democratic state is violated.

We want the people to rule in this country. We want them to be educated on this question. Abraham Lincoln said:

> The people are the rightful masters of both congresses and courts, not to overthrow the Constitution, but to overthrow the men who pervert the Constitution.

There are men in this Parliament today who would pervert the constitution of Canada. Let us have this Bill submitted as speedily as possible to the people either by referendum or by general election. If both a referendum and an election are decided on, they could be held on the same day to save time and expense. I might cite one other authority, the Manchester Guardian, a paper whose standing in the British Empire is very high. I have often heard the hon. member for Red Deer approving its doctrines. Commenting upon the Prime Minister's reluctance to submit this Bill to the people, and the proposal of the leader of the Opposition for a referendum, the Manchester Guardian says:

> It is so clearly the more honest procedure that the Canadian Government is not likely to incur the odium of enforcing it.

That is strong language. Let me refer for a moment to what has been done in Australia, the loyalty of whose people no one will question. Hon. gentlemen say that this country is not loyal because there are some French people in it. Now in Austraila I do not suppose there is a single French Canadian. A referendum was held in Australia on the question of conscription, and the loyal people there voted against it. We cannot blame Quebec for the defeat of the referendum in Australia, at all events. My hon. friend from Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) who finds nothing in the province of Quebec to appeal to his soul or mind might go to Australia and take a lesson from the British people there.

I have said nothing new. I have stood by the constitution ever since 1873, when the trouble arose in my county over the New Brunswick school question, as mentioned by the hon. member for St. John last night. I was strongly opposed then to any amendment to the constitution, because I knew that one amendment led to others, and the constitution might in that way eventually be destroyed.

Therefore, when we call for a referendum, we are just as loyal as any who oppose it, just as desirous of helping our young men across the sea and of sending more to their assistance. But we want these men to go in the spirit of democracy; and we hope that when they have done their bit and return to Canada, they will, as citizens of this Dominion, stand for democracy in time of peace as they have stood for democracy and against militarism in time of war and under the greatest possible sacrifices.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 101, respecting the Canada Preferred Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 102, respecting the Western Canada Accident and Guarantee Insurance Company.—Mr. Bradbury.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Sir Robert Borden for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, resumed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, the Bill before the House does not lend itself to extended debate and I suppose it might well be said that every viewpoint of the question has been already touched upon by preceding speakers. In the circumstances, I might well have remained silent, but finding myself in disagreement upon the measure with my leader, and with many of my political friends; realizing my responsibility for the vote which I shall give upon the Bill, I feel compelled to briefly give to the House my views as to the principle of the measure. I do not intend discussing any of the provisions of the Bill. An opportunity for so doing will be presented to every hon. member of the House and when that time arrives I shall deem it my duty to discuss the provisions of the Bill with frankness and candour and to suggest to the Government the amendments which I think should be made.

During my remarks, I do not desire at all to refer to the matter of the mobilization and utilization of the resources of the nation for the purpose of carrying on the war. That has been introduced into the debate and has been referred to by many hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House. I agree fully with the views which they have expressed, but the suggestion involves so much that I feel that I should rather debate the same on another occasion which no doubt will present itself to the House.

The party system of politics may have its objectionable features. It may be, as Pope said, "the madness of the many for the gain of the few." but it is only when one finds himself in disagreement with his

leader and the majority of his party that he realizes the strength of political associations and the warm attachment which comes from a long comradeship in party politics. These embarrassments have been very much softened by the generous pronouncement of my leader in extending to his supporters the utmost freedom to take the course which they thought fit upon the Bill, which far transcends political considerations and which is deserving of the most candid and impartial treatment. This announcement of our leader was not sought for; it was not asked for; it came from him spontaneously. It was particularly characteristic of the man and truly reflects his intelligent liberalism.

I appreciate fully the viewpoint of my party friends who differ from me, and particularly with the viewpoint of my friends from the province of Quebec. I think I can appreciate all that in history, tradition and experience which contributes to that conclusion. I can hear them say that the views of their leader are their views, and where he leads they will follow. That is all clear to me and I understand it thoroughly. No one will question the importance and gravity of the Bill which we are now considering. Inevitably, it creates a more profound interest in and out of Parliament than any question which we have had before us since Confederation. There is in this country, in some degree or other, amongst all classes of the people, a traditional repugnance to compulsory military service. We cannot escape, try how we will, a well defined division of public opinion. That division is applicable to the whole country; it is applicable to both parties, diverse principles are involved and the distinctions are fundamental in their character. Inevitably, therefore, we find a very substantial body of opinion in every part of Canada against the measure, which opinion, I think, we must all respect and recognize. In opposing this view, it is only my desire to speak with modesty and without arrogance or dogmatism. I think that I clearly realize the strength of the position of those who take a view opposite to that which I propose taking. If I were dissatisfied with the opinion held in some section of Canada, in some province, I would deem it my duty, in my feeble way, to point out to them the path of duty, or the proper conception of the principles involved in the Bill, rather than attack offensively such views which I believe are conscientiously held. I somewhat regret that this afternoon, in one or two spots of the debate, there did seem to be evidence of a spirit for which I personally did not care. For one very definite reason I felt constrained to intervene in this debate, and that is because I desire to make reference to certain views which have been frequently expressed in regard to our position in this war. A variety of views have been expressed, and I have in mind statements made, not in this Parliament but outside of it, in respect to our actual position in the war. Newspapers report men from time to time as saying that we are fighting for Great Britain, that we are aiding the Allies and not one of the Allies, that we are not in the war primarily as a belligerent, fighting for ourselves and our country, but rather out of filial regard for Great Britain, or from purely altruistic and humanitarian motives alone. Some few days ago Mr. Henri Bourassa, a prominent publicist of Quebec, said that his province was not interested in the war, a view which I believe does not truly reflect the best opinion of the province of Quebec, and I am sure it does not reflect the opinion of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House from that province, and particularly might I say this of my friends from Quebec upon this side of the House, whom I know better. These views are heard frequently; they are not heard in one province alone. If I am correct in this, I say that such views should be discussed with candour and with frankness, because they go to the very foundation of this Bill. We should be clear in our conception of our position in this war and the purposes for which we fight, for if we are not, then our faith in the cause for which we contend will not be clearly established. For that reason I do not purpose apologizing to the House if I occupy its time for a few minutes in discussing the matters to which I have just referred.

We have now been in this war for two and one-half years, and I say it is strange to me how often I have heard expressed the statements which I have just indicated. It may be that these views are quite prevalent, and that they have militated against recruiting in this country. If such views were widely held we could not expect anything but an intermittent and indifferent and divided interest in this country in respect to the war. Whether we like it or not, we were subject to invasion and attack and invasion was the settled policy of the enemy. Let there be no difference of opinion on that point; there cannot, I submit, be any view to the contrary, that is well founded. Our participation in this war was

inevitable for defensive purposes alone, and defensive war does not mean that it must be waged in one's own country. It is an untenable doctrine to propound in modern days that because an army has not actually penetrated into one's country that therefore that country is not at war and not vitally interested, and should not assume the aggressive. The German Empire would have struck at Canada as quickly as it struck at Great Britain, if it could. They endeavoured, I have no doubt, to attack our coast line in the early days of the war. The battle of the Falkland islands was a battle fought to protect the coasts of Canada. We are liable to bombardment of our coasts at any moment, although that danger is now remote. Canadian ships were sunk in the earlier days of the war, and I think in one instance before our policy in regard to the war was declared by Parliament. Canadian lives and property have been lost on our own and on neutral shipping; international bridges were destroyed and public works in this country were attacked by Germans, and the defence made by these offenders was that the acts were committed by them as soldiers of the German Empire against a country with which they were at war. The vigilant secret service of the United States, I have no doubt, if the truth were known, protected our country against assault on many an occasion. It may be true as well, for aught I know, that the secret service of Canada protected us against many a premeditated assault by those resident in the United States who still counted themselves as citizens and soldiers of the German Empire. A fellow Canadian and a fellow member of this House to-day, languishes in a German military prison. He was arrested in a country in which he had a right to be, by a nation which had no right to be in that country— a burglar and criminal nation. This act was the natural and logical sequence of the outrage committed by Germany against the sovereignty of Belgium. The arrest of the Hon. Dr. Beland is as much an attack upon the honour and integrity of Canada as was the initial invasion of Belgium by the enemy an attack upon its integrity. I have no doubt that the flag that flies over us whispers to him the hope of his freedom and restoration to his native country, and, if God spares his life, I have no doubt that hope will be realized.

In the early days of this war, I think I may truthfully say, we lacked a campaign of education in this country as to the causes and the purposes of the war and the reason of our participation therein, and for this lack in a great measure we have since suffered. I repeat that we hear it frequently said that we are fighting for Great Britain and not as a principal belligerent. That view is only possible by shutting one's eyes to the political evolution of recent years as to the constitution of the British Empire. Nothing, in my judgment, could be more erroneous. I disagree with that view to-day and I have always disagreed with it, and I believe it is mischievous. It is true that Great Britain has saved us from the horrors of actual invasion. It is true that she has protected our trade and commerce, and by reason of that fact, we are enjoying a material prosperity equal to if not greater than that of ante bellum days. It is true that Great Briain is the ancestral home of a majority of the citizens of this country, which fact naturally evokes a spirit of loyalty and devotion to the country which is fighting for the democracy of the whole world. It is true the British flag is the herald of mercy as well as of might, not only for us, but for many other countries of this world to-day. I submit these reasons alone would have justified our participation in the war, and, doubtless, were a tremendous factor in impelling us in the first instance to participate in this war. But Germany was a strong maritime power. She had the will and the power to strike at any part of the British Empire, and it is now quite clear that that had long been her intention. But, notwithstanding this, I think it is well that we have in our minds correctly our political and constitutional relations with Great Britain, as component parts of one Empire. This country is not owned by Great Britain. Great Britain and Canada each form a distinct part of one Empire, and such alone are the political relations of one to the other. The autonomy of the one is as complete as the autonomy of the other. It is only by resorting to historical and political fictions, that are long since dead, that you can establish the doctrine of the sovereignty of one and the subjection of the other. We are fighting with Great Britain, and not for Great Britain. The latter proposition would import an idea of subjection, which should not exist in the minds of the citizens of this country. It is not the correct idea, and I fear it has been productive of more or less harm. It is true the efforts of the Empire are co-ordinated for Imperial

purposes, but it is also true that these efforts are co-ordinated in the interest of the autonomous parts of the Empire as well. In the debate in the American Congress, on the occasion of that body considering whether or not it would support the President in his declaration of war against Germany, it was submitted by opponents of the President that the proposed action of the United States was designed more for the purpose of aiding Great Britain than for the defence of principle or democracy. I am glad to say that that view does not prevail generally in the United States. One of the stoutest opponents of the entry of the United States into the war was Senator Lafollette. Upon the floor of Congress he stated that, as the purpose of the nation was only to assist Great Britain, it would be better for them to furnish Great Britain with money for the purpose of carrying on the war by the purchase of Canada. He was graceful enough to suggest that they should leave Canada in the possession of Canadians until the end of the war, even if they paid the purchase money at once. The idea prevails therefore in foreign countries as well, that the condition of sovereignty and subjection exists in our political and constitutional relations with Great Britain, and the sooner we dispel that idea the better it will be for Canada. Let us understand properly what the British Empire means. Do not let us destroy its grandeur by misconceptions. But there is, Mr. Speaker, the consideration of self-interest and self-protection, which, after all, is the great motive power behind every great national and individual effort. In this war we are fighting in defense of Canada, and we are resisting an invasion of Canada just as surely as Great Britain is resisting an invasion of the United Kingdom. It is said, in connection with the South African war, by one speaker, I think, on this side of the House, that the circumstances were quite similar to the present war. I do not agree with that view. It was not possible for the Dutch republic to have struck at Canada. She was powerless in that respect, being without a navy; but in this case, by no means could we have kept outside the vortex of the war, even if we had so wished. We should be thankful that the battle line where fight our Canadian soldiers to protect us against actual invasion is in foreign lands, and not upon Canadian soil. Thank God, we are spared that sorrow. But though we are separated by thousands of miles of ocean from the actual scene of the conflict, we are fighting with the Allies, not for the Allies, in defence of our own country. War cannot be conducted on purely defensive lines. A country's defence can frequently be made by aggressive means, and not always within her own territory. That is particularly true of the present war, and probably will be true of future wars. In the supreme moment of our history, I cannot but feel, Sir, that in very truth the foreign soil where fight Canadian soldiers, is really Canadian soil. This thought was beautifully expressed by a young Englishman of distinction in the realm of literature, Rupert Brook, in a beautiful poem well known to many hon. gentlemen of the House, and written, I think, just shortly before he gave up his life at Galipoli, when he wrote the words—

> If I should die, think only this of me:
> That there's some corner of a foreign field
> That is forever—England.

I say we are in this war as an interested principal. We have, for more than two years, been fighting in defence of our country, and against actual invasion. Canadians, in the after years, when they visit the many corners of foreign fields, where are buried our fallen heroes, will truly feel that such spots are forever part of Canada, and they will, in imagination at least, project our territorial bounds to those points upon foreign soil.

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, give adherence to the view that our Militia Act contemplates power only to strike the enemy when within our own territorial bounds. It seems to me that would render the Militia Act absolutely useless. The idea further contemplates that we must remain quiescent, until the enemy are actually within the bounds of our country before we are justified in striking. The absurdity of this position is self evident. Could that contention be legally maintained, then the constitution should be amended. There is a higher law than the constitution, and if needs be, the constitution must sometimes bend to meet national necessities.

But are we not justified and supported in our efforts in this war by reasons and motives which are higher than Imperial interest, and Canadian self interest, as suggested in the splendid speech of the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee)? Who is there in this country that has intelligently observed the march of events from the beginning of this war down

to the present moment, who does not believe that we are in the path of right, justice, humanity and duty in placing, for the protection of the world's civilization, our military strength, whatever measure it may be, in the scale against the barbaric and brutal militarism of Germany. Shall not our efforts, judged by these high considerations, go down the ages to our eternal credit, to the enrichment of our Canadian history, and a rich legacy for those who will follow us as citizens in this country?

We hear the question asked: Why should we become embroiled in the old-world issues? Owen Wister, in his very readable book, "Pentecost of Calamity," which hon. gentlemen no doubt know well, says that "He who talks of the old world and the new world, talks in a dead language." The interests and the destinies of this continent are involved in the destinies of the old world. The world he compared to a boat which never grows in size, but the occupants of which grow in number. If any occupant commences rocking the boat, it is the duty of all other occupants that love safety and peace to control the disturber, and if necessary, to throw him overboard.

If Canada were a republic and absolutely dissociated from the British Empire, she would, I venture to say, be in this war as a belligerent. She is peopled by a breed of men who would fight against a nation that has filled the world with astonishment and horror; that has hurled calamity against the whole universe and grievously sinned against civilization. She would not see democracy and freedom and national human rights crushed out without proferring a saving hand. Her people would ultimately do as our neighbours in the United States decided to do, in order that democracy might not perish from the earth. They would at least do what the little South American republics aspire to do. They would quickly realize that the liberty of their constitution was in danger; they would fight for its preservation in foreign lands if the battle line was there, and they would even break the bounds of the constitution, if needs be, for after all it is the spirit of the people and not its political institutions that safeguard its freedom. They too would have turned a willing ear to the importunities of France and Belgium to save their countries from the aggressor and their peoples from immolation and a despot's lust, and we would be unworthy of the races from which we come if we were not willing to strike against the enemy in so just a cause. We are not a warlike country nor a warlike people. If that is our attitude, then we should be active in this war, because it is a war against war, as they speak of it in France, and the same idea was expressed this afternoon by some hon. gentlemen. We are not favourable to militarism, but if we despise and hate militarism, this is a splendid opportunity to destroy it, or at least to weaken it, for essentially is this a war against militarism.

Then, Mr. Speaker, relegating to the background all the events, reasons and causes leading up to the war, do you not think that the conduct of the war by Germany, on the one hand, and by the Allied nations, on the other, should clearly point out to us our path of duty? If the question as to which nation is responsible for the commencement of the war was in doubt surely the manner in which the war, since its commencement has been conducted by the Allied nations on one hand and the Central powers on the other, can there be any doubt upon which side our military strength should be cast? Witness the death of Edith Cavell, the sinking of the Lusitania, the desolation of that part of France behind the battle lines, the immolation of its innocent and defenceless people, the attacks upon defenceless noncombatants; then place against that the splendid and generous attitude so often taken by Great Britain and France in their conduct towards the enemy, when, in many instances, they might well have displayed a different spirit. Witness, as one example, the conduct of the French priest at the Cathedral of Rheims, when German wounded soldiers were being taken from the cathedral and were about to be attacked by French soldiers. This venerable priest stood upon the steps and raising both hands, he cried: "Stop soldiers, remember the ancient name and chivalry af France." As a writer of that incident states, hearts throughout the world throbbed upon reading of the incident, and eyes were wet with tears that never saw the Cathedral of Rheims. No matter how assured one felt about the strength and justice of our position in entering the war, who can but realize the contrast in the manner in which the war has been conducted by the principal belligerents of each side. Is it not clear that our duty is to vigorously carry on.

I must apologize for my lengthy remarks upon this phase of our relation to the

world's great issue. I know that every member of this House is as much aware of its importance and as well informed upon it as I am. But, after all, everything is involved in it. It has often been said—and it will bear reiteration. With this clearly in view our duties and our obligations in the premises will be so much the clearer. If we believe the issue is serious, and it is, if civilization and human rights are in jeopardy, and they are, if our country and its future is in danger, and it is, then our course from the beginning was and is now well chartered and well marked.

What is the purpose and scope of the Bill which is now before the House? Purely as a piece of legislation does it in principle introduce anything which has not been a part of our statute law since Confederation. I can understand how there might be a difference of opinion as to when the Act should be put into force, but surely, in principle, it is legislation that any country at war or even at peace might well have incorporated in its statute law.

What is our law at the present time in respect to military service? All men between the ages of 18 and 60 are liable to service within or without the Dominion whenever it is deemed advisable to call them up by reason of war or invasion; that is practically the reading of the statute. We entered this war of our own volition, a free people, by and through the Parliament of a free country. We believed that the issues involved were of the first importance, and that we were liable to attack and invasion by the enemy; there can be no question about that. Now, in principle, is the Bill out of harmony with the obligations which we assumed when we decided to enter the war? In all the circumstances, is not this measure one which wisdom dictates? Apart from our immediate needs, might it not be the part of wisdom to enact this legislation for our future protection and our future guidance? The Bill in my judgment is only amendatory of the Militia Act. Its purpose is simply to modify the Act so as to make it effective, if needs be, to meet the necessities or exigencies of the present or some future time. It means nothing more and nothing less. I cannot bring myself to believe that we are contending about a piece of proposed legislation which in itself presents a new principle to this Parliament or to this country. The principle is already upon our statute books, and has been there for 50 years without occasioning any adverse comment. Therefore, I modestly submit that I cannot view the principle of the Bill as do some hon. gentlemen. But whether the principle should be applied now or in the near future is a matter concerning which we may fairly and honestly differ. Do the conditions justify the contemplated application of the Militia Act as proposed to be amended by this Bill? As I have already remarked, there is a clear division of opinion as to the respective merits of voluntary and obligatory military service. The exponents of each system differ in a fundamental principle, and, therefore, they are irreconcilable. But, after all, is that the real question involved in the Bill? Is not the question rather one as to our national necessities and as to whether a military necessity exists for more man power, rather than a question of which principle is correct, that of the voluntary system or that of the obligatory system? Do we need the man power? If so, how are we to get it? After all, is not that the question? Is the question of voluntary service as opposed to obligatory service the real question before us? If it is a question of necessity one would naturally ask: Has the necessity been established? Is the evidence before us as to the necessity sufficient to justify the passing of this Bill? I do not intend to make a survey of all the evidence available for or against the proposition, or for determining upon which side lies the preponderance of evidence. One man with one son at the front may say that no further men should be sent to the front. Another man, or a mother, who is, perhaps, in humbler circumstances and has four sons at the front, is of the opinion that we should send further troops to the battle line. Some say that our troops are amply supplied with reserves, another, perhaps a soldier who has fought and suffered, says that further reserves are urgently required. Another will say that the cause for which we contend is so sacred that the absolute maximum is alone sufficient to discharge our duty. Others say that we have gone as far as our financial resources will allow, and, of course, there is a limit in that direction. Some say that before we add to our military forces in Europe the United States should put into the field five or six million men. It is pointed out, in answer to this, that the more men the United States puts into the battle line and the sooner they do it the sooner the war will be over, and the less will be the sacrifice of Canadian life. One is confused by the variety and number of opinions. I do not hesitate to say that there is a vast section of public opinion

which feels that the Government's statement in this respect is not yet complete, and that a more exhaustive and clearer statement should be made as to our military necessities. In the circumstances, I think that all the facts should be placed before the people of this country in the clearest possible manner. It may be that hon. gentlemen around me are fully seized of all the facts. They may be satisfied that the necessity for future additions to our military strength has been established. But we must remember that outside of this Parliament there is a vast electorate, who are entitled to the fullest and clearest information on this subject.

I am influenced to the conclusion that the necessity has been established; because that is the view of the Government, who are in possession of the actual facts; because it seems to be the judgment of our military advisers; because from private sources we occasionally receive evidences confirmatory of this fact; and lastly, because there seems to be a unanimous demand on the part of every belligerent nation of the world for more man-power and I cannot make myself believe that Canada is an exception. If further men are required to support our soldiers and to fight in France, then I say it is a compelling demand and one which no man can lightly cast aside. If it is true that more men are required, then in justice to those who fight and out of respect to the memory of those who have died we should feel obliged to bring forth the quota of men which is stated by the Government as being necessary. At least for myself I shall not take the responsibility of saying that further men are not required and thus oppose the Bill. Therefore it is that I intend to vote for the principle of the Bill and against any delay in the second reading—that is I shall vote against the amendments. If a submission of the issue to the people should be deemed proper and desirable, I should choose the pathway of a general election in preference to a referendum; but in reference to that I do not express an opinion to-night. It will come before us on another and more fitting occasion for extended debate, and when it does I shall be very glad to give to the House my views upon it.

I have endeavoured to show that we are vitally interested in this war; that the necessity has been established for additions to our manpower strength; and that further troops should be despatched to Europe as reserves. In my mind the question naturally arises, is it necessary, in order to meet these necessities, that the provisions of the Bill when enacted, be put into effect? Just a few words upon that point. There can be no doubt, as has been said frequently by speakers on both sides of the House, that voluntary enlistment in Canada was highly creditable indeed. No credit whatever is due to the Government, or to the nation; the credit is due to the men who enlisted; it is to them alone that the credit is due. The glory is ours. The credit is due to the men who enlisted. Therefore do I say that I do not care to hear the statement, "We have done splendidly; we have done nobly;" all the credit is due to the men who enlisted. It is true, of course, that the nation in other respects has played its part well.

The late Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) addressed the House last week, and one would imagine that all the glory and credit of this war, so far as Canada is concerned, was his. All the mistakes and shortcomings in the administration of the war he, in the most generous fashion, passes along to his late colleagues, and they do not seem to resent the same very vigorously. The hon. gentleman seems to be under the obsession that as a soldier he is super-human, that he has all the characteristics of omnipotence, omnipresence and omniscience. Putting everything together, I have no doubt that in his own mind he is quite sure that at the beginning of August, 1914, figuratively speaking and in the military sense, this part of the North American continent was without form and void, and darkness was upon the deep. And after that, I suppose he will claim, he brought forth the light; and in imitation of High Example, he divided the night from the day; but I observe that immediately he made this division, he took all the light to himself and left all the rest of his fellow countrymen in darkness. Then, he created an army of 33,000 men; and I suppose that when he comes to write his autobiography he will say, in order to show his ability to do things contrary to the ways of God Almighty, that he made these men out of the ribs of women. The administrative career of my hon. friend, instead of being one which he should have so persistently and so offensively boasted of, is one that was not at all creditable, but one that has brought forth much of the turmoil which we have to-day. He says his recruiting career was magnificent, and it was infallible; I say that he was an obstacle to recruiting and in no sense was he helpful to it. The other day the hon. gentleman

9 p.m.

thrust my name into his speech because I have refused his personal solicitations to debate here his personal grievances against the minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). I told him the other day, while he was addressing the House, that he deliberately gave instructions that a young man living in my city was by his directions refused enlistment. I thought I would be able to read the letter which was sent by the Department of Militia here to headquarters at Halifax, directing that under no circumstances should this young man, who was desirous of fighting for his King and country, be permitted to enlist. The hon. gentleman stated that this was done because, as correspondent of a Nova Scotia newspaper, while in England, this young man had written letters to his paper criticising the conduct and management of Salisbury camp. Mr. Speaker, one could hardly imagine that it could happen anywhere in the British Empire, that a young, intelligent man anxious to fight—and not as an officer but as a private—was to be refused enlistment under the direction of the Minister of Militia.

The most bitter and unrelenting newspaper criticism against the war administration in England has come from Lord Northcliffe who was the other day honoured with a very high appointment to the United States. We also remember that in the early days of the war, a Montreal genteman, sir Herbert Holt, returned from England and very vigorously criticised the conduct of the war by the British authorities and for a few days it caused a considerable stir in this country. I suppose it will yet transpire that, if Sir Herbert Holt has unfortunately no sons, some fool Liberal or Conservative Government will force him into the British peerage because he criticised the conduct of the war by the British war authorities. Here was a case where a young man was willing to serve as a private and anxious to fight for his King and country and it was apparently the policy of the Minister of Militia to prevent him if he possibly could. Mr. Speaker, will you please pardon this diversion? I do not want to provoke any partisan discussion but I cannot help but protest when I hear the threatenings of that hon. gentleman hurled against the leader of the Opposition and other gentlemen on this side and against hon. gentlemen opposite, looking for smiles here, plaudits there. I hate skim milk, masquerading as cream, man as superman, human weakness as infallibility, and when I hear it, I protest. I do not say this with malice. Naturally, I am disposed to be generous and I quite appreciate the position of the late Minister of Militia. It is always sad, to look upon an exiled monarch, longing for his kingdom, crown and sceptre. He always thinks of right forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne. Yes, that administrative record did not help recruiting, and I want to say to hon. gentlemen opposite that it makes it very difficult for many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to take the position which they do by reason of the many just criticisms made by citizens of this country in respect of that record. That administrative record has planted the seed of distrust in the minds of our people, and has militated against recruiting. It makes it difficult for the public to accept with favour and confidence the proposals of the Bill and offers a justification for the suggestion that there should be a further trial of voluntary enlistment after the Bill becomes law and before it is enforced.

I am of the opinion that in any event it should not be put into immediate operation. I do not make this statement casually or perfunctorily. I say it earnestly and sincerely. I would make the statement if I were before my constituents tomorrow and I would make it as a matter of policy. I am of the belief that a further campaign of education is necessary and desirable in this country to make clear to our people our military necessities and the purposes of the war. It took the best of our countrymen some time to catch the true vision of the real significance of the war. Some may have been slower than others. Let us not be too critical, but let us be fair and generous in assigning causes. Should a further appeal be made to our people, I believe that our young men who have so nobly responded in the past will make a further and sufficient response if given another opportunity for voluntary enlistment under the inspiration of the sincere and united efforts of all leaders of public opinion in this country. Having put our hands to the plough, I cannot make myself believe that the young manhood of this country now want to look back. I believe that they would rather prefer seeing a magnificent beginning end in a blaze of glory. At any rate, is it not worth a trial? It will be regrettable if resort has to be made to the present Bill to secure the relatively small number who are needed if a united and sincere effort on the part of our leaders of all shades of public opinion in this country would

bring forth the desired number of men. If that fails and our needs still continue, then our path is made all the clearer. If we could but realize, all of us in this country, the gravity of our position, the imminent danger of the cause for which we are contending, if we could forget our political differences for the moment, and they are trifling after all as compared with the supreme question confronting us, we would regardless of party, race or creed, walk in spirit at least, hand in hand, across No Man's land into the enemy's trenches where fight our soldiers for Canada, and in defence of Canada, in order that we might live our lives in our accustomed way. If we could approach the question in that spirit I believe the suggestion which I have made, and which has been made by other hon. gentlemen, is a practicable one and one that should be tried. In that spirit I believe we could accomplish our ends and meet our immediate necessities. In that spirit let me say we should stand behind those who have fought for us and the memory of those who have consecrated with their blood the principles for which we contend.

Is it too late, Mr. Speaker, to make this appeal? My closing remarks this evening are that before the provisions of the Bill, after enactment, are put into effect, there should be a sincere and united effort on the part of everybody in every province in this country to secure the result which we all wish by a final appeal for voluntary enlistment. There has been considerable political manoeuvring on the part of both sides since the beginning of the war. It would be purposeless and useless to deny that. Political propaganda has been carried on by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. If they indulged in any just criticism whatever, it would inevitably be termed political propaganda by hon. gentlemen opposite. Party politics may have been carried on by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, but, on the other hand, party politics has been certainly practised by hon. gentlemen opposite. Are they willing to abandon their practices in party politics in order to make it possible to carry out successfully the suggestion which I have made?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, yes.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If my hon. friends opposite are willing to do so, I am sure that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would be willing to join with them. With such an effort on our part, I cannot make myself believe that we could not accomplish everything we desire by united effort; and in a very brief space of time, without putting into force the provisions of the Bill after it becomes law.

Mr. ROGERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would be a splendid thing, if, even at this late period of the war, we could approximate that period in our political history described by the English poet when he put into the mouth of the Roman minstrel who, when singing about the heroic past of his country, mournfully referred to the time

When none were for the party, and all were for the State.

That is the attitude which I think should characterize hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, and if that were possible, I believe the suggestion which has been made by several hon. gentlemen already could be carried out, that our military necessities could yet be accomplished, without the enforcement of the Bill, by further but brief efforts to secure enlistment voluntarily.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance that I rise to speak after listening to the eloquent address just delivered by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). I must also admit that as the days have been passing I have become more impatient at the delay, possibly without very good reason in view of the address that we heard this afternoon by the hon. member from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), from which I can quite understand that a public discussion of the question at issue and the Bill now before the House might possibly have a good effect throughout Canada. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has told us that he thought a further campaign of education throughout Canada necessary. If that is the case, and it is possible that it may be so, then perhaps a discussion such as is taking place here in this Chamber will accomplish that better and more effectually than it could be accomplished in any other way. I feel, I have thought for some time, that the people of Canada have not been fully awake to the seriousness of the situation that confronts the people of the world at the present time. We are allied with the most progressive nations of the world in a world war. This war is our war, just as much as it is that of any other country. I think that that ought to sink down into the

minds of every one. Do not think for one moment that we are fighting some one else's battles. We are fighting our own battles, we are fighting for a principle. There are two principles in conflict in this world at the present time; one is going to overcome the other, and that other is going to be blotted out of existence. We believe that we are in the right, and it is our duty, holding that belief, to do everything possible to see that victory rests on the banners of the Allies. I may be pardoned if, in order to make my own position clear, I make reference to some remarks which I made in the House in the war session of 1914. In moving the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, I said:—

> Dark and threatening clouds have been visible on the horizon for several years. These have at last burst forth like a tornado, and threaten the whole world with the most terrific and devastating war the world has ever seen. The greatest disaster of recorded time is at hand; many millions of men are now engaged in one of the most desperate and fearful struggles the mind of man can conceive of.

I also said:—

> The Government are to be commended for their promptness in immediately taking action to forward troops and munitions of war, without waiting for Parliament to assemble, with the certain assurance that the sentiment of the people of Canada and of Parliament would endorse and sustain such action.

And further on:—

> The war may be a long and bitter one; the loss of life is sure to be enormous; suffering and want may come to many who are dependent on those who go to the front, or who may fall in battle. It is therefore the duty of the people of Canada and the Government of Canada to make provision for the alleviation of such suffering and want. Would not the tribute we would be called upon to pay be most beggarly when compared with the sacrifice, the tribute of life-blood paid by our country's defenders? There is no sacrifice the occasion demands that the people of Canada are not prepared to make. Let our response to the needs of the Empire be immediate and sufficient.

Those were the sentiments that I held at that time. I may say, also, in connection with that matter, that in the war session of August, 1914, we had no mandate from the people for the action that we took upon that occasion, yet not a dissenting voice was heard throughout Canada with regard to our action. I believe that the contention that is advanced at this time that we do not hold a mandate to enforce an Act that has been on the statute books of this country since Confederation is not well founded. I believe that we hold as much of a mandate to-day and more than when we took steps to enter into this war. Nearly three years have passed since that time. We now look upon these questions from a different point of view. I believe that any man who would have suggested then that we would, at the end of three years, be still engaged in this desperate conflict, and that the issue would be still undecided, would have been laughed at. When Lord Kitchener, who was asked by the British Government to take charge of the military operations of Great Britain, accepted office he did so on the understanding that if, at the end of three years, the war was not decided some one else would take the office he occupied. I believe he had a clear vision as to the conditions confronting the people of Great Britain, confronting the people of the whole world.

When you realize that the enemy entered, after careful and deliberate preparation, upon the campaign which is now being waged, covering a period of forty or fifty years, and that they took every possible precaution to make as effective as they possibly could the machinery by which they hoped to subdue the world and make themselves its masters, you can rest assured that the other nations, who had not made such preparation, were very badly handicapped indeed. When we recall the events that have taken place since this war began, it seems almost miraculous that the enemy did not succeed in the early months of the war. There are three outstanding features in connection with that war which, to my mind, have made it impossible for the enemy to succeed. The first was the heroic stand taken by the little army of Belgium, when the enemy invaded that country. They held them up for several weeks; they disarranged their plans so much that what was termed by the German Emperor "the contemptible little army of Great Britain" was transported over the Channel to France, and met the invader when they came to Belgium. They put up such a fight as was never fought before on the retreat from Mons, and they enabled the French generals to mature their plans to mobilize the army, so that when the Germans got within sight of the walls of Paris, General Joffre's army was able to hurl the invader back. To my mind these are two of the things that saved the situation. The third great factor, I believe, is the British Navy. The navy of Great Britain has done a work during this war which we do not fully appreciate. They have made it possible for the people of Canada, and the people of the whole world, to carry on business in such a way that they

feel very little of the effects of the war. As a matter of fact, did hon. gentlemen ever know, during the whole history of Canada, when we enjoyed greater prosperity than is enjoyed at the present, largely owing to the fact that our commerce is uninterrupted? Prices and wages are high. True, the cost of living is high, but there is abundance of work for everybody. These are some of the things that we should not lose sight of. One of the principal causes of the great prosperity that we are enjoying was first the establishment of munition manufactories in this country. The enormous sums of money that have been expended here by the British Government have had a tremendous effect on the prosperity of the country. These are a few of the things that have enabled us to go on and do business in a way, that I am afraid, has led a great many people to lose sight of the ultimate goal we have in view. In the early days of the struggle, when that army of Germany was smashing through Belgium, when they were invading France, you know how eagerly we looked for the morning papers—yes, during our sleeping hours we could scarcely let pass from our minds the menace that was then marching on at the heart of France, and we felt that, if they conquered France, it would be a long uphill struggle, if we ever were able to subdue the enemy. We watched events carefully, and when we found that the Prussians were stopped, and that, as month after month passed, we had strong hopes that the enemy would be repelled as soon as we could get supplies of munitions and reinforcements forwarded to the front.

The marvel of the whole world is the manner in which Great Britain has mobilized her forces, and the way in which she has carried on the manufacture of munitions, and has equipped her army of 5,500,000 men, as compared with an army of 150,000 men when war broke out. That was one of the greatest feats that has ever been accomplished by any nation in the history of the world. Canada did not hesitate. We entered upon this struggle at the very outset, and when a nervous tremor was felt throughout the length and breadth of this country as to what would happen should the enemy reach Paris, our men were coming forward by the thousands and tens of thousands. Our Government agreed to send a first contingent of 20,000 men overseas, and, instead of sending 20,000, they sent 33,000. They could not hold the men back. They were coming so fast they could not equip and take care of them, and 33,000 men were sent over a very few weeks after the war broke out. The men still kept coming on by the thousands, faster than they could be equipped, taken care of, and trained. That is something to be wondered at, in a peace loving country like Canada, which had no military men, and which was anxious to live in peace. During 1915 men were coming forward in large numbers. The war was becoming more serious, as time passed on, and it was found the enemy were not able to make any progress on the western front, but, in the meantime, other countries were being conquered and subdued, and Germany to-day holds practically the whole of Poland. The Germans have over-run Rumania, Serbia, Albania, and a large portion of France and Belgium, and there the enemy stands to-day, unconquered and unsubdued. We have strong faith that they will be conquered ultimately, but let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it is only by a tremendous effort on the part of the people of the Allies that the enemy will be subdued. The failure of Russia in the last few weeks has weakened the Allies tremendously. It has released the tremendous army which Germany had in the east, and has made it all the more difficult to drive them back on the west.

Sir, there is a difference of opinion in this House, and there is a difference of opinion throughout the country, with regard to the measure that is now before this House. It is not identical with the Militia Act that was enacted in 1868, but it is very similar. It is not so drastic, I believe it is a much more reasonable measure than the former Act.

I may say that I have been in favour of compulsory service for some time, and, in order to make clear my views on that question, I may just refer to an address which I delivered at a recruiting meeting in Woodstock, on April 10, 1916, to which reference was made in several of the Toronto papers at the time. The language I used upon that occasion was as follows:

> All honor to the men who have already gone to the front, many of whom will never come back, and when we read of the heavy casualties from time to time, we realize the growing need for more men in this great struggle.
>
> Never before has the call been so clear and imperative. We have prided ourselves in the matter of recruiting. We have not, as yet, found the necessity for conscription here, but I want to say that the State has claims upon us that some may think to be an infringement of rights.

I believe the time is coming if it has not already arrived, when there should be a judicious selection of men to fight the battles of the Empire.

I should be sorry to think that it should have to come, but it is quite impossible. There are strong arguments to justify it. When we find one man with perhaps a wife and five or six children, going to the front, and another man, single, and with no other ties holding him back, we begin to question the system in vogue.

I have had no reason to change my views since a year ago; in fact, I have become strengthened in my conviction. I believe that the system that has been in vogue in this country has, from a good many standpoints, not been the proper one. At the outset of this war, it would have been impossible to put into force any other system than the voluntary system, but I do not believe it was the best system. The enforcement of the old Militia Act which has been on the statute books of this country for many years, would be a great injustice at this time, after three years of war have passed, and after over 400,000 men have enlisted voluntarily. A judicial selection of men is the only proper course for Canada to pursue at the present time. It has been pointed out by hon. gentlemen opposite that the United States have adopted at the outset a compulsory military service. It is very easy for them to do so. They have had the advantage of what has been going on in other countries since the commencement of the war. The people of Canada did not hesitate; they adopted methods to suit conditions as they existed in this country at that time, and they have sometimes to readjust matters in order to meet changed conditions. When the Prime Minister was in the Old Country during the long adjournment of Parliament, he was certainly in a position to secure the most definite information as to the need for reinforcements at the front, and he must have received that information, because almost immediately on his return to Canada, he announced that a measure of compulsory service was to be introduced. Why should he make that statement immediately on his arrival in this country? Because of the fact that recruiting in Canada had fallen off to such an extent that the wastage of war was not being met under the voluntary system, and that it was a question either of introducing a measure of compulsory service or of the divisions of our army in France and Belgium gradually dwindling away to nothing.

We have heard a good deal of criticism from hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to recruiting. I have been filled with admiration for the courage displayed by some hon. gentlemen opposite in taking a stand in opposition to those with whom they have been associated for many years. Party ties are strong, and it is not a very pleasant task to sever them even on such a question as this, and it must have required a good deal of courage on their part to take the stand they did. This, however, is a time that tries men, when the very best that is in them must come to the surface, when their consciences must be their guide. Therefore, I give those gentlemen credit for being actuated by high motives. Some hon. gentlemen opposite do not agree with the leader of the Opposition who has taken a very firm stand in opposition to this measure, and who has moved an amendment that a referendum should be submitted to the people of Canada in order to find out their views on the matter. He has received strong support from some of the leading men in the Liberal party in his position. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) the other night took a very strong stand with regard to the question of a referendum, and other hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken along similar lines. It is quite evident, therefore, that in this House there are many hon. members who have very strong views in favour of compulsory service, and that there are other hon. members who have equally strong views in opposition to that measure. But why should compulsory service be necessary? As I said a moment ago, it is necessary because men have not been volunteering as readily as they are required, because the wastage of our army has not been met. Quite a number of hon. members who have spoken in this debate have placed before the House the figures showing what the several provinces have done in the way of recruiting, and it appears that in one of the great provinces of this Dominion, recruiting has not been such as we would like to have seen it; that it has not been anything like on a par with the recruiting that has taken place in other provinces. Had recruiting in that province been as successful as in the other provinces, there would be no necessity to-day for introducing a measure of compulsory military service.

I have followed with a good deal of interest the arguments advanced and the attempts made to justify the slowness of recruiting in Quebec. This is a time when we might as well say in this House what is in our minds as say it outside, and hon. gentlemen opposite, whether they agree with me on other matters or not, I am sure, will

much prefer that that should be done. I take issue with the leader of the Opposition when he tries to make excuses for the people of Quebec, stating that the British-born volunteer more readily than the Canadian-born, because the former have not been so long in Canada as the latter, and their feeling for the Old Country is, therefore, stronger. The figures do not justify any such contention, because there is in Canada a race of people who were here long before the French came to the shores of Canada. I refer to the Indians of this country. One hundred and five thousand Indians do not forget that they have sent 2,000 volunteers to the front. The most magnificent response that has been made by any race in Canada has been made by the Indians, who have not been given very generous treatment, and who have been deprived of the franchise. One would think that if there were in this country any one who had a grievance against the Government, or against the people of another race, it would have been the Indians of Canada. We were told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the French had been deprived of their arms shortly after the conquest; we were also told that the attitude of the other provinces towards Quebec had something to do with its failure to recruit in proportion to the enlistments in the other provinces. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), in dealing with the matter, referred to the French Premier Clemenceau when he welcomed the British delegation at Paris, and he quoted the words used on that occasion by Mr. Clemenceau, and then spoke as follows:

> To my fellowmen of British extraction, I say: "We are awaiting you since the Plains of Abraham and since the battle of St. Foye. Why do you not trust us, as your fellow-men, as your partners, just as the British overseas have trusted the Boers, as they have trusted the Scotch, as they are about to trust the Irish, after so many years of misunderstanding and miseries?"

Other hon. gentlemen have made reference to the injustice that has been done to Quebec. I think it was the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) who was interruped in his speech the other evening by the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) asking: "If we do as you request, will you repeal the school law in Ontario?" The hon. member for Brantford replied that he was not prepared to discuss the question, and then the hon. member for Montcalm said, "Neither are we prepared to go." That is an exhibition of what was in the mind of at least one hon. member of this House. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), not only this session but in previous sessions, has often made the statement that credit for the fact that Canada is a British colony at the present time is due to Quebec. Had it not been for Quebec, he said, the chances are that Canada would not now be under British rule, and that statement has also been made by other hon. gentlemen. In this connection I should like to call the attention of the House to an address that was delivered at the 49th Convocation of the University of Chicago by none other than the late Sir George W. Ross. The subject was "The Political Cleavage of North America". He dealt with the question very fully, going back to the congress that was held at Philadelphia in 1774, and quoting from the journals of that congress. In order to make clear just what were the views of the people of the province of Quebec with regard to the offers that were made to them by the President of the United States and others to induce them to come into the Union, I shall read a few paragraphs from the address delivered by Sir George W. Ross. He said:

> Now it is a rather strange circumstance in the history of this continent that the Declaration of Rights, which laid the foundation of the American Republic, practically laid the foundation of the Dominion of Canada. If this statement is historically true, we can claim a share in the pride you feel in that memorable gathering out of which has sprung your great Republic, with its wonderful record of democracy and achievement. Let us examine the validity of this statement.
>
> The call to the first Continental Congress in 1774 was responded to by all the North American colonies, excepting Georgia and Canada. I have not seen any good reason why Canada did not appear there. It might have been on account of the difficulties of transportation, or because the French Canadians, who were accustomed to taxation under the French Government prior to the conquest of 1759, did not object to the Stamp Act. But it is not to the absence of representatives from Canada that I desire to call attention, but rather to the objections taken by the Congress to the concessions made by Great Britain to the French Canadians in the Quebec Act of 1774. After reciting the grievances from which the colonists suffered under the misgovernment of His Majesty's ministers the Congress denounced the concessions made to the French Canadians already referred to, but more especially to the provisions of the Quebec Act of 1774. This Act was characterized as an Act "which recognized the Catholic religion, abolished the equitable jurisdiction of England and, ignoring the antagonistic faith of the old colonies, their laws and governments, set up civil and spiritual tyranny in Canada to the great danger of the neighboring provinces which had so much aided Britain to conquer our country. Nor can we suppress our astonishment that a British parliament should ever consent to establish in that colony a religion that often

drenched your island in blood and disseminated impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder and rebellion throughout every part of the world."

This was the fly in the pot of ointment. The denunciation of the privileges conceded to the French Canadians, and particularly their religion, in such specific and forcible terms, could not fail to restrain any desire they might have to throw off their allegiance to Great Britain. On the one hand, they had the guarantee of perfect security and the enjoyment of their civil and religious liberties by a solemn treaty subsequently embodied in an Act of the British Parliament.

I believe that Sir George W. Ross in that speech gave us the strongest reason why Quebec did not agree to the offers that were made by the people of the United States. The very fact that they had a greater degree of liberty and freedom under British rule than they ever had under French rule, or could possibly hope to have in the United States or elsewhere, was one of the main reasons why they decided to remain as they were.

We all know the difficulties that beset the statesmen of this country at the time of Confederation, and that it was only by a compromise on the part of the various provinces that Confederation was brought about. I shall quote from a few addresses that were delivered on that occasion. The first is by Henry Joly, member for Lotbiniere (afterwards Sir Henri Joly de Lotbiniere):

I have asked of myself with all seriousness, where then are the aspirations of the French Canadians? I have always imagined, indeed I still imagine, that they all centre in one point, the maintenance of their nationality as a shield destined for the protection of the institutions they hold most dear. For a whole century this has ever been the aim of the French Canadians . In the long years of adversity they have never for a moment lost sight of it.

Sir George E. Cartier, after quoting from Washington's proclamation, said:

We see what promises, what seductive offers were made by the Republican General to the French Canadians. But they were made in vain.

Quoting from the proclamation by Baron D'Estaing, commander of the French fleet which was acting in aid of the American Revolutionary party, he said:

The French Canadians realized their situation too well. They understood that they would preserve intact their institutions, their language and their religion by adhesion to the British Crown. But if they had accepted the offers of Washington it is probable that there would not have existed to-day a vestige of British power on this continent, and that the French Canadians would also have seen their nationality disappear.

These are the views that were expressed over 50 years ago in regard to the attitude of the French Canadians at that time. The present leader of the Opposition, during the session of 1913, made the following statement which appeared in the Hansard of that year:

Nor do I admit that we owe gratitude to Great Britain because she has spent money to defend this country. Sir, sovereignty implies defence, and so long as Britain was sovereign over Canada, it was her duty to defend Canada. If we were a colony still, we should have the right to claim this defence at the hands of the mother country. But to-day we are a free nation. Yet, I have already said that we do owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. I proclaim it to the world. And why should we be grateful? Not because she has defended us, not because she has loaned us money, but because of the liberality of the regime she has introduced here. And especially do we of the province of Quebec owe gratitude to her—I say so without hesitation—because she has permitted us to become a nation within her empire. That is the ground upon which I rest our gratitude to the mother country.

These are some of the views that go to refute the suggestion of the hon. member for Rouville the other day that the English-speaking provinces of Canada were doing an injustice to the people of Quebec. I do not like to discuss matters of this kind. I feel that there is ample room in this great country of Canada for all our people to grow up and develop. The people of Ontario are certainly not jealous of the people of Quebec; they are not anxious to deprive them of any rights they enjoy to-day, but at the same time they do not like the people of Quebec to interfere in legislation that has been passed in Ontario, and which is quite in accordance with the constitution of this country.

I do not think that a question of that kind should be an issue in this country at present.. In my opinion, the right hon. leader of the Opposition, by his attitude in this House a year ago on a question agitating the minds of the people in eastern Ontario, the bilingual question, did a great deal to intensify the antagonistic feeling existing in the province of Quebec. If he had adopted a different attitude, if he had endeavoured to use the great ability which he undoubtedly possesses in influencing the people of the province of Quebec, I believe they would have responded much more readily than they have done. The people of Quebec are of one of the finest races in Europe. They have reason to be proud of their ancestry: old France fighting doggedly for her life, is an inspiration to-day for all the world. I say that this war is

doubly their cause, even more than it is the cause of those of English birth, in view of the position of their motherland; and I have always said that the man who forgets the land from which his ancestors come, whatever land that may be, is a a poor specimen of humanity. The attitude of the leader of the Opposition on the occasion to which I have referred did not help to allay the feeling that existed in the province of Quebec.

The criticisms levelled at the Government with regard to the lack of recruiting in Quebec have been demonstrated by what has transpired to be absolutely without foundation. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) has suggested that this Bill, after it passes, should not be put into effect until a further recruiting campaign is entered upon throughout Canada. This position, I believe, has no strong foundation. In the past few months an attempt has been made in the province of Quebec under the man, General Lessard, who, according to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), could appeal to the people of that province more than any other. I was amazed, dumbfounded, yesterday when the Minister of Militia laid the statement before the House showing the actual results of that recruiting campaign all over the great province of Quebec. The result was 221 recruits; and it appears that even half of these were not recruited in the province of Quebec. It is quite evident that compulsion must be used, or we will have to desert the men at the front. That is the question, the only question, with which we are concerned. The measure, I believe, will be put through this House and it must be put into effect and put into effect quickly. There has been altogether too much delay already. Time has been wasted, days and weeks have been passed in this House, and we are not making very rapid progress. Let us try to realize that men are doggedly fighting our battles at the front, men who have been in the ranks now for upwards of two and a half years, some of them war-worn and weary and needing a respite which cannot be given them. I say it is a crying shame, it is one of the greatest outrages that has ever taken place in the history of Canada or of the world, if these men must be kept there, year after year, year after year, without opportunity to get away and recuperate. I listened to the eloquent member for Rouville when he took exception to the statement made by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). He said:

10 p.m.

> Let me tell my hon. friend from South Wellington that I have as much at stake in this war as he has. I am one of those who have given up an only son to fight the battle of liberty. At the age of 18 he left the university classroom to fight for his King and country, but he went with unfaltering steps to fight as a volunteer, not as conscript; the two things are quite different. Perhaps it is because I have French blood in my veins, but I make quite a distinction between voluntarily offering to fight and fighting under compulsion. That is the essential difference between my hon. friend and myself, and it is quite a difference, I am free to admit.

I congratulate the hon. member from Rouville on having a son with that spirit. If a man has a son who is of military age and physically fit, and that son has not the spirit to offer his services to his country, he has good reason to feel ashamed of that son. I hope the hon. gentleman's son will return to him safe and in good health after the war is over. But on the very day the hon. member was making his statement, I received a letter from one of my constituents enclosing two letters which he had received from his son, a boy—yes, a boy, for I tried to put his name on the woters' list last year and he was objected to by the friends of our friends opposite because he was not old enough. This young man went over with the first contingent as a volunteer, and has been in the thick of the fight ever since. He has been through many engagements where his comrades have fallen around him. His own brother was with him, and fell at Vimy Ridge. The boy to whom I refer was wounded in the same engagement. He writes from a hospital in France, asking his friends if I could not by some means get him leave of absence for three months. Just for three months. He felt that he was on the verge of a breakdown and could not stand the life much longer. Yet, is there any prospect of his getting that respite? Is there anybody who would volunteer and take the place of that boy and let him off for three months after nearly three years of that life? Here is a case that should touch the heart of any one. Let me say to the hon. member for Rouville who, I am sorry to say, is not in his seat, that I understand his son has not yet left the province of Quebec—I do not know whether I am rightly informed on that point or not. I am told that he is a member of the battalion that is being raised by Col. Blondin. If that is the case, I should think that the hon. member for Rouville would be one of the first men who would come forward

and advocate conscription, so that the regiment could be filled up and his boy get away to the front, rather than let him pine away here in the province of Quebec with no prospect of getting over for a long time.

I fear I am taking up too much time, but I wish to refer to remarks made by a number of hon. gentlemen opposite who have signified their intention of voting for this Bill and against the amendment. It was rather amusing how some of them endeavoured to retain their standing in the party, and to make it appear that they were heartily in accord with their leader except on this measure.

They tried to put the whole blame for the failure of recruiting on the shoulders of the Government. Recruiting in Canada has been a tremendous success and is due to the men themselves as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has said. As far as the county of Oxford is concerned, which I know better than any other part of Canada, no more pressure was exercised by the Government there than in Quebec or any other part of Canada; it was absolutely owing to the action of the men themselves and the efforts of the people in the county that recruiting became so successful there. There was a time when the Government found a great deal of difficulty in equipping and training the men, they were coming in so swiftly. But, after a few months, a change came over the country. There were whisperings and insinuations. Finally they became louder and louder. Statements were made in the House accusing the Government of all kinds of iniquities and a lack of business methods in connection with the administration of the war. They were not charges, because it was denied afterwards by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) when the matter came up that any charges had been made. I am referring now to what were known as the Kyte charges. The people were right on edge, as it were. Statements were made in such a manner as to lead one to suppose that they were based upon substantial facts. The same thing applied to the purchase of submarines on the Pacific coast immediately after the war was declared and to the purchase of the boots that were furnished to the soldiers. Hon. gentlemen opposite did everything in their power to discredit the Government, and to create a suspicion in the minds of the people that the Government were not acting as they should have acted.

I want to point out in contrast to that the attitude of the Prime Minister and the Government. When the first of these statements were made, he immediately took steps to appoint a commissioner to investigate any charges of mismanagement that were made by any one and the commissioner appointed for the purpose went throughout Canada in order to facilitate inquiry into statements of this kind, with the result of which investigation hon. gentlemen are all familiar. You remember, when Camp Borden was opened up, all the Liberal press and the leaders of the Liberal party blamed the Government for the laying out of that camp and talked about the injustice that was being done to the men in sending them to that camp. This was just at the time that recruiting was beginning to fall off. I have not the slightest doubt that the Liberal party and press are in no small measure responsible for the falling off in recruiting at that time.

I want to say a word in regard to the danger to Canada. The leader of the Opposition referring to the Prime Minister in his speech in this House on the 18th June stated:

> 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 insolence, cruelties, and barbarities.

He was opposed to going outside of Canada to fight the battles of Canada when he made that statement. On December 8, 1916, the right hon. gentleman made a speech in the city of Quebec, and I take from the Toronto Globe a report of that speech. I shall just quote a part of it. He said that:—

> There was not a country in the world which would not be affected to the roots of its being if Germany won. If she won it would be the fall of Great Britain, of France, of Russia, and of Italy, and there would remain only Germany and the United States. The anxiety shown by President Wilson had shown how he realized the peril.
>
> Sir Wilfrid then read extracts from a plan prepared for the German General Staff and published before the war, showing that it was their intention to add two more provinces to those taken from France. He could prove that the German idea was the imposition of Deutschtum, or German domination, on the world, and he added that the war had shown how near they had come to succeeding. If it was possible for merchant submarines to enter

United States ports it was possible for armed submarines to enter Halifax, St. John and Quebec ports

The right hon. gentleman has evidently changed his mind since he delivered that address in Quebec. We have the authority of a former president of the United States for the statement that the British fleet was the only reason why the United States had not been subjected to invasion by Germany, that the British fleet was the only protection the United States had before they entered into this war, and it is quite evident that if it had not been for the United States we might have had to meet the German in Canada. Is it not much better that we should meet him in France and Belgium rather than in Canada? This battle is our battle just as much as it is the battle of France, Belgium, Britain, Italy, or any of those countries that are now fighting the enemy.

Now, I would like to say a word or two in regard to a matter that has been discussed quite freely throughout the country during the last few weeks, and that is the efforts that have been made by the Prime Minister for the formation of a coalition Government. Some hon. gentlemen opposite ask: Why were not those attempts made earlier in the war; why was not the leader of the Opposition approached before with a view to his entering a government of this kind? Let me say to the hon. gentlemen who advance that argument that the leader of the Opposition took a stand previous to the war and that up to the present day he has never shown that he was a penitent, or regretted the step that he took upon that occasion. You remember that at the time we were endeavouring to put a measure through this House to assist Great Britain to build three dreadnoughts, to strengthen and make more effective the British fleet, how he opposed that measure. Only a few weeks before war was declared we found him in this House taunting the Prime Minister and the Government with regard to their views on that question. He said:—

Emergency, who speaks to-day of emergency. Twelve months have passed since my right hon. friend the Prime Minister introduced his measure. Twelve months and more have passed since that time when he saw the German peril. He saw Germany almost ready to jump at the throat of Great Britain; he saw clouds on the horizon; he saw these clouds rent by lightning; he heard the murmur and rumbling of distant thunders. But my right hon. friend to-day may live in peace, the atmosphere is pure, the sky is clear. I do not charge any intention of deceit on the part of the Prime Minister in this regard.

[Mr Sutherland.]

This was delivered in the very year war was declared. Later on in that year, within a few weeks of the declaration of war, he again taunted the Prime Minister with regard to his attitude in regard to this question. These are some of the things that we should not allow to pass from our minds. If the right hon. leader of the Opposition had expressed any regret that he had taken the wrong stand with regard to that question, it might have been somewhat different.

Now, Sir, I wish to refer for a moment to the efforts that were made by the Prime Minister to secure a coalition on his return from the Old Land after Parliament resumed here a few weeks ago. He came back from England fully seized with the peril menacing the whole world, fully realizing the difficulties and obstacles we have yet to overcome. He made the announcement that compulsory service will have to be brought into effect in order to replenish the ranks of the Canadians at the front. I believe that the correspondence that took place between the Prime Minister and the right hon. leader of the Opposition on that occasion has not yet been placed on Hansard. I wish to read that correspondence in order to show that the right hon. the Prime Minister offered every possible inducement to the right hon. gentlemen opposite to accept the proposition which he offered on that occasion, that he was absolutely sincere in his desire to secure their co-operation in order to further the interests of the country and of the Allies. The letter of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier to the Prime Minister is as follows:

Ottawa, Ont., June 6, 1917.

Dear Sir Robert:—

On the 24th of May you asked me to meet you on the following day, which I did. After explaining fully the conditions of the war in the light of knowledge acquired during your recent visit to Great Britain, you stated the reasons which had led you to the conclusion that compulsory service was necessary, and you explained to me the provisions of the Military Service Bill.

You then proposed the formation of a coalition government, upon the basis that, outside of the Prime Minister, each of the two political parties should have an equal representation in the Cabinet, and you emphasized the importance of avoiding, if possible, an election during the war.

I told you at once that if my co-operation was desired, I regretted that I had not been invited before you had announced the policy of compulsory service, as I dreaded very serious difficulties if a conscription law was passed by the present Parliament. You rejoined that you had thought it preferable to invite me after the policy had been enunciated, rather than before.

At an interview which took place on Tuesday, the 29th of May, you suggested to me that you thought it necessary to hold a caucus of your supporters but desired to consult me before doing so. I suggested to you that to hold a caucus pending negotiations would not likely tend towards the object to be attained. At the same time I suggested that as I wanted to consult particularly Sir Lomer Gouin and some other friends, I would like to have a clear statement in writing of your proposal, which you formulated as follows:

That a coalition government should be formed; that the Military Service Bill should be passed; that a pledge should be given not to enforce it until after a general election; that Parliament should be dissolved and the coalition government should seek a mandate from the people.

At the conference on Friday, the 1st of June, and again on Monday, the 4th, the possible personnel of a coalition government was considered, some not insuperable difficulties in that personnel were anticipated and the subject not concluded.

On Wednesday, the 6th of June, the final conference took place, at which I announced that I had not seen my way clear to join the Government on the terms proposed. I asked you at the same time if conscription was the only basis, to which you replied in the affirmative.

At this and previous interviews, I always stated to you that whenever conscription was adopted, after a consultation of the people, I would certainly urge in every possible way obedience to the law.

Believe me, yours sincerely,

Wilfrid Laurier.

Right Honorable Sir Robert L. Borden,
P.C., G.C.M.G., Ottawa, Ont.

To this Sir Robert replied on June 7:

Ottawa, Ont., June 7, 1917.

Dear Sir Wilfrid Laurier:—

I beg to acknowledge your letter of yesterday in which you set forth the substance of recent negotiations respecting the formation of a coalition government.

At our first interview you had expressed the opinion that compulsory service should not be enforced until it had been approved by a referendum or at a general election. It was for this reason that I submitted the further proposal on the 29th of May, which is described in the fourth paragraph of your letter.

I agree that it was the policy of compulsory service which in your judgment made it impossible for you to join a coalition government. I was convinced that compulsory service was necessary and must be included in the policy of the proposed coalition. You, on the other hand, decided that you could not accept such a policy, and that you could not join a government which adopted it.

Yours faithfully,

R. L. Borden.

The Right Honorable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C.,
at House of Commons, Ottawa.

There was a straight issue, a difference of opinion with regard to this question; and in consequence of that difference of opinion between the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition, nothing resulted from the negotiations. But notwithstanding the attitude of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, there is in the ranks of the Liberal party in this House and there is among the ranks of the Liberals throughout the length and breadth of Canada, a strong feeling in favour of the attitude taken by the Prime Minister, a feeling that will justify, I believe, still further recognition being made of some of those people who have expressed their views on this question. This question is too serious a one to be made a party issue. Party politics never looked so mean and contemptible in my eyes and in the eyes of the people of this country as at the present time, when you contrast party politics with the sacrifices made since the outbreak of this war by those heroic men who are at the front fighting our battles for us. I hope that further efforts will be made by the Government to recognize the opinion of other elements of this country, not that I have any criticisms to offer with regard to the men now constituting the Government. I believe that there never was in the whole history of Canada a Government whose members have laboured more diligently, more earnestly, more sincerely than have the members of this Government. They have given all the best that they possess in the interest of the cause we have at heart. I believe that there never was—and there never will be again—a Prime Minister of Canada who has had a heavier burden to carry than has the Prime Minister since this war came about. There are tremendous questions outside of the war, that would be enough to engage the attention of any other Government, and these continual and unjustifiable criticisms that are being levelled at the Government do not make matters easier. The bringing of this war to a successful issue is to my mind the most important thing that we have to contend with now. With reference to a referendum, I have absolutely no use for it myself. I do not think that is in keeping with responsible Government. Some hon. gentlemen opposite may say that this Parliament has outlived the time for which it was elected, that we have to-day no mandate from the people.

I believe that there never was a time since this Government came into power in 1911 when there was less desire on the part of the people of Canada for an election than there is at the present time. They would

much prefer that the two parties should come together, settle their differences, and carry this war to a successful issue, rather than have the whole country engaged in the turmoil which would accompany an election. I desire to say further, Mr. Speaker, as far as the referendum is concerned, that it is unfair, unjust, and there is not one strong argument that can be advanced in favour of such a proposition. The very fact that you would find aligned against those in favour of selective conscription men who, if they were doing their duty, would be in the ranks, is the strongest argument why they should not have an opportunity to place themselves on record. We are at war, and we are experiencing a different condition from anything that has heretofore confronted the people of Canada. I want to say that this state is made up of different individuals who are subject to the laws of the state. The individual who enjoys the advantages of Government in this country and the protection of the state has to discharge his duties to that state when the very life and existence of that state is in the balance. The demands of the state are supreme to all other demands, and when the state requires men to fight in its defence, then, Sir, it is not a matter of submitting a referendum to the people, but a matter of enforcing the military laws of the country and making those men do their duty. I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that the men at the front do not want a referendum, and I believe those men at the front would scorn to put their mark on the ballot in a cause such as this. I say further that, to my mind, this is a plea that is absolutely unworthy of the right hon. gentleman who has moved the amendment to the Bill now before the House.

Let me ask the right hon. leader of the Opposition, the mover of the amendment, to submit a referendum to the people of Canada, to say whether compulsion should be used to secure men to support those on the battle line, now that the volunteer system fails to do so. What other course is left, unless we abandon these men and see our gallant army, made up of the Canadian divisions, dwindle and pass away?

Let him have his way. Send out your secret ballot. Place it in the hands of the people of Canada. Ask them to decide the question. What would the response be? I can see in my mind's eye how readily some would respond, how eagerly the pacifist who made the war possible would sign, the coward, the slacker, the man too proud to fight would be first at the poll to mark the ballot. Now the alien enemy within our gates—and they are many—how they would applaud the hon. gentlemen for the privilege of his secret ballot, giving them an opportunity to even up with the Canadians on the battle line; every one of them would be out to mark his ballot. But still the fight goes on. The ranks of the men on the battle line are growing thinner, and ever thinner. These grim, silent, war weary veterans, many of whom have borne the brunt of the brutal conflict for upwards of two years are doggedly holding on, ever confident that reinforcements from their home land will soon be at hand. And now, when the limit of their endurance has been almost reached, the right hon. gentleman approaches them with his referendum ballot, explains to them its object and the reason for adopting it and asks them to say whether they would favour compulsion being used to secure support for them, or whether they should be left to their fate, and the cause for which they have been contending during the past three years, and which they have ever had in mind as the goal of their ambition, should be given up. These men, who have endured trials and agonies indescribable, who gave up friends, homes and loved ones that we might continue to enjoy the benefits and liberties our heroic ancestors had acquired for us at a great cost of blood and sacrifice; these men who have done their full duty and have received the congratulations and plaudits of their allied comrades on their gallant conduct whether on the advance or when standing firm under the concentrated attack of the hordes of the enemy with his murderous gasses, knowing that many thousands of their comrades are sleeping their last sleep beneath the soil of a foreign land, knowing that thousands of their comrades have returned to Canada, whose maimed and broken bodies are evidence of their unfitness for further service, but who would give the people of Canada the true story of the pressing need for men, confident that assistance will be speedily forthcoming as soon as the people of Canada realize the pressing need.

This is the condition at the front, when the right hon. gentleman arrives with his secret ballot for them to mark in the quiet and privacy of their trenches and dug-outs, and asks them to say whether they would be kind enough to say whether they would be in favour of compulsion being used to secure men to support them; to force Canadians from their comfortable homes, from their families and children and their luxuries to relieve them of some of the heavy

task which they had voluntarily assumed as a duty; to give them a respite for ever so short a time. These proud spirited men, with honour as their motto emblazoned on their shield, are to be asked to take a chance on a throw of loaded dice with the pacifist, the conscientious objector, the coward, the slacker and the alien enemy within our gates, who have adopted as their shield a secret ballot. What reception would the right hon. gentleman receive? What would be the response of these grim proud spirited heroes? Every man of them would fling the insult back in your teeth and consign you and your cowardly ballot to a warmer place than the south of France, and well might they say, if that is the spirit of those left in Canada, which name they had placed high on the scroll of fame by their gallant deeds and sacrifices, if this is the code of honour left in Canada we will fight as long as human endurance will hold out and go down to our graves with those gallant comrades who have preceded us, facing the foe with the keenest, the bitterest wound in their broken hearts, inflicted not by the enemy but by those whom they have left at home, and for whom they have been fighting during these weary months.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): I cannot give a silent vote on this matter, because I consider it to be the most important question ever submitted to the Canadian people. It affects two of the greatest gifts of the citizen, his life and his liberty. In considering this measure, one who is a true democrat and a true Canadian deserving the support of his fellow citizens, must use his sober judgment, and analyse carefully the consequences of the measure, scrutinize thoroughly the motives that inspired it, search with care, and ascertain the sentiments and opinions of those he represents. We have a right, and it is our duty, to express our opinions and our sentiments on this matter. Whatever opinions may be expressed or whatever threats may be made, we are willing to go before the country on the stand we are taking, and to face all fair-minded men.

I desire to say at the outset that what we seek is light on the subject, not abuse. What we want is unity and confidence in one another, not disunion and distrust. No one is more in sympathy with the Allies or more desires the winning of this war than we Canadians of French origin in Quebec, because living in a country where we are in the minority, where we have had to suffer and are now suffering in silence in order to avoid struggle and strife, and where pledges and treaties are our only safeguards, we are in close sympathy with those European nations, such as Belgium, Serbia and the other smaller Balkan states which occupy a similar position to ours in Canada, although not as minorities, yet as weaker powers. Our respect for Great Britain for having entered into an equitable contract with us at the time of the Quebec Act is well known, and my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) has confirmed the statement made in this House by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), namely, that if it had not been for the senior Canadians, whom some hon. members are pleased to call French Canadians, the British flag would not be floating on this building today, and we would not be discussing the question of conscription. The hon. member for South Oxford, after doing us the compliment of putting us in an inferior position to the Indians of this country, showed that we had some heart anyway. He quoted statements to show that in 1774 propositions were made to Lower Canada to join the American Republic. History shows that Canada was given the opportunity of becoming an independent republic; but, according to the element which the hon. member represents, we are not capable of noble sentiments and motives, therefore he endeavours to deprecate our act of loyalty on the ground that it was inspired by egotism; that, after thinking the matter over, we decided that we would not be as free; that we would not have as much liberty to practice our religion, to speak our language and to use our laws, under American rule (or as a republic, which would be ridiculous), as under a treaty with Great Britain. That shows that we understood what the contract was, and we endeavoured, in consideration of fair play on the part of Great Britain in carrying out her share of it, to show that we were going to carry out our share, without any regret.

Our sympathies for France, whence our ancestors came were great. I remember in 1871, at the time of the Franco-Prussian war the sorrow that was displayed in Canada by the senior Canadians when Germany defeated France. Others alongside of us laughed and rejoiced; we bore our grief in silence. I have shown what feelings of gratitude and sympathy we have for the two nations which are now fighting for the liberty of the world. I make the statement because by word of mouth and

by expressions in certain newspapers we have been taxed with being pro-Germans. Of course, the truth is that we have never had any sympathy for Germany, which is the natural enemy of France, and that our sentiments of distrust and antipathy for the Germans were not born yesterday. It is, therefore, most unjustifiable to endeavour to classify us as some hon. gentlemen opposite have done. I speak here to-night as a Canadian; I would rather not use the word "French Canadian," or the word "English Canadian;" I would use the word "Canadian." But if I were to endeavour to make a distinction between the races which compose Canada I would speak of us as the senior Canadians, as we are, and who, I claim, are the only true, genuine Canadians, and of the junior Canadians, who are in the majority at the present time.

Listening to the speeches that have been delivered so far by hon. gentlemen opposite, one would be inclined to think that we are opposed to the winning of this war by the Allied nations. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the war must be won. Certainly, the war must be won. That is not the question before the House. We are all agreed in regard to that question. In the short session of 1914 not a voice was raised in opposition to the proposals of the Government; we said to the Government: We give you carte blanche; go on and win this war. The question now before this House is: Are we to have conscription without first consulting the people? Are we to legislate on matters affecting so vitally all the people of this country without having their consent? For my part, I do not purpose tearing another piece out of the constitution. I object to the Bill, and I am in favour of a referendum, because I believe that if we are in a democratic country we ought not to legislate as to the life or liberty of the subject unless we have special authority by statute, and in that case we must live within the four corners of that statute, or unless we have a special mandate from the people.

The legal aspect of the question has been discussed, and I believe it has been shown beyond a doubt that the clause upon which we now rely to impose conscription on this country, or to send troops overseas never meant what hon. gentlemen opposite want it to mean to-day. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) the other day made an irrefutable argument to show what the meaning of the existing law is. It is well known that when you are going to give the true interpretation of a statute, you do not give it the interpretation that will suit your purpose for the time being, but the meaning that he who made the law wanted to convey. To do this you must go back and follow from its inception the legislation, seeing what the intent has been ever since such legislation was enacted, and putting all those facts together with the various objections and the different statements made by the parties interested in the measure, you can come to a correct interpretation. I had expected the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) to answer the argument of my hon. friend from Kamouraska.

Knowing the ingenuity and astuteness of the Solicitor General, I was surprised at the poor answer he made. My hon. friend from Kamouraska had cited all the laws from 1808 to 1868 to show that "without" in the phrase "within or without Canada," referring to the calling out of militia in the case of emergency, meant contiguous territory. To that, the first answer of the Solicitor General was that nobody had given this interpretation to the law so far, and he said that the speech of the hon. member for Kamouraska "was made for distribution in the province of Quebec." Let me tell my hon. friend that the people of Quebec do not need to have the speech of the hon. member for Kamouraska distributed among them to know what the clause means. It has been discussed and re-discussed and over-discussed ever since 1911. You know, Mr. Speaker, all the discussions that have been held on this clause, and all the ink that has been spilled over it.

The second answer of the Solicitor General was that the interpretation "expressing doubt about our right to send troops overseas" is shared by no one except political agitators. I am not going to quote, but it will be remembered that on the 1st of August, 1914—I think the extract will be found in the Hansard report of the speech of my right hon. leader the other day—a despatch was sent by the Governor General to the Imperial authorities stating that his Government was willing to help in case of war, which then seemed to be imminent, and the question was mooted whether under section 69 the Government had authority to send troops overseas. Now, at that time the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice were in office. They had at their service to interpret the statutes a man of unquestioned authority and of the highest qualifications, a man through whose hands this particular law had passed in 1904 when it was presented to the House, a man who has pub-

lished a book on Constitutional Cases—the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. E. L. Newcombe. I think he is a sufficiently high legal authority, and I say that the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice were either derelict in their duty in not looking up the law and getting sufficient information about it, or else they came to the conclusion that they had absolutely no authority to send troops abroad under this Militia Act.

On the 5th of August, 1914, another message was sent to the Imperial authorities by the Governor General, but not from himself; he always states "my advisors." Who were his advisors? One of them was my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he has had a wide experience in legislation. The Governor General states in that communication that his advisors had some doubts. And what did they ask? Did they call upon the Militia Act? No, they asked His Majesty the King to put the Canadian Force under sections 175 and 176 of the British Army Act. Is that in conformity with the statement of the Solicitor General that the interpretation given to the clause by the hon. member for Kamouraska could only have been given by a political agitator? Personally, I am well content to be in company with such political agitators as His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught.

Then the Solicitor General gave his third answer. The hon. member for Kamouraska had quoted the words of the Minister of Militia of 1904 and of the ex-Minister of Militia of the present Cabinet. The Solicitor General, following his usual practice of meeting argument by argument and reason by reason, said: "Who have you for authority? A doctor and an editor." Since when, Mr. Speaker, has Canada or the Parliament of Canada delegated to the gentlemen of the legal profession the exclusive right to present Bills in this House, to discuss and explain them and have them adopted? Since when has the legal profession had the monopoly of knowing what they want to express. The Solicitor General quoted Sir Charles Fitzpatrick as saying that the troops could be sent to India, and then he discarded the explanation given by the Minister of Militia. If my hon friend will look at the Hansard of 1904, vol. 4, p. 6471, he will see that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick said:

> When drafting a law I want to know what the party who introduced the Bill has in his mind. My functions are limited to giving effect to the intentions of the person introducing the Bill.

Therefore I conclude that the higher authority as between the Minister of Justice and the head of a department introducing a Bill, is the head of the department who knows exactly what he wants, and simply sends his Bill to the Minister of Justice to have it put in proper legal form. That is one of the reasons why I claim that the sudden change in the interpretation of the law which has taken place recently is only to suit the convenience of hon. gentlemen opposite, who know that this measure is unpopular and want to say: "You did this yourselves; you are responsible for it."

There is another reason why I object to the Bill. I have said before, and I cannot repeat it too often, that we in this Parliament when dealing with the life and liberty of the subject should at least be the representatives of those subjects. When the extension of Parliament was granted it was never contemplated that such a radical change as this would be brought about in our domestic life. We are to-day in session under and by virtue of the Imperial Act. We are practically an Imperial Parliament, and the Imperial Parliament, having no right to deal with the life and liberty of the Canadian subject, cannot, I maintain, delegate that right to the Parliament of Canada. If we passed this Act we would not only be setting a bad precedent, but doing something that was most undemocratic and most unconstitutional.

My third reason for opposing the Bill—and this reason was adduced when the British Conscription Bill was introduced at Westminster—is that a law of this kind should not be passed without the general consent of the people, or at least the Government should have the confidence of the people; I claim that both are lacking in this case. The ex-Minister of Militia has stated that the members of the Cabinet had no confidence in one another. In a speech at Lindsay he said that they were poking their noses into each other's departments and watching each other, and that when he arrived at New York he was told to be careful as he was going to be murdered politically for standing so loyally behind the leader of the Government, and that the Finance Minister was after his scalp. Is that a properly constituted Cabinet? Are you going to tell me that the people of this country will have confidence in a Cabinet the members of which have no confidence in one another? I say; No. I will not tolerate any such

agglomeration legislating upon the life and liberty of the subject.

There is another reason for my opposition. It may not appeal to my friends on the other side, it may not appeal to the junior Canadians; but it appeals to us the senior Canadians, and it appeals to me. We are not opposing this Bill for the purpose of creating delay, nor for political reasons; we are fighting for the preservation of our ideals, and one of those ideals is the sacredness of pledges, or, to use the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) "plighted faith." We have had promises made. All over the province of Quebec we have been told, and repeatedly told, that conscription would not be put in force. There is no emergency that I can see that has happened since to call for conscription without first asking those men to whom we have promised that conscription would never be put in force to say whether or not they have changed their minds as the Government has changed its mind since the promise was made. We are interested in seeing that pledges and treaties are respected, because we are the senior Canadians and the minority; but now that the majority of the stock of the concern seems to have got into the hands of the juniors knowing their own views on these matters, we will not tolerate, if we can help it, that treaties and pledges in Canada shall be treated as the Prussians have treated theirs. When they call us "pro-Germans", and "Prussians," it makes me smile. If we are to judge men by their deeds, the inclination of these hon. gentlemen is toward Prussianism rather that toward democracy and liberty.

This is not a military question only, it is also a social and economic question. A statement has been made in this House, and not contradicted so far, that if we send another hundred thousand men across the seas we cannot produce enough to help the Allies and prevent them from suffering from famine. I read in the Free Press only the other day an account of a meeting held in Ottawa, taken part in by farmers and by members of the Board of Trade. At that meeting, a gentlemen named Black, if I remember his name correctly, a Government official, made the statement that this year's wheat crop would be between 20,000,000 and 30,000,000 bushels short. A farmer who spoke made the statement that what they wanted was help, otherwise they could not cultivate their farms. Lord Rhondda has made the same appeal—

An hon. MEMBER: And Lord Shaughnessy.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, Lord Shaughnessy the same. And in the Montreal Star of to-night I find a despatch from London, dated to-day, containing this statement made to the Associated Press by right hon. R. E. Prothero, Minister of Agriculture:

"The outcome of the war," said Mr. Prothero, "may ultimately hang on the question of food supplies, and the American farmer is allotted the essential part to play in the great struggle for freedom."

Mr. Prothero then discussed the value of co-operation of the American farmers and continued:

There is risk that the shortage of food may strain endurance to the breaking point There is as yet no indication that we even have distantly approached that point, but endurance might snap if, for instance, the milk supply failed through inability to feed the dairy herd, because then the lives of little children would be threatened. Thus, there is a greater question involved in food supply than the loss of ordinary comforts of life, or even reduction in its accustomed necessities.

"For this reason it is a welcome relief to us to know that the farmers of the United States are co-operating with the Allies, that they fully realize the essential part they play in this struggle for freedom, that they are bringing into their work the spirit of self-sacrifice and endurance and that they are determined to put out the last ounce of their strength to win the war on the ploughlands of the United States. Here and there, God speed the plough!"

That is not an appeal from this side of the House or from people who want to embarrass the Government, but from the Minister of Agriculture in the British ministry. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) the other day read to the House an advertisement published in a Chicago paper at the instance of the Government, calling for 60,000 men to come to Canada to till the soil, and offering these men the guarantees that if they would come they should not be conscripted. Why should we now take the men who are coming from the United States, give our money to the Americans, and send our own men to the battlefield? I say, if you cannot fill the gaps with five divisions, make it four; if you cannot do it with four, make it three; but do not become guilty of murder, do not leave the man who has gone to the front to famish; do not let the soldiers die of hunger. I see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) smiling, but I can tell him that nothing has been brought before the House to show that the taking of more men from the country will not impair our agricultural industry.

There is another phase of this subject, and it is with certain pain, or regret, that

I touch upon it. Reasons have been given why conscription was imposed; but the way the leaves move generally indicates the way in which the wind blows. I find that the reasons so far given are an imputation upon the province in which I live. Although the subject is grave, the expressions of these gentlemen concerning it are evidently a vent for feelings that must have been pent up for a long time. The Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) in the course of his speech the other day told us: We of English-speaking Canada have the kindest feelings towards our French compatriots. Thinking of the Toronto Orange Sentinel, of the Toronto News, of the Kingston and Hamilton papers, I said to myself: These men are great verbal acrobats, because if the sentiments expressed by these papers towards the province of Quebec are kindly sentiments, I do not understand English.

It is said that voluntary enrolment has been a failure. In presenting this Bill the Prime Minister said that in 1915 and 1916, delegations came to him and asked him to suspend or lessen recruiting.

The ex-Minister of Militia says that in March, 1916, he was not told to drop recruiting but he was told to go slow and let it rest awhile. Therefore, if voluntary recruiting has not been a success it was not due to the fault of any one except those who had put a damper on it. The ex-Minister of Militia says that the heads of the great industries were after the Prime Minister fearing that they would be short of labour. He, in his ordinary gallant way, says: They came before me but I kicked them out; the Prime Minister did not have his back stiff enough to kick them out and so he gave in. He also says that they went after the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) and that he was afraid that Toronto would be up in arms. Yet these hon. gentlemen say that voluntary enlistment has failed. If it has it is because they stopped it.

Now, I desire to say a word in regard to the operation of the system in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) made a statement the other night which was jeered at by our Conservative friends opposite who have spoken against recruiting in Quebec. He said that one of the faults of the Government was that they had not employed proper officers for recruiting in Quebec. I back up that statement. If they had sent to Toronto, or anywhere in Ontario, as a recruiting officer, a French Canadian who could not speak a word of English, what would have been the response to his efforts? They would not have tolerated him for a minute, they would have escorted him to the train and said: Go and learn English and call again. In Quebec, the Solicitor General says, of course with kindly feelings always that the numbers of French recruiting officers were legion and that when he got the list, he thought it was the list of recruits that he had. If they were legion what have they done? The services of an officer whom I know and whom I have seen at work commanding camps at Three Rivers, having as many as 10,000 or 15,000 men under him at a time, a man who has had experience and who is well qualified, was at their disposal, I refer to Colonel Pelletier whom I saw in active service during the Northwest rebellion. He was wounded on the field, he came back, was put in command of the Quebec district and went from there to the South African war. They cannot say that this man had no experience. He was liked by the men who came to the camp at Three Rivers, they had confidence in him and he liked them. Colonel Roy was an officer in much the same position. General Lessard was another officer of standing and when I hear the statement made that he secured no recruits, my reply to that is, that he did not start well, that he was not encouraged, that he started with Colonel Blondin who had been opposed to recruiting all his life, and the people were rather reluctant to think that he had changed his views on his way to Damascus. General Lessard started and the Government thought it might be a success but they did not want it to be a success in Quebec.

If a man is going to war, if he is going to give his life or shed his blood for any cause, he wants to go with a man that he trusts and in whom he has confidence. He wants to go with a man whose sympathy he knows he can command. If we are to judge by the expressions of feeling that we have had from a certain element, the French Canadian has no reason, no justification, to believe that he would get any sympathy from people outside of his own race. I was astounded when I read in the papers that at a meeting in Queen's Park, which was mentioned by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy), a returned soldier made the statement that if the Government would conscript the foreigners the returned soldiers would fight the French Canadians. I do not object to that statement so much as I do to the manner in which it was received, what is worse, because it expresses a feeling which ought not to be tolerated in this

country, was the ovation that took place amongst the auditors when that statement was made. That feeling is not confined to Toronto, it has gone farther. It was published in the press broadcast that wounded soldiers had been insulted in the streets of the city of Quebec and that soldiers' trains had been stoned at Fraserville and Rivière du Loup. We asked for an investigation and the report has been deposited on the table of the House. Let me read from the report of the gentlemen who were appointed by the Government to investigate the incident in order to show the House whether any case has been made out against voluntary recruiting in Quebec. In clause 10 of the report No. 172, it is stated that:

Owing to the strong feeling of the majority of the soldiers that the province of Quebec has not as yet done her full duty in sending troops over, they express their views to the citizens in strong terms whenever occasion offers and this had an apparent effect on the volunteer services in these localities.

It is useless to say, Sir, that these accusations were not founded on fact that the report of the commission showed that there was no ground for them and further that in certain instances the soldiers had attacked the civilians and it was only in retaliation that they received anything from them. Were these people satisfied to have these slurs cast upon the French Canadians within the borders of Canada? No, Sir. Just to show the animus, and to show the position that we are in, I propose to put a cablegram before the House. The report of this military commission is dated the 18th day of May. On the 19th June a cable was sent from London addressed to the hon. member for Rouville. It reads as follows:

Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux,
Ottawa.

Major from British Columbia pretends to a pressman that his regiment was attacked and insulted passing through Quebec province. Can you send me report of enquiry committee?

(Sgd) Pelletier.

Mr. Pelletier is the representative of the province of Quebec in London. As my hon. friend from Rouville stated in this House, the American press is being poisoned. Now somebody is trying to poison the mind of the English people on the other side of the ocean knowing that the statements made are untrue, knowing that an investigation by the military authorities has been held and a report made to the contrary, and yet a month after that report is made this despatch is sent in order to ascertain the truth of statements made by men who are across the ocean, officers of the Canadian army.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Who sends that message?

Mr. BUREAU: Mr. Pelletier, the Commissioner of the province of Quebec in London. Do they want to stop in England? No, Sir: they go further; they cross the channel and go right to the trenches. The other day I read in a newspaper a letter from a young French Canadian from the province of Quebec, stating that even in the trenches practically the only thing they had to read was a paper which was circulated, a paper which was slurring and slandering the French-Canadians. It is a Toronto paper, which has for its title Jack Canuck. That is the kind of literature they get in the trenches, and that is the kind of respect that is shown not only for the slacker, but for the man who has gone to the front to shed his blood.

Not only since the beginning of the war but for a long time before, we have been insulted; but we have borne our ills with patience. The element which is so active against us cannot realize the position. Let me tell them that the French Canadians did not come to this side of the ocean in palatial steel steamers. When the Frenchman came to America he did not proceed to the Windsor hotel, there to spread a map of Canada before him, pull out his cheque book and decide where he was going to invest his thousands of dollars. He did not come either to seek wealth. His arms and his capital were courage and a strong heart. The wealth he was seeking was peace and happiness. The twin screw steel palace that he had was nothing but a small bark, and when he fastened it to the shore of the St. Lawrence, when he stepped on the shore, there to wrest and conquer from the forest and from the aborigines a piece of land on which he could live in peace and raise his family he was satisfied. What he wanted was to create a home for his descendants, to worship his God according to his creed, to speak his language, and to find happiness with his family by his fireside. This man cannot have the same mentality as the man who came to Canada twenty-five or thirty years ago. This man is rooted to the soil, and his only country in the world is the spot bought by his forefathers by the sweat of their brows, and paid for with their blood. We are proud of the French blood that flows in our veins, but you cannot call us French we are Canadians. The fortune of war went against us one day; we had to change companions and to submit to a new regime. We did it, we accepted the new companions, to live in peace with them. At that time, Sir, the

partner senior was holding the majority of the stock, 70,000 against 3,000 when men of his blood called Lafayette and Rochambault came and made him a proposition to forego his allegiance and join the American republic; he said no. He was loyal, he knew that he had sworn allegiance to his new associates. Let those who doubt the loyalty of that man go down into the province of Quebec, on the national highway along the St. Lawrence, and there they will see that the French Canadians has in front of his house the witness of his pledge, they will see on every farm the cross, standing there to remind the French Canadians that he cannot be a perjurer to the British Crown—and he never will be.

To show the animus of a certain element, I need only refer to what occurred this afternoon. I was amazed at the answers made by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs). My friend from Cape Breton asked him a question. The member for Parry Sound was making a statement that there were only a thousand French Canadians left at the front, that one regiment had been decimated, that only commissioned and non-commissioned officers were in England. Upon that my friend asked him a question something as follows: You made the statement that there were 5,000 or 6,000 French-Canadians; one regiment has been decimated, 1,000 are in the trenches, where are the others? The hon. member replied: They must have deserted.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

Mr. BUREAU: Sir, is that noble, is that generous, I ask you, is that British—is it even decent? I say no.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: It is German.

Mr. BUREAU: Do you think that a mother with a heart in her breast or a father with blood in his veins will tell his son to enroll under men who express such sentiments as that? What treatment can he expect? You say: Go and fight the Prussians; in the name of liberty, in the name of democracy, go and fight the Prussians. Why? Because he has called his pledges scraps of paper, because he has put his heel on the weaker nation, Belgium; because he has tried to wipe from the earth the smaller nations of the Balkans; and in the same breath you treat your fellow countrymen, you treat the men in the trenches, in this way. Read the casualty lists, and you will see that some men have deserted to go to a better land; some have deserted by shedding their blood; some have deserted by taking Courcelette, and I ask a gentleman who says he has been in the trenches, a gentleman who says he has raised a regiment and who has nothing but words of scorn for men who have lost their lives, I ask: Are we going to enroll with such people? No. And then, Sir, those gentlemen will come—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Do not call him a gentleman.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not calling him, I am talking about the gentlemen on the other side generally. They will come and call us the white-livered brigade, the cold-feet association, the slacker band. Do they think we are going to follow their footsteps? Who is the man who is foolish enough to go and enroll when he knows he will have a greater fight with the men who are commanding him than he will have with the Prussian when he meets him? The insinuations, the implications, the slurs and slanders against my fellow countrymen were started by a certain element in the neighbouring province of Ontario. Mind you we exempt certain good-willed people. A movement was made to try and bring about a better understanding between the two provinces. There was the bonne entente delegation. I had the pleasure of being present when they came to Three Rivers, and I may say that they were all delighted and some were surprised at what they saw. A return visit was made, but some titled editors laughed and scoffed at it. Why, Sir, what we want now is unity. What we want now is not strife and struggle; we want to understand that we are a common people fighting for a common cause, and that there is no superior and no inferior race in this country. I will never consent to be a party to ratify broken pledges. I will never consent to be content when one class of the citizens is being brushed aside with the hand as unworthy of being Canadians.

As I have said, the member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) and the member for North York (Mr. D. A. Armstrong) are not the only ones. We, who depend upon treaties and pledges for our safeguard, have heard the statement made in this House, by members who claimed they represented the people, that they did not care for the constitution I will quote the speech so that I will not be unfair to the hon. gentleman. Mr. Armstrong of North York started with the usual complimentary address:

I must say that the reason why conscription faces us to-day is because French Canada has failed to do its duty.

Further on he says:

I personally do not care two straws whether it is constitutional or not. Personally I would puncture the constitution a dozen times, if it was necessary, in order to stand by the boys at the front and to uphold Canada's arm in this struggle.

Going back to the opening of his address, I find he made the following statement:

Those who know the political history of the part of the province from which I come know that the riding of North York has long claimed to be the birthplace and cradle of reform; that it has given to the public life of Canada men like George Brown, William Lyon Mackenzie, Sir William Mulock and Sir Allen Aylesworth, names that are closely interwoven with the history and principle of old time Liberalism.

Sir William Lyon Mackenzie and George Brown are gone, but there are men living to-day who must find a considerable change in the constituency of North York. I had the pleasure of being closely associated with one of them, Sir Allen Aylesworth, and no man had more respect for the constitution than he had, and I ask myself, how is it that to-day North York is sending to Parliament a man who wants to puncture the constitution? He had better go and puncture the Prussians first. What are we fighting for and what are we asked to fight for? The very same thing that the Allies are fighting for. We are asked to fight because the constitution, or pledge or treaty that Germany signed, protecting a smaller nation, Belgium, has been treated as a scrap of paper. The hon. member from North York says, "I will tear in pieces the treaty or contract which safeguards you as a minority. In the name of liberty, I enslave you. In the name of democracy I shackle you." I remember the indignation of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce when we passed legislation creating new provinces. I was reminded of the preacher in an old church in the southern states, when he made us hear the rattling of the shackles on the young man on the plains of the Northwest, and when he made them cry, "Give me liberty or give me death." What are we to expect? Has Prussia been transported to America. Has Kaiserism been implanted in Ottawa? Has the gentleman gone into hysterics, or is it mental aberration? I do not know what to think. My people do not know what to think. Are we going to be slaves, or are we going to be treated as slaves. I say, No.

The ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) said the other day that one of the influences which worked against recruiting was that some young people would get on the platform and call the others slackers. And he says the young men who were called slackers would get their backs against the wall and say, "We will not enroll." Mr. Speaker, do not let our friends believe that, because we do not hold the majority of the stock in this association, we are going to run away. Don't let them think that abuse or threats are going to scare us, either inside or outside of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BUREAU: Look at the way the Hon. gentleman from Parry Sound, (Mr. Arthurs) opened his remarks. The first thing was to quote the member from St. Hyacinthe whose remarks were interpreted as meaning resistance to the enforcement of the bill. Why should the Hon. gentleman be scandalized? Is there not to-day in the British Cabinet a man who said he would resist by force of arms the law sanctioned by his King? The same gentleman was presented with a sword on a certain occasion by his supporters as a mark of approval for the stand taken by him on the Home Rule question. On that particular occasion, the government which the member for Parry Sound supports, was represented at the ceremony by the present Canadian Minister of Railways and Canals. Does he reprove the British Government or does he reprove the Canadian Government? No, Sir, but he brings this forward try and cast suspicion and disloyalty upon a member because he is from the province of Quebec. I see my friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) in the House to-night. While speaking the other day he asked my hon. leader in this House: "Who leads public opinion in the province of Quebec?" He was trying to fasten on him the responsibility for all the slurs and slanders which are heaped upon us. Who are the leaders of public opinion? He said, "The leader of the Opposition will go down to Quebec and with Sir Lomer Gouin, will carry 60 seats out of 65. Can you not find in Quebec five or six men of good will, who will preach to their fellow citizens that they have to enroll?" I ask the hon. gentleman from North Grey, who is the leader of public opinion in Ontario? Who is the man that goes to that province, and comes back to this House in 1911 with 69 seats out of 82? Can he not find among his fellow men or politicians, among his Tory friends, five or six men of good will, who will go through the province of Ontario and say, "Stop this abuse. We do not ask you to shed your blood, we do not ask you to fight, but we ask you to stop

slurring and slandering, and when you get on the platform, do not deprecate your fellow citizens residing in the next province." Let me make the prediction that when peace is restored among ourselves there will be no more recrimination against Quebec. Let me tell my hon. friends on the other side of the House that the Canadian of Quebec is not afraid of the Prussian. He is more afraid of the man who lives alongside of him, from whom he receives no sympathy, but in whom he feels there is hatred in his heart against the French. We cannot hate but we can distrust. It is not in our nature to enjoy pain in others. It is not in our nature to stand suffering. We can distrust but when do we distrust? We distrust when we feel that we are hated, and we feel that we are hated when there is a systematic campaign of slander going on. When this venom filters into the United States, we feel it; when it goes across the ocean, we feel it; when it goes into the trenches at the front, we feel it; but when it comes into this House of Commons, we feel it worse.

My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), when closing his remarks the other day, made an appeal to hon. members, stating that the call for men came from the dead. If the shades of the dead were to pass over this House and to witness what is going on, they would say: Have we sacrificed our lives for naught? Have we shed our blood to make slaves of free men? Are you going to disgrace us by having flowers placed upon our tombs by slaves instead of by free men? Have you called us in the name of liberty to help enslave and shackle others? If you have called us in the name of liberty to have treaties respected, do not imitate Prussianism, send free men to plant flowers on our graves, but do not send slaves, respect treaties but do not despise them; that would be the call of the dead. What kind of an army are you going to have if you force men to serve at the front? There is an old saying that was in vogue at the time of the Civil war that it took two good soldiers to keep a recruit in line. I am not a military man, I do not know whether that is true or not.

Some hon. members have referred to a question put by the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune), who said: If we enlist, will you repeal the school law? This question they think is ridiculous. There are three things that are dear to the French Canadian heart—his fireside, his faith, and his language. We all know that the roots of that tree which has grown so big in 300 years cannot be pulled out. The French Canadian will die to defend his fireside; but hon. gentlemen put forward as being the next best proposition: Isolate Quebec, and in order to isolate it, create a feeling against it; try to get those French Canadian fellows so indignant over the bad treatment we are giving them that, in their indignation, they will do something that will justify us in saying: You are rebels and do not deserve the protection of the law; and treating us as so many Indians of whom the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) spoke, they will say: Go back to your reservation and stay there. As to the French Canadian's faith, what has not been said against the clergy of Quebec? What has not been written against them? Even in this House, they were called parasites by an ex-minister of the Crown, and he stated that they ought to be cast away. I read in a newspaper the other day that there were 80,000 of those parasites who ought to be put out of the country. The fact of the matter is that hon. gentleman opposite do not have anything against the clergy; they know that the clergy have been doing noble work, but hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to get at one of those things that are dear to the heart of the French Canadian. As to his language, last year, when in this House we asked for an expression of sympathy for those French Canadians who lived in Ontario, we were turned down.

Mr. LALOR: The hon. member says that upon this side of the House reflections have been cast upon the clergy of Quebec. Will he kindly explain who cast those reflections?

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes)—I cannot speak as to the year.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: In 1910.

An hon. MEMBER: We have not forgotten that.

Mr. BUREAU: We discussed in this House a motion asking for an expression of sympathy for those French Canadians who live in Ontario, asking whether in the opinion of this House it would be well not to abolish the teaching of the French language in the schools of Ontario. We remember how that motion was received, and I will abstain from going into details. The French Canadians of Ontario, when they made that request, were practically told: Those privileges ars constitutional; they do

not extend beyond the limits of Quebec, and your privileges are co-extensive therewith. Therefore, the only conclusion to be drawn, although it was not put in so many words, was: If you want to enjoy those privileges, go back to the province of Quebec. I have here an expression of opinion, not by a French Canadian, not in a paper published in Quebec, not even in a paper published in Canada or in the United States, but in an English paper called the New Witness and edited by Mr. G. K. Chesterton. On page 78 of the issue of May 24, 1917, I find the following:

As we are in the act of celebrating Empire day, it may be well to consider what is the charter of the Empire, General Smuts said recently: "The British Empire, or this British Commonwealth of Nations, does not stand for unity, standardization, or assimilation, or denationalization; but it stands for a fuller, a richer, and more various life among all the nations that compose it. And even nations who have fought against you, like my own, must feel that they and their interests, their language, their religions, and all their cultural interests, are as safe and as secure under the British flag as those of the children of your household and your own blood."

This is the comment of the editor:

And at this very moment, in Canada, we are giving the lie to his words. The slander that the French Canadian has been a slacker in the war, which has been given a good deal of publicity, was bad enough. But that slander has been effectually rebutted by the Montreal paper, La Presse. What is now happening is more serious than mere vulgar abuse. The French Canadian is being robbed of his language. Despite our solemn guarantees, the use of French in the Manitoba Legislature has long ceased; but now the separate French schools have been abolished—a few months ago the final blow was struck. In Ontario it is now a crime to teach French to little French Canadian boys and girls in French Canadian schools. The penalty is a fine of $500 or six months' imprisonment. In the event of the French-speaking people of Ontario refusing to submit meekly to this iniquitous rule, they are threatened with the fate of Manitoba; their schools will be suppressed. What does General Smuts say? "Even nations that have fought against you feel that their interests, their language, their religions, and all their cultured interests are as safe under the British flag as those of the children of your own household and your own blood." But in the war of American Independence the French Canadians stood by the British flag—and this is their reward! Redress has already been refused by the Privy Council. But we cannot be content to know on Empire day that in this "free" Empire of ours we are imitating so slavishly the methods of Prussia in Poland and Alsace-Lorraine.

That is not from the pen of a Frenchman or from a newspaper in Quebec, but from an English paper published in London. How does this compare with the Toronto News of 2nd June, 1914, shortly before the war? It boldly repudiates the pledge and says, "One-hundred-year-old treaties must be interpreted in the light of new circumstances." Just exactly two months and three days later the Prussian Chancellor was using the same language in the German Reichstag. Now they are telling us: You of the province of Quebec have no enthusiasm, or inspiration. How can we have it, Sir, when we have to fight at home. We are being attacked as if we were to be isolated. We are being slandered and slurred. Is that an encouragement or an inspiration to us? In the hour when we close our eyes to the sun where will we find the friend, where could the word of consolation so sadly needed in that hour come from? When we see around us nothing but hatred and slander, when we hear no word of sympathy, I for one can feel no enthusiasm.

But that is not all. Why does the Government refuse a referendum? The Minister of Trade and Commerce said this was a dilatory motion moved for the purpose of gaining time. The Prime Minister has offered an election but has refused a referendum, and is has been stated in this House on both sides that the referendum was refused because it was feared it would be defeated. Even those on this side of the House who do not share our views have expressed the same opinion. My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) urged that we have an open vote, because there were men who were opposed to conscription, he said, who dare not express their views.

Mr. Speaker, a man who dare not speak his mind has no right to call his neighbour a slacker. A man who has not the courage to stand up in a free parliament and say what he thinks, or stand up in a free country and express his opinion, has no right to call his neighbour a coward. The coward is he who is afraid to speak his mind when he thinks he is in the right. Kaiser-like, this Government, knowing the people do not want conscription, say: We will put our heel on their necks; we will be the masters. Is that democracy? Is it in the name of a democracy such as that, that we are going to compel our race, who have ideals, to enlist? Sir, that is no inspiration to us. We do not want to fight for liberty in Europe and create a condition of slavery in Canada. We do not want to fight for democracy in Europe and establish autocracy in Canada. The time has passed when we can be called to slavery

in the name of liberty, and to love in the name of hatred. Let us get together. I have spoken my mind without any reservation and without any malice. I have stated the facts as they are, and put the case as I conceive it to be. That being done I repeat my appeal to my hon. friend from North Grey. I appeal to him and to all the ministers of the Cabinet to find half a dozen men of good will who will stop this campaign of slander and calumny in Ontario and other English-speaking provinces against French-Canadians. Not till then shall we have peace and unity. Do not think because we are in a minority that we are heartless; we feel all the more on that account. We can only appeal to sympathy, and how can conditions be bettered when that sympathy is lacking, and distrust and worse is in the hearts of those to whom we appeal. If this campaign of slander were stopped and good-will were established between the two races it would not be necessary to put a Conscription Bill on the statute book to get French Canadians from the province of Quebec to enlist. When you show some sympathy to the French Canadian of the province of Quebec he will reciprocate and show how he is loyal and true. The things that are so dear to him, his fireside, his language, and his faith, are the only things that have kept him patient under circumstances where any other man would have lost his patience. It is his love for the land that he has discovered and conquered that has kept him silent. If I were a young man eligible to enlist I would consider that the condition I have exposed would justify me in not enlisting. If the people of Quebec have not responded the fault is not with the right hon. leader of the Opposition or members on this side of the House from the province of Quebec, but it is for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. FERDINAND JOSEPH ROBIDOUX (Kent, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, I would take no part in this debate did I not feel bound to raise my voice in support of the measure introduced by the Prime Minister, and I take this position believing it to be in the best interests of the race to which I belong, as well as of the country generally. I have followed with close attention the debate which has taken place in this House during the last few days, and it seems to me that there are a few things which have been pretty conclusively established, the first of which is the fact that the principle of compulsory military service has been embodied in our statute law ever since Confederation. It is therefore quite clear that the proposed Military Service Act does not introduce into the legislation of this country any new principle as far as compulsion for the defence of Canada is concerned, except in so far as it provides that troops shall be raised by selective drafts and not by the methods laid down in the Militia Act, which require that the men be selected by ballot. The new Act does not trust to luck for the selection of the men; it provides that the selection shall be made in an intelligent manner, having regard to the requirements of the great industries of the country, chief among which must necessarily rank agriculture and the fisheries, which are the most important agencies of food production.

In the second place, it has been shown beyond question that the Governor in Council already has the power, under the terms of the Militia Act of 1904, to send Canadian troops beyond the limits of Canada for the defence of Canada in a case of emergency. The hon. member for Kamouraska has cited old statutes in force before Confederation, in which it was specially stipulated that the militia could be called out and marched to any place without the province, but conterminous therewith for the purpose of repelling or meeting an attack. My hon. friend cited those old statutes in an endeavour to prove that under the present Militia Act the same limitations applied. But in my judgment he has only succeeded in proving exactly the contrary proposition to that which he sought to establish. In the Militia Act of 1868, drafted by Sir George Etienne Cartier, as well as in the Act of 1904, the word "conterminous" has been eliminated, showing conclusively that the framers of the new law had in contemplation certain circumstances which might arise and might compel Canada to send her troops even beyond the seas to fight for the defence of Canada. Otherwise the word "conterminous" would have been left in the statute. Moreover the words uttered by the then Minister of Justice, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, at the time the clause dealing with this matter was adopted, words which have already been quoted in this House, evidently show that this is the true and proper construction to put on that clause.

There is another fact which, clear and distinct, looms out of this debate and out of the events which transpired in this country at the outbreak of the war. Canada went into this war, not only because Great Britain and the Empire were threatened

by a grave danger, not merely for the purpose of helping Great Britain and France in the tremendous struggle into which the unjust aggression of Germany had thrust them without cause or warning; but Canada entered this war for the stern and fixed purpose of protecting herself and her people against a grave and serious danger which would inevitably become a disaster should Germany win out. It was mainly this sentiment of self-preservation which prompted the people of this country at the outbreak of the war, and ever since, without distinction of race and creed, to unite in a common voluntary effort to resist the German menace and help crush it, and upon this sentiment chiefly rested the appeal which was made to the youth of Canada in order to urge them to enlist and fly to the defence of our country.

Finally it has been shown by the Prime Minister, and it has been generally admitted by those who have spoken in this debate, that the system of voluntary enlistment had ceased to yield the requisite number of men to maintain the Canadian troops at full strength at the front. While this state of affairs is to be regretted, at the same time I agree with those who hold that voluntary enlistment has not been a failure. My own native province, the province of New Brunswick, has done wonders under the voluntary system. It gave me a good deal of satisfaction the other day to hear the former Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), quoting from a memorandum on recruiting which he had addressed to the Prime Minister on July 10, 1916, state that " it must be borne in mind that the Acadians have done magnificently." While I might not be justified in saying that the Acadians in proportion to numbers have enlisted as well as their English-speaking fellow citizens in my province—and there are good and valid reasons which I need not give here which can account for this—still it can indeed be stated truthfully that they have nobly answered the call to arms and that they have performed their duty as Canadians and British subjects in a splendid manner. But, Sir, the attitude taken by my compatriots in the present war is in line with the best traditions of the past. In years gone by, in the hour of their country's need, they never failed to respond to the call of duty. As far back as in the year 1812, when they had just begun to recuperate from the hardships of evil days, when hostilities broke out between Great Britain and the United States, we find them faithfully and courageously serving their king and country in the militia of their respective provinces. A few days ago I came across an old militia list containing the names of a comparatively large number of Acadians from my own county, the county of Kent, the population of which was small in those days, the names of men who, within a month after the declaration of war, had enlisted to fight for their country. I would like, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the consent of the House, to put these names on Hansard as a matter of record:

MILITIA LIST, KENT COUNTY, 1812-1815.

Saint Louis—Romain Voutour, Charles Henry, Oliver Bariault, Jacques Henry, Jean Baptiste Johnson, Jean Johnson, Pierre Thebaud.

Saint Charles—Raphael Richard, Jacques Daigle, Pierre Luc Robichaud, Fabien Daigle, Jean Louis Daigle.

Richibucto Village—Anselme Bourque, Janvier Hebert, Hilarion Babineau, Urbain Richard, Emmanuel Richard, Jean Bte. Thibodeau, Laurent Richard, Germain Thibodeau, Laurent a Petit Jean Richard, Charles Maillet and Charles Maillet (Cousins), Pierre Daigle, Raphael Caissie, Simon Richard, Augustine Maillet, Joseph Maillet, Damase Richard.

Buctouche—Francois Cormier, Andre Jaillet, Laurent LeBlanc, Thadee Bastarache, Moise Bastarache, Denis Cormier, Benoni Girouard, Joseph Girouard, Placide DesRoches, Benoni Savoie, Placide Richard, Marin Girouard.

Cocagne—Benoni Bourque, Usebe Leger, Georges Breau, Honore Desprez, Hubert Lirette, Cyrille Gueguen, Placide Gueguen

Grand Digue—Thomas Poirier, Maurice Hache, Isaac Hache, Louis Arseneau, Joachim Gallant, Placide Poirier, Fleurant Caissie.

Baie des Winds—Louis Guimond, Benoni Meunier, Dominique Martin, Louis Mazerolle.

Our young men have enlisted to bear their share in the present great struggle, because they had a proper appreciation of the free institutions under which we have lived and prospered; because they prized highly the rights and privileges of British citizenship, and because they did not want German rule and Prussian militarism to prevail. They enlisted also because of the appeals which were made to them by the highest authorities in their church and by the public men to whom they looked for leadership. Let me quote in this connection the eloquent and earnest words uttered by His Lordship Bishop Edward LeBlanc, the Acadian bishop of the diocese of Saint John, in my province, at a mass meeting held in the city of St. John a short time after the outbreak of war. I wish to put on record the eloquent words of that distinguished prelate as they are a true and faithful expression of the sentiments which have animated and guided the Acadians in the present crisis. Having stated that it was a

happy coincidence that his first utterance on a public platform in the loyal city of St. John should be for the noble purpose of encouraging our young men to enlist for the defence of the Motherland and that he was heartily in accord with the object of the meeting, and that he should consider he was lacking in patriotism and in his duty to the Empire were he, the leader of the Catholic people of St. John, to remain absent or silent on that occasion, he proceeded to say:

We are living in perilous times; war is being brought home to us in a way we never experienced before. England, our Motherland, and France, the land of our ancestors, the two nations that are in the forefront of civilization and human liberties, are to-day fighting desperately against a powerful foe; they are engaged in a struggle the issue of which is still uncertain. "The British Empire is now fighting for its existence. I want every citizen to understand this cardinal fact," said Lord Kitchener the other day.

As Canadians our cause is bound up with the cause of Great Britain; her interests are ours. If England falls, we are going to fall with her, and we are going to lose all the glorious privileges we enjoy as citizens of the British Empire. Canada, now so free and so happy, so blessed by God with such great resources, Canada that has such a brilliant future before her, will be reduced to a condition of vassalage and crushed under the iron heel of a foreign and unsympathetic ruler.

Failure for England in this war will mean England's destruction and even success will have to be dearly paid for; but, let us thank God, the age of chivalry is not passed; there is still enough patriotism and heroism in the young men of this province to make a supreme effort now for England's cause. Our hope is in our young men; to them we look to uphold the honour and the glory of the British Empire, of that Empire which, rather than to break its plighted word to little Belgium has been willing to sacrifice the best and noblest of her sons.

I need not enter here at length into the causes that led to this terrible war; I need not dwell on the violation of the neutrality of Belgium, that wonderful little kingdom which the Bishop of Salford called "the victim and the saviour of Europe." I need not recall the breaking of a treaty which the powers had solemnly promised to keep intact, or England's entente with France for the protection of the channel ports. Above all this stands the one great fact that England did not want this war, but now that she has been forced into it, it is our duty as loyal subjects of His Majesty the King to uphold her cause and to rally to her defence.

Young men of New Brunswick, we appeal to you not to allow Britain, to whom we are indebted for our civil and religious beliefs, for our just laws, and for the protection and prosperity that we enjoy, to have her very existence imperilled without striking a blow in her defence. To-night from over the seas is wafted to us the cry of the Motherland: More men, more men! It is England's call to arms. Let every man who is willing to heed that cry enlist.

It will not do for Canadians to be behind; better things are expected of us; we want our best and bravest sons from this province and from the different parts of Canada to go forth to stem the tide of hostile aggression, to say to the enemies of the Empire, this far shall you come but no farther.

Remember, young men, it is just possible that unless you strike a blow now in defence of the Mother Country, our days of prosperity may soon be ended. The enemy is dangerously near our doors. The fall of Antwerp, the occupation of Ostend and the disastrous battle off the Chilean coast a few days ago threatens them. Would it not be possible to have enacted here and in our quiet country homes tragic scenes similar to those which have taken place in Belgium,—and in northern France,—prosperous villages where once reigned peace and contentment now burnt, or destroyed, magnificent cathedrals and public buildings laid in ruins, millions of innocent and suffering people seeking refuge in other lands.

Go forth to battle now, while the future of Canada is being fought for on the plains and river banks of France. Let the spirit of patriotism prompt you to-night to say "England never did, nor ever shall be at the proud foot of a conqueror."

At a late date in January 1917, Bishop LeBlanc in a pastoral letter again urged the young men to enlist and he wrote:

As long as the world will last, nations will have recourse to arms whenever principles are to be defended on pain of dishonour. At present, it is British freedom against Prussian tyranny; it is a struggle for right and civilization against brutal force and despotism. Realizing the justice of our cause, it is our duty to assist the Empire by every means in our power. There is no use minimizing the danger to which we are exposed. The outlook is very serious. It is to be regretted that people do not take the matter more seriously to heart. Men who are physically fit are still wanted in the army; in the matter of enlisting there should be no delay.

Chief Justice Landry, another eminent Acadian and also a recognized leader of public opinion in New Brunswick, spoke in the same strain on many occasions; so did Senator Poirier; so did my good friend the member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) and other men occupying leading positions in public life as well as in the church. No man in the public life of the province of New Brunswick ever had a better and a truer conception of the many and precious advantages derived from British rule and British institutions and of the corresponding responsibilities which these advantages involve than had Mr. Justice Landry, and he did not hesitate to advise his fellow-countrymen to join the colours in this war. I shall not quote from the many speeches which he delivered on recruiting and which were published in the papers, but I shall read a letter which he wrote to Mr. Raymond Leger, the Mayor of Shediac,

on November 25, 1914; I quote the letter because it contains in writing, over his own signature, the views of a man who devoted his whole life to the advancement of his own people and whose greatest ambition was to secure for them that position which they have attained in the Government of the country. I translate the letter which was written in French:

Saint John, N.B.,
November 25, 1914.

Mr. Leger, Mayor, Shediac, N.B.
Dear Sir:

I regret to be unable to be present at the patriotic meeting to be held in Shediac. If my presence or my voice can stimulate the worthy and necessary work of recruiting, they both are with you to-night, although much to my regret I personally cannot be present.

Two of my sons have taken the steps to reach the firing line and I would view with satisfaction, however dire is the necessity thereof, the voluntary enlistment of one member of each Acadian family in New Brunswick. Our ancestors were heroes in the days of adversity; may their descendants display as much patriotism and heroism in the crisis which is now threatening the very foundation of Christian civilization.

May they play an honourable part in that gigantic struggle the issue of which may imperil the British Empire and carry with it the triumph of an aggressive militarism, unless the full resources of the nation are available.

(Sgd) P. A Landry.

Let me say here that later on Chief Justice Landry became so imbued with the importance of the war, in so far as it affected Canada, and so impressed with the necessity to mobilize the forces of the nation that he did not hesitate publicly to advocate conscription, and he did so at a meeting of the Supreme Court in the city of St. John, observing at the same time that it was the fairest and most equitable system of raising an army.

Now, Sir, I am only repeating what has already been stated over and over again in the debate when I say that, to-day, Canada is face to face with a situation the extreme gravity of which cannot be overestimated. It is evident that we have reached the point where we must either adopt new methods to do that which voluntary recruiting is not doing and maintain our forces at the front, or we must gradually drop out of the war. In other words, the time has come when we must make up our minds either to remain in the war to a finish or practically get out of it.

Mr. Speaker, I think I voice the sentiment of this country when I say that the Canadian people, English and French speaking, are determined to stand by Great Britain and her Allies until this war has been carried to a victorious conclusion. They are so determined because they know that so long as Great Britain shall be in danger, Canada will equally be in danger and that, in the words used by Bishop LeBlanc, "If England falls, we are going to fall with her."

Speaking for the people I have the honour to represent, I think I can say that they are in accord with the great majority of the people of Canada on this question; that while the idea of compulsion is repugnant to them, they will not hesitate, when they realize the seriousness of the situation, to assume cheerfully and bravely their full share of responsibility in the prosecution of the war. They have behaved magnificently in the past and they will so conduct themselves in the future however difficult may be the task before them.

I must register my protest against the unfortunate remarks which were made in this House by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. L. J. Gauthier) at the close of his speech. The words which he uttered were not worthy of himself and of this Canadian parliament; they were certainly not worthy of the great race to which we both belong, and I will venture to say that they do not voice the sober sense of the people of the province of Quebec.

I see no reason why there should be a distinct line of cleavage over this question between the two great races which have inhabited Canada for a century and more and have made it what it is to-day. Their interests are identical; they have the same love for freedom and liberty and for those British institutions which are the best guaranty of liberty and freedom; they are facing a common foe in the trenches of Flanders and of France, and French and English lads are fighting side by side, making the supreme sacrifice and laying down their lives for the common cause.

Sir, I believe that, fortunately for Canada, the deeds of bravery and of heroism which have been performed by the sons of French Canadians at Courcelette, at Vimy Ridge and elsewhere on the bloody battlefields of France, will play a far greater part and will wield a much broader influence in shaping the future destinies of this country than will the irresponsible speeches of demagogues and political agitators.

Under no other flag and under no other possible form of Government would we enjoy as large a measure of freedom and of protection as we now have under the British flag. For this reason, and for other reasons which I have given, convinced as

I am that the destinies of Canada are closely linked with those of the Empire; feeling as I do that the French Canadian race has more at stake in the present conflict than any other element of the population of Canada, for, should Germany win this war we would lose many of the precious rights and privileges we now have; believing as I do that, not only is it necessary, but that it is fair as well to the men who have already gone into the trenches, that sufficient reinforcements be provided for our troops in France, I will support the Bill.

On motion of Mr. Carvell the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Burrell the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, June 27, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

QUESTIONS.

DR. NEILLY OF NEW GLASGOW.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has Dr. Neilly, of New Glasgow, N.S., been connected with the Overseas Dental Corps?
2. If so, is he still so connected?
3. Is he on leave?
4. If so, when does such leave expire?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Yes.
2 and 3 answered by No. 1.
4. On July 23rd, 1917.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CLAIM FOR DAMAGES.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Have Ludovic Poitras and Zephirin Gagnon, who claim to have suffered injury in an accident at Chaudière, on the Intercolonial Railway, made a claim from the Department of Justice for a Petition of Right?
2. If so, at what date?
3. Has such request been acceded to? If not, why not?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.
2. May 7, 1917.
3. No. The Minister of Justice has not yet received the necessary information and papers relating to the claims set forth in the said petitions of right to enable him to decide whether or not he should recommend the granting of fiats upon the petitions.

PRIVILEGE.

CORRECTION BY SIR THOMAS WHITE OF EDITORIAL IN TORONTO GLOBE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I rise to a question of privilege. My attention has been drawn to an editorial in the Toronto Globe which is founded upon wholly erroneous information and which reflects somewhat on me as Minister of Finance. It is headed "Where the Money Goes." I quote:

> Within twelve months the Dominion Government has paid to a few favoured industries, chiefly for the production of iron and steel, the sum of $21,669,965.
>
> In his Budget statement on April 24 the Finance Minister reported that the entire yield of the business profits tax in twelve months had been $15,000,000. The revenue from the same source in the current accounting period of twelve months is estimated at $20,000,000.

After dealing with the bounty system, the editorial goes on:

> On the eve of a measure to conscript the manhood of the country the case for a more courageous and progressive financial policy at Ottawa is unanswerable.

Similar statements as to the payment out of $20,000,000 in bounties during the past year have been made in the Montreal Journal of Commerce, and in many other papers throughout Canada. With reference to this Globe editorial and the other editorials to which I have referred, I desire to say that the bounties upon iron and steel expired five years ago, in 1911, and have not been renewed. The result is that no money has been paid out by way of bounty upon iron and steel production in Canada for the past five years. The Montreal Journal of Commerce, in its issue of June 26, made a complete withdrawal of the statement which it had published in an earlier issue respecting the matter. I draw this matter to the attention of the House because the sum is so large and because, as I have stated, it seems to reflect on the administration of the Finance Department.

PRIVILEGE—SIR SAM HUGHES.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. MARK IRISH RESPECTING RECRUITING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On June 20, I received the following telegram from Mr. Mark H. Irish:

> Toronto, Ont., June 20, 1917
>
> Lieut.-General Hon. Sir Sam Hughes, K.C.B.,
> House of Commons,
> Ottawa, Ont.
>
> Press reports of your speech in the House yesterday credit you with saying that I urged the Prime Minister some months back to let up on recruiting. I have never spoken to Sir Robert nor any other Minister of the Crown either Federal or Provincial on the subject of recruiting. I do not and never have held the views you attribute to me. In my opinion recruiting properly done is a stimulus not a retardant to the production of munitions. You

should not have made the statement you did regarding me because such statement is not founded on facts.

Mark H. Irish.

Passing over the paternalism and general tone assumed by the outfit to which that gentleman belongs, I shall read my reply, which I sent immediately, without looking up Hansard.

Ottawa, June 20, 1917.

Mark H Irish, M.P.P.,
Toronto.

Replying to yours. You spoke to me many times on the question of scarcity of labour for munitions and advocated some plan of control. The assertions made by you then all pointed to a limitation within definite lines of service, something bordering on controlling employment of men thus interfering with the will of men in recruiting. I did not intend to say you spoke to Sir Robert. You spoke with me repeatedly on the subject.

Sam Hughes.

I have looked up Hansard and I find, on page 2546, that I said:

Mark Irish of the Imperial Munitions Board, Mr. Flavelle of the Imperial Munitions Board and others have been insistent in their demands that these men would not be taken.

This statement follows a sentence to the effect that the Finance Minister had told the Prime Minister that there was a perfect storm brewing in Toronto:

And that agitation was due to the fact that men could not be obtained as workers.

The two sentences are entirely distinct, and every statement I made is absolutely true. Not only did Mr. Irish speak to me once, but twenty times, till I told him he was becoming a perfect nuisance in his agitation, which was not to stop recruiting, but to prevent men who were wanted on the Munitions Board recruiting. I assured him then, as I assure the country to-day, that there were tens of thousands of men not working, who were anxious to work, but could not get work.

An hon. MEMBER: Who sent that telegram?

Sir SAM HUGHES: The telegram I have read was from Mark H. Irish who is connected with the Munitions Board.

MOOSEJAW NEWS—PATRONAGE.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): On the 20th of April, 1917, I asked a question of the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) and received a promise from the minister. The discussion in Hansard is as follows:

Mr. Knowles: To what extent does the Moosejaw News obtain patronage as a result of the minister's discretion?

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Mr. Patenaude: I can bring down the information.

Mr. Knowles: Will the minister let me know early next week how much the Moosejaw News has received lately?

Mr. Patenaude: Yes.

That is over a month ago and I have recently written asking for the information, and have not even had an acknowledgment. I draw the matter to the attention of the Government, and desire to have the information placed in Hansard.

SALARY OF POSTAL CLERKS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): On May 31, 1917, I asked the following question:

Mr. W. E. Knowles: Will the Acting Postmaster General tell us what is to be done with regard to the prospective salary increases for the postal clerks, including carriers? The hon. gentleman is no doubt aware that the different associations have been asking for increases.

The answer given me at that time appears in Hansard as follows:

Hon. Mr. Patenaude: I shall probably be able to answer my hon. friend in two or three days.

That occurred in May, and I would ask if some information could not be furnished at the present time. The answer to the former question will require some consideration, perhaps, but the latter question might be answered now.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): With regard to the last mentioned question, since it has fallen upon my shoulders to bear the burden of the Postmaster General's Department, I have taken up the matter, and I will have, presently, ready for submission to council, a suggestion looking to an improvement in the smaller salaries of the employees of the post office, which I hope will be dealt with very promptly.

INTERIOR AND INDIAN DEPARTMENTS —ENLISTMENTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Some weeks ago I asked the question, which was passed as an order for return. The return asked for was in regard to the employees of the Interior and Indian Departments who had enlisted for overseas service, and the arrangements made with them by the department. So far as I am aware, that return has not yet been produced. It is important that it should be forthcoming dur-

ing the course of the present discussion on the Military Service Bill. I ask the minister to have it brought down without delay.

PRIVILEGE.

STATEMENT BY MR. BUREAU.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: I rise to a question of privilege. In the Montreal Gazette of to-day I observe a headline which reads:

> Mr. Bureau wants Laurier and Gouin to tour the province.

I never expressed any such desire. On the contrary I appealed to the member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) and the Prime Minister to tour the province of Ontario and try to stop the campaign that was waged against Quebec. I make this declaration, so that I will not be told that I never denied it.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Consideration of the motion of the right hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and the amendment thereto, and the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barette, resumed from Tuesday, June 26th.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, As my position on this very important matter is perhaps not as well known as that of my hon. colleague from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), I feel it is incumbent upon me, in view of the position I intend to take, to state in the simplest and shortest language possible, the views which I entertain, and the vote which I intend to give, on this very important measure which is now before the House of Commons. I find myself, perhaps, in the most peculiar position of any member in this House, from the fact that for the past two years and a half no man has criticised the conduct of the Government, in the management of the war, to the extent that I have. I honestly believed in my criticism, and I am convinced that I had good ground for making every statement which I made. I believed that partisanship was running rampant all over the Dominion of Canada in the conduct of this war, and, as a member of Parliament, to whose knowledge these matters had come, I felt it my duty to make them public, and I made them public in as forcible a manner as I knew how. I have no apology to make, and take back nothing which I have said. I only wish to say that in the future, notwithstanding the attitude I may take to-day, if in my judgment, the conduct of this war by the Government is such as to require criticism, I hope I shall have the courage to perform the duties for which I was sent to this Parliament. I have nothing further to say regarding what has taken place in the past.

I look upon the condition of affairs at present, and on what may take place in the future, as of very much more importance than what has taken place during the past two or three years of war. I have taken a very serious view of this war from the beginning—perhaps too serious—but, Sir, it has been in my thoughts constantly, as I think it will be, until the closing scenes of this great drama. I was attending court in St. John on the 4th August, 1914, and on the morning of that day I read in the newspapers that war had been declared, and I immediately sent a telegram to my chief (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) telling him that in my judgment he should offer the Government his full support in anything that was necessary, in order that Canada should do her duty in the conduct of the war. I have taken that attitude, both privately and publicly, ever since that time, and I still take that attitude. I think there is nothing which Canada is so much interested in at the present time as that we should do our full duty to bring the war to a successful conclusion, in order that liberty, justice and righteousness may have a chance upon the earth in the future.

The Prime Minister, who is charged with the responsibility of conducting the affairs of this country in this crisis, came back from the seat of the Empire a month or six weeks ago, and he made the statement that they needed more men at the front, and he also stated, it is said without consultation with his political friends—and I know without consultation with my political friends—that the only way to get those men was to introduce a Bill for compulsory military service. It has been said by many of my friends that in doing so he was actuated by political motives. I know nothing about that, Sir, and for the purposes of my argument I care very little. The Prime Minister of this country declares we need more men. Every responsible official, both civil and military, of the two great nations, France and England, who are really waging

this war, from the 4th day of August down to the present time, have sent out the cry, "We need men and more men, and still more men." That cry has gone forth the world over. It is going forth to-day in the United States, and all over the civilized world. From every country which is fighting against the Hun to-day comes the cry: "We need more men." The Prime Minister says that on the 1st day of January 1916, he promised the Allied Governments that Canada would send half a million men. He regards that as a pledge. I do not so regard it, but I really believe that Canada stands pledged, from the day this war began to the present time, and will stand pledged until the final conclusion of this great conflict, to send every man who can be possibly spared from the ordinary vocations of life. I do not care whether the number be 50,000, 75,000, 100,000 or more; I look upon it as our duty to send all the men we possibly can, in order to make this war the success that the whole civilized world is praying that it will be.

The Prime Minister says that we cannot secure a sufficient number of men by voluntary enlistment; therefore it is necessary to introduce a measure of compulsory military service. I do not know whether or not he is right in that statement. I do believe that recruiting in Canada has not had a fair show; I do believe that party patronage has been exercised in the matter of recruiting to an extent which even members of the Government must be heartily sorry for. Not only do I believe this; I know it. I am speaking about my own section of the country; gentlemen sitting around me in this Chamber who represent different parts of Canada know that what I am saying is true. Whether a sufficient number of men can be obtained by voluntary recruiting, I do not know; but I do know that the Prime Minister says that we must adopt more forcible measures for obtaining men than we have adopted in the past. When a man in his position takes that view, I have not the nerve to say that he is wrong and that I am right. I put the burden on him, and I am willing to stand by him as far as it is possible for me to do so in order that he may get all the men that he wants.

I do not intend to discuss the terms of the Bill. With some of its details I am not entirely pleased, but if it passes the second reading and reaches the committee stage, every member will have the right to discuss these matters, propose amendments, if necessary, and endeavour to make the Bill as workable as possible.

I sometimes wonder whether I approach from a proper standpoint a consideration of the position which we occupy in this great world-struggle, or whether I stand alone in my views. But if every man could view this matter as I do, I do not think there would be much question as to what Canada should do. I do not know whether I have been possessed of the same kind of loyalty and patriotism as that which some of my friends from Ontario seem to possess. I am not always willing to take my hat off and bow down to every Englishman that I happen to meet on the street, but I do take my hat off to the 150,000 Canadians British-born who gave up their jobs, threw down their tools, and joined the colours the moment war was declared. Whatever opinions we may have as to the past and future of our Empire, we must recognize the splendid manner in which our British-born have rallied to the flag, from the Arctic ocean to the 49th parallel of latitude, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They have gone not by thousands, but by tens of thousands. Thousands have made the supreme sacrifice; tens of thousands will come back to Canada, if they ever do come back, maimed, disfigured, probably as wards of the people. I hope that the people will not be remiss in the duty which they owe to these brave men as well as to the rest of the Canadians who are taking part in this great fight. I do admire British institutions; I believe I am as loyal a British subject as any man in Canada. I do admire British laws, British sense of justice, British literature. I admire the way the British people do things in the world. I feel that I am in the judgment of every member of this House when I say that the ideals that have gone forth from the British Islands have been the foundation of the liberty of the world. But I do not concur in the view that Canada is fighting for England or because England wants her to fight; I do not support any other view than that we are simply doing our duty as Canadians. After the eloquent exposition of this aspect of the matter presented by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Albert Sévigny) two nights ago, and after the very logical presentation of it made by my colleague from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) only last evening, it would be a waste of time for me to state the position which Canada really occupies in this war. I am not very much concerned whether under the Militia Act as it now stands the Prime Minister has the right to call up the men of Canada and send them beyond the con-

fines of our country for military service. Personally, I think that a strict interpretation of that Act might be against the contention of the Prime Minister; yet, under present conditions, I would not hesitate to give the Act a broader meaning and say that under it the Government have the right to send the militia of Canada out of Canada for the defence of the Empire. It matters very little to me, therefore, whether the Prime Minister is right in his contention. If he is not right, yet says that he wants more power; that he wants Canada put in a position to do her duty better than she has been doing it, I consider it the duty of every member of the House and of every voter in Canada to give the matter his most earnest and careful consideration in the light of present conditions.

Perhaps few people appreciate the position in which some members on this side of the House found themselves in the consideration of this very important matter. But I think we all agree that we must have more men in order to win the war. We agree that the war must be won; the only difference of opinion seems to be as to the manner in which the men should be obtained. To the man who says: you are fighting for England in this war, I say: we are fighting for ourselves in this war. No man reveres the autonomy of Canada more than I do; no man believes more strongly than I do that Canada should manage her own affairs. Because I believe that I am convinced that it is our duty to do everything we possibly can to assist the rest of the civilized world in bringing order out of the present chaos.

Is this England's war? Did England start this war? Has England any more to do with it than the eight or ten other allied nations have? The history of the war from its commencement covers a period of only three years; every man here is familiar with it. Every one knows that Germany started the war by declaring war upon France and Russia and by ruthlessly trampling upon Belgium, whose integrity she had guaranteed some years before to maintain. The question which Britain had to face was whether she should stand by her pledged word to little Belgium, or allow the Hun to trample that country under foot. Perhaps no more momentous question was ever considered by a civilized country than that which the British statesmen had to consider within forty-eight hours of the declaration of war and the invasion of Belgium by Germany.

I do not often read quotations in this House, but in going over the debates of the first session of Parliament after the beginning of the war I was so struck with the wonderful presentation of this aspect of the case made by my honoured leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that I wish to ask the House to listen while I read one paragraph from the memorable speech made by the right hon. gentleman on the 19th day of August, 1914. It puts the case of the British Empire in language so much more noble than I could use, that I can do no better service than to reproduce the words in the light of present circumstances:—

> Sir, it will go down on a still nobler page of history that England could have averted this war if she had been willing to forego the position which she has maintained for many centuries at the head of European civilization, if she had been willing to desert her allies, to sacrifice her obligations; to allow the German Emperor to bully heroic Belgium, to trample upon defenceless Luxemburg, to rush upon isolated France, and to put down his booted heel upon continental Europe. At that price England would have secured peace; but her answer to the German Emperor was: "Your proposals are infamous." And, rather than accept them, England has entered this war; and there is not to-day in the universe a British subject, there is not outside the British Empire a single man, whose admiration for England is not greater by reason of this firm and noble attitude.

I might ask any man who says we owe nothing to England and have no right to fight for the Empire in this war, what has brought the United States into this great conflict? The United States did not enter the war to fight for England or France or Russia or Italy or Canada; not by any means. She remained out of this war just as long as her decency and public spirit would allow her to do so, but when the time came that the Germans were continually throwing insults in her face, sinking her ships upon the high seas, and breaking the treaties which she had made, that great Anglo-Saxon country rose up in her might and said: "We are not going to fight for England, but we are going to fight for ourselves. We are going to see this thing through and put the German Empire where it belongs." The United States are going ahead in a way to command the admiration of the world, and in a way which I have no doubt will produce results; it is quite possible that she will be the deciding factor in this great struggle, which we all earnestly hope may come to a successful end in the not far distant future.

I was in the United States a few days ago, and it was one of the most inspiring sights of my life. I spent a day in Boston, a day in Portland, Maine, and two days in

Bangor, Maine. I met bankers, professional men, lawyers, business men and labouring men, and I never heard a man talk about the war who did not stand up and say: "We are in this thing and are going to see it through." I was over there on the last day of their wonderful Liberty Loan, when between two and three billion dollars were raised, and every man who had been able to contribute seemed to be proud that he had done something to put his nation and the Allies in a position to win this great war. Perhaps I would not be considered out of order if I related one little incident in connection with some labouring men. I was in a garage, where a man besmeared with grease was on the floor under my car. A fellow workman came along and said: "Did you get your notice last night from the Government?" "Yes," was the reply. "What are you going to do about it?" "I am going to do just what they tell me to do." That was the spirit I found in every part of the United States that I visited. I only wish I could find the same spirit all over Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: I hope that some of my hon. friends who cheer that remark and are so much affected with Quebec-phobia will not think I am referring altogether to Quebec, for there are slackers all over Canada, and it is because of the condition of affairs not only in the province of Quebec but in Canada as a whole that I am constrained to stand behind the Government on this momentous question.

I sympathize and sympathize heartily, perhaps to a greater extent than any other man in this House, with the right hon. gentleman who has been my esteemed leader ever since I have known anything about politics in Canada—a man in whose judgment and integrity I have absolute and supreme confidence, a man whose one aim in life has been to weld into one great whole the two great races in this country. I realize to as great an extent at least as any other man in this House the position which he occupies to-day and has occupied ever since this measure was introduced. Knowing the position which he occupies, and the position which his friends and my friends occupy, I am better able to sympathize with him than are gentlemen who are not so intimately acquainted with the real condition of affairs. My right hon. leader realizes, as I think every person in Canada must realize, that this Bill is extremely unpopular in his native province of Quebec. I do not think there is any use in dissembling that; there is no question whatever about its being true. I am not going to hark back and say who is responsible for the condition of affairs which unhappily exists at the present time. But we do know that certain English-speaking Canadians in 1910 and 1911 spent their money, not by tens of thousands, but by hundreds of thousands of dollars, to sow broadcast throughout Quebec and amongst the French-speaking people of Canada, the doctrine that they owed nothing to England and that the whole policy of Laurier and his party was to introduce conscription in the province of Quebec. For seven long years they have spent their money and assiduously preached that seditious doctrine in that part of the country; and to-day they are reaping the whirlwind. Canada is also reaping the whirlwind, and my right hon. leader finds himself in the position he is in to-day very largely because of the attitude of the gentlemen whose names have heretofore been mentioned in this House, and who are pretty well known in Canada as the men who have been guilty of the conduct to which I have alluded.

But, Sir, that does not change the fact that we are up against a really serious problem; it does not change the fact that Canada must raise more men, and, as I said before, the whole question is, how shall Canada get the men? Shall she go on with the voluntary system, or introduce compulsory service?

My right hon. leader proposes a referendum, and pledges that if a referendum is held and the vote is in favour of conscription, he will ask his people to support it and to recognize it as the law of the land. I think the most depressing day of my life was yesterday when I sat here and listened to three speeches in particular, which in my judgment revealed a condition of affairs in Canada for which every true Canadian should be sorry, and for which he should try to seek a remedy. I have listened to one hon. gentleman who has been a soldier and has returned from the front, practically branding every French Canadian who enlisted in his regiment as a renegade and a deserter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame on him.

Mr. CARVELL: I listened to another hon. gentleman who I believe hopes to be Minister of Agriculture in the near future comparing the French race in Canada with the red man. and the comparison he made

was very much in favour of the red man. Then I heard another hon. gentleman, my good friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), practically say to the people of Canada that because the people of Ontario were insulting the French Canadians, the French Canadians were not going to enlist and do their duty in this war.

An hon. MEMBER: Shame again.

Mr. CARVELL: You may say "shame again" if you want to, but I tell you this kind of thing has brought to my mind thoughts which had never been there before. The thought comes to me: Is this the net result of three years of war? Is it for this that we have gone through all the troubles and trials, all the agonies of this terrible time?—is it for this that the men of Canada have shed their blood and women have given their tears for the last three years? Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a time when the wise men of Canada, wise men of all political parties, of all religious beliefs, of all nationalities, ought to get their heads together and see if there cannot be some way to get away from this terrible condition of affairs, this is the time. I know of no man, I care not whether he be French or English, who is a greater enemy of the state than the man who, at this time of national stress, deliberately charges his fellow and neighbour as being a rebel and a traitor to the country because that neighbour does not agree with him as to action to be taken. There must be some better way of getting at this thing than the way indicated in what we heard here yesterday and in what we have heard to-day. There must be some set of men in Canada who are big enough to find a way out of this condition of affairs.

One of the pleasantest things I have heard since this debate began was the statement made by the hon. member for Kent, N.B., (Mr. Robidoux) setting forth the condition of affairs that we have in our little province down by the sea. We are not saints in the province of New Brunswick—we do not profess to be. We fight our elections with as great bitterness, perhaps, as the people of any portion of the Dominion. But we have shown the people of this country that French and English, Scotch and Irish, Protestant and Catholic—all classes and all creeds—can live together in peace and harmony. We are able to show the people of Quebec and Ontario, that different nationalities can live together, respect one another, respect one another's beliefs and creeds and nationalities. I was proud and happy when I heard my hon. friend read—I was going to read it to-day, but he has made it unnecessary—the noble address of the Lord Bishop of St. John in appealing to his people in the early stages of this war to enlist. The hon. gentleman read portions of that great encylical—I wish he had read it all, for it was all published in the newspapers—issued by that prelate a few months ago, again urging his people to come forth and do their duty. And the members of that church, French and Irish, have done their duty in a manner which reflects credit upon the province and upon the whole Dominion. Let me say also, no man in Canada deserves a greater mead of praise than does my hon. friend and colleague from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) who spoke here yesterday. That hon. gentleman travelled all over his own county in company with his colleague in the local legislature, the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Veniot), appealing to the people to stand up and fight for what is right and true and just in this war—not to fight for England, but to fight for Canada, for civilization. The result was that a thousand of their compatriots in one county alone volunteered. Many of them laid down their lives on the field of glory, and many more, I fear, will follow before these days of stress are over. And what is true of Gloucester is true of every other county of New Brunswick in which there are French and Irish people. And when I come from my own province, where we live in peace and harmony, and see the terrible condition of affairs that exists between Quebec and Ontario, it is enough to make any thoughtful man pause and wonder whether there is not some way by which we can bring about a better condition of affairs than we have at the present time.

Some of my hon. friends say: Let the people rule; hand this over to the people of Canada by means of a referendum and abide by their decision. I find no fault with the man who says, let the people rule. There is not a stronger democrat in Canada than I am; there is no man who, under ordinary conditions, has greater faith in the people than I have. But I am constrained to come to the conclusion that we are at war, and this is not an ordinary political matter; it is a question of life or death for civilization. The men whom we shall send from Canada from now to the end of the war may be the deciding factor between success and failure. I do not say this will be so; I say it may be so.

When Great Britain decided to go into the war in August, 1914, they did not first take the opinion of the people by means of a referendum. They hardly even called Parliament together. The heads of the nation got together and had hurried consultations. They decided that their duty was to go ahead, that Britain should stand by her treaties and protect her neighbours. And they did. The Canadian Government did not call for a referendum when the war broke out; they called for volunteers. Then Parliament was assembled, and when we came together, we voted everything that the Government wanted, we passed the War Measures Act, and in effect said to the Government: Go ahead, do your duty. The United States did not ask for a referendum when they decided to go into the war. There had been an election only a few months before. And, as well as I can judge, having been in New York and other American cities during that campaign, President Wilson ran more as a pacifist than as an advocate of war, and I believe that more men opposed to war in the United States voted for him than voted for his opponent. Yet when the time came that the United States felt that they ought to engage in the war, there was no referendum. They called together their elected representatives in Congress, and Congress said: Go ahead. And they went ahead. In what position are we in Canada different from Britain, France, Italy, or the United States? True, I admit, this is a moribund Parliament. I rather agree that we all made a mistake in voting to extend the life of Parliament a year ago. However, we did it unanimously and we believed we were working for the best. But we are, as things stand to-day, the Parliament of Canada. This country is at war, and the war is the most terrible that the world has ever known. We are called upon to act and to bear our responsibilities as long as we form the Canadian Parliament, and the man who is not ready to face his duty in this matter is not fit to be a member of this Parliament.

My logical friend from Welland (Mr. German) the other night said he was in favour of a referendum. Yet he said that we must have men, and more men, and still more men, in order to win the war. And his logical mind told him that he must believe that a referendum would result in favour of the Conscription Bill. Sir, I am not the keeper of my brother's conscience; I am the last man in the world to force any other man to vote with me who does not wish to vote with me. I hope I am big enough to give any man who differs from me the credit of being just as honest in his convictions as I am honest in mine. And I have just as much respect for the honesty of the man who declares he will vote for the referendum as I have for my own. But I cannot help asking: Should the referendum be defeated, what then? That is a question I cannot get around. I do not say it will be defeated. I do not say that Parliament ought to pass a law if it is sure that in doing so it is going against the will of the people. But again I come back to my first proposition: This country is at war and must have men; this country must go on doing its duty. Again I say: Suppose the referendum is defeated, what then? And, not being the keeper of any other man's conscience, I have no fault to find with the man who says he is willing to take this chance. But so far as I am concerned, I can only say, it is not good enough for me. Therefore, I am constrained to vote against my leader on this question of referendum, and those of us who feel that way must logically be compelled to go on and vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Perhaps the one incident in the whole history of things during the last two or three years which has created the greatest impression on my mind, and which has led me to the conclusion at which I have arrived, is what took place in this Chamber just two or three weeks ago when that great French statesman, Rene Viviani, addressed the House of Commons and Senate. Unfortunately, I was not able to understand every word that that distinguished gentleman said although I could follow him fairly well and could tell what he was talking about. But, I have read and re-read the translated report of his speech in Hansard and I must say that I felt the inspiration of his eloquence and earnestness. It seemed to me as I sat here and listened to him that he closed every period of his speech by the appeal: For God's sake come over and help us. I almost felt the desperation of the man as he seemed to say: We have stood out against this onslaught for the last three years; we cannot hold out much longer; won't you give us material support in men and money? France, the most chivalrous nation in the world has supported the burden for three years; millions of her men have faced the enemy; they have been mown down by thousands and hundreds of thousands; a large portion of the country has been made desolate and this distin-

guished representative of that great nation comes to us and says: Come over and help us. As far as I am concerned, I am not the man who will refuse to respond to the call to action which that man addressed to us.

But, Sir, while my intention is to vote for this Bill, I do not think there is any man in Canada to whom the word "conscription" is as repugnant as it is to me. Many hon. members have said that in their judgment conscription is the proper form of raising an army and from the purely material standpoint of getting the men who ought to go and leaving the men who ought to remain, probably that is correct. But had this Bill been proposed a year ago, I would not have voted for it. I do not believe in conscription. I believe in freedom as far as it is possible to have freedom upon the earth. I am glad that up to the present time it has not been necessary to attempt to take away from any man in Canada the freedom which is bestowed upon him by the constitution. So long as we were getting all the men we reasonably required by the voluntary system I was opposed to conscription, and if I believed to-day that we could get all the men we might require I would still be opposed to conscription. Believing that the voluntary system has not been honestly carried out, I do hope that the Government will delay the practical enforcement of this Act until voluntary enlistment has had a fair chance. I am not going to hark back to past events or to point out to the Government its sins of omission or commission, but I must say that all over the country the Government has not done its duty. The petty, party patronage system has militated against the best interests of recruiting in all parts of Canada. I do not know what the condition may be in other parts of Canada, but I know that in eastern Canada party patronage has been the greatest curse that this country has ever known.

4 p.m.

I do not know that we have all done our duty, but I do know that by a united, concerted effort, coupled with the abolition of the party system, in the last three years, very much more could have been done throughout eastern Canada than has been done, and I believe that the same is true all over Canada. I hope the Government will give voluntary recruiting one more chance. Let the men of Canada get together. Every man who is a Canadian, every man who wants to see the country prosper, every man who wants to see the war won, every Liberal, every Conservative, every Frenchman, every Englishman, men of every nationality and of every colour and race—let people get together and make one great, mighty attempt to get the number of men required. I do ask that this legislation shall not be put into force until after that is done. But if we fail, then you have my full consent to get the men, to get them by any means possible. I do hope that before this is done an honest, united effort will be made and thus avoid the necessity of applying this Act, which most of us, I think, on both sides of the House, hate to support at the present time.

I do not know whether most of the members of this House realize what it means to me to vote against my leader. I believe very few do. I think very few men realize what it means to vote against the man whom you have followed as loyally as I have, and in whose judgment you have had such supreme confidence as I have had in that of my leader since I have been a member of this House, now some thirteen years. But, Sir, as I view the matter, and for the reasons which I have given, I feel constrained to take the course which I have indicated. At the same time I want my friends to feel, and I want my opponent to feel, that I still have faith in the honesty, integrity, loyalty and uprightness of the great man who has led the Liberal party for the last thirty years, and who I hope will lead it on to greater victories in the future than have been achieved in the past.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I desire to preface my remarks this afternoon by again placing on Hansard the touching lines which were quoted by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), in his admirable address:—

In Flanders' Fields.

In Flanders' fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place, and in the sky
The larks still bravely singing, fly,
Scarce heard amidst the guns below.
We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders' fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe,
To you from falling hands we throw
The torch,—be yours to hold it high;
If ye break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep though poppies grow
In Flanders' fields.

Beneath these crosses erected amongst the poppies of Flanders fields lie some of the men from the county of Frontenac—too many I am sorry to say—and I regard the

lines of this Canadian soldier, written on the field of battle, as a direct appeal to me as the representative of the county of Frontenac, and one which I am expected to pass on to the people of my county, that we may not forget the men who have given their lives in this great cause; that we will not break faith with the men still living, but, that we will give them the reinforcements which they need in order to carry on this great struggle.

I regard it as a direct appeal to me and I have no hesitation in saying that it is my intention to give this Bill my very hearty and cordial support because I believe it is the only means whereby we can do our duty to the men who have gone to the front and who are at present fighting in this great cause. It is up to us, as the representatives of the Canadian people, to consider the position in which our country is placed and to consider the conditions at the present time. The conditions as they are to-day in Canada, have not been created in the last twenty-four hours, nor in the last two or three years. These conditions are not satisfactory to-day, and I will venture to say that in making that statement every member of this House will agree with me. Conditions, such as there are in this country, are not the result of what has transpired during the last two or three years but as the result of years and years of wrong teaching and wrong directing.

If we, as representatives of the people, are to do our full duty, we must look matters fairly and squarely in the face, state facts as we find them, and draw conclusions from those facts fairly and honestly. It will be necessary for me to place a few figures on Hansard with respect to recruiting in this country. Every preceding speaker has made reference to recruiting and enlistment and has given his opinion, adverse or otherwise, of the means and methods adopted by this Government in securing recruits by the voluntary system. I must place on Hansard some figures in order to make my future remarks intelligible. The enlistments by provinces up to May, 15th of this year, according to a return brought down in this House, were:

Province.	Enlistments.
Ontario	173,078
Quebec	45,277
Maritime Provinces	38,200
Manitoba and Saskatchewan	79,779
Alberta	35,477
British Columbia	40,264
Yukon	2,327
Total	414,402

On the 1st of January, 1916, the right hon. the Prime Minister announced the authorizing of the raising of half a million men in Canada. The legitimate or fair share of each province in that half million men asked for, according to population, would be as follows:

Province.	Proportion of Recruits.
Ontario	170,213
Quebec	138,298
Maritime Provinces	65,957
Manitoba and Saskatchewan	70,213
Alberta	34,517
British Columbia	29,787
Total	508,985

If you take those figures in conjunction with those I gave as enlistments, it will be seen that Ontario has contributed 101 per cent of the number which, according to population, that province should contribute to the half million men authorized. Quebec has contributed only 32 per cent; the Maritime Provinces 58 per cent; Manitoba and Saskatchewan 112 per cent; Alberta 102 per cent; and British Columbia 137 per cent. If Quebec had recruited as well as the Maritime Provinces, it would have meant 34,935 more men in uniform to-day, and would bring our total up to 449,367 men. If Quebec had done as well as Ontario, our total enlistment to-day would be 508,805 men.

I want to ask two questions, both of which I think are pertinent: 1, Why should not Quebec do as well as any of the other provinces? and, 2, why has Quebec not done as well as any of the other provinces? I think I may ask these questions of many hon. gentlemen here without being accused of raising race issues. It is a question of fact, it is a matter for us, as members of this House of Parliament, representatives of the people, to ask ourselves calmly why this is the case. There must be reasons for it, and it is our duty to try to find out what those reasons are, and to apply a remedy if it is within our power to do so.

I wish to consider this matter from another standpoint. According to the last census, the French population of Canada was 2,054,890. Of these, 1,605,339 were in the province of Quebec, and 449,551 were in the other provinces. A return tabled on June 14, and signed by the Adjutant General, says that from the outbreak of the war until April 30, 1911, only 14,100 French Canadians had enlisted from all Canada and proceeded overseas. That is seven-tenths of one per cent of the French population of

Canada. Sir, how many of these were from Quebec? According to the same return, 6,917, exclusive of those who went with the first contingent, were from the province of Quebec. If we add to that 6,917 the 1,217 French Canadians who were with the First Contingent, according to that return, crediting the whole 1,217 to the province of Quebec, it will give 8,134 men overseas from the province of Quebec, out of a population of 1,605,339, or about one-half of one per cent. If we credit the half of that 1,217 to Quebec, it would give us about 7,500 French-Canadians from that province overseas, or less than one-half of one per cent.

What of the French Canadians who enlisted outside of Quebec? The returns show that 6,512 French Canadians have answered the call from outside the province of Quebec, out of a population of 449,551, or nearly one and one-half per cent. If the French Canadians of Quebec had responded as well as the French Canadians in the provinces outside of Quebec, they would have had some 17,000 more men overseas than they have at the present time, 17,000 more representatives of their race in France, sharing in and adding to the glories which their compatriots gained at Courcelette and other places along the western battle front. I may ask, I think, without being accused of any wrong motive, why there is this difference of sentiment amongst the French Canadians outside of Quebec and those within that province, and I say it is our duty to endeavour to find an honest answer to that question and to apply a proper remedy to that condition. Out of a population of 3,564,792 English-speaking Canadians born in Canada, 125,245 have proceeded overseas, or over three and one-half per cent. Out of a population of 813,714 of English-speaking people born outside of Canada, 155,095, or 19 per cent, have answered the call of King and country. And let me say that I endorse most heartily the words of approval and commendation uttered by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) of the conduct of British-born Canadians in responding to the call of their King and country. We have been wont in the past to sneer somewhat at some of the oddities of the Englishman who comes to this country, and who perhaps affects an eyeglass. Well, the Englishman in the future can come to this country, and he can wear a ring in his nose if he wants to, and one in each ear.

I will take off my hat to the Englishman, when it comes to a matter of his doing his duty, and responding to the call of his country in the great cause. Up to April, 1917, 44,937 men had enlisted from Quebec. That is 32 per cent of Quebec's allotment or fair share of the half million men authorized. It is certainly most remarkable that the French Canadians, who comprise 78 per cent of the population of Quebec, should supply less than one-fifth of the enlistments of that province, while the English- speaking men of the province of Quebec, who comprise 15 per cent of its population, should supply over four-fifths of the recruits from that province. Again I say this is a matter for us to inquire into, to endeavour to find a remedy for it. In this connection, allow me to add that, of the 316,103 English in Quebec, from whom four-fifths of the recruits of that province have been drawn, 245,212 were born in Canada, and 70,891 in the United Kingdom, or other parts of the British Empire. These are plain, cold, hard facts, and if we find the Quebec recruiting figures unsatisfactory—and I think we do—it is up to us to try and ascertain the cause of this condition of things, and to honestly try to apply a remedy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw attention to the statements made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, in the course of his speech in this debate. Referring to a statement of the Prime Minister he said:

> I say that he (the Prime Minister) could not under the Act as it is send anybody across the ocean to serve in the war.

I do not read the Militia Act in that way, but I am not a lawyer. However, I want to quote the opinion given by a very eminent lawyer and statesman on this very point. There appeared in the Toronto Globe on October 4, 1899, a statement made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, in regard to our sending troops to South Africa at the outbreak of the Boer war. The following statement is attributed to the right hon. gentleman:

> "There exists a great deal of misconception in the country regarding the powers of the Government in the present crisis. As I understand the Militia Act, and I may say that I have given it some study of late, our volunteers are enrolled to be used in the defence of the Dominion. They are Canadian troops to be used to fight for Canada's defence. Perhaps the most widespread misapprehension is that they cannot be sent out of Canada. To my mind it is clear that cases might arise when they might be sent to a foreign land to fight. To postulate a case: Suppose that Spain should declare war upon Great Britain. Spain

has, or had, a navy, and that navy might be being got ready to assail Canada as part of the Empire. Sometimes the best method of defending one's self is to attack, and in that case Canadian soldiers might certainly be sent to Spain, and it is quite certain that they legally might be so despatched to the Iberian Peninsula. The case of the South African Republic is not analagous.

I might say that, in the brief session of 1914, when we had under consideration the resolution for the appropriation of $50,000,000 for war purposes, the right hon. gentleman paid particular attention to matters in connection with that vote. He called attention to the fact that the money was voted for the conduct of military or naval operations in or beyond Canada, and for the carrying out of any measures, deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council, in consequence of the existence of a state of war. I maintain this is one of the measures deemed necessary by the Governor in Council to be carried out in consequence of this country being in a state of war, and I think an expression of opinion of that kind by the right hon. leader of the Opposition was, in itself, an endorsation of the power of the Government to send troops overseas.

It has been said that the Prime Minister, speaking in this House, expressed himself against conscription. No doubt that is true. I think I am correct in saying that Lloyd George, the present Prime Minister of England, when conscription was first suggested in England, went so far as to threaten to resign from the British Cabinet if that suggestion were carried into effect, and yet the Right Hon. Lloyd George came to see the necessity of conscription as the only means of providing the men required to maintain the English forces in France. I might also say that not only is there a strong feeling among the men overseas, the rank and file, that more men are required, but I am sure I am right in saying that the men who are at the head of our forces in France to-day, General Turner and General Currie, both of whom, I am told, are Liberals, are very emphatic and urgent in their request that more men should be sent overseas, and sent as speedily as it is possible to send them.

I want to draw attention to another statement made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in discussing this question in the debate. He said:

> He (the Prime Minister) 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.

These are the words of the right hon. gentleman uttered in this House a short time ago. I want this House to contrast those sentences with the expression of opinion by the same right hon. gentleman, in that brief session of Parliament, held at the outbreak of the war, 19th August, 1914. His words as recorded in Hansard are:

> "Our territory is liable to attack and invasion. No one pretends that our maritime cities on the Pacific and Atlantic are free from the possibility of insult by an audacious corsair who descending suddenly upon our shores might subject them to an insolent raid and decamp with his booty before punishment could reach him. This is not an unfounded dread of danger; this is no mere illusion; it is a real and indeed aproximate danger, since it is a matter of notoriety that both on the Pacific and on the Atlantic there are German cruisers whose mission is to inflict all the injury they can upon our commerce, and even to raid our cities should they find our harbours unguarded."

Those were the words of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition and who has proposed this referendum, and I say that those words are in direct contrast to his statement of a few days ago, where he said that he did not believe there was ever any danger of invasion of Canada on the part of Germany. Be that as it may, if this country is not to be invaded by Germany, it will be because we make things so hot for the Germans over in Flanders on that western front that they will not have time to come over here and invade us. The first line of Canada's defence is in Flanders, and is it not far better for us that we maintain that line and prevent the Germans from breaking through and subsequently attacking this country? We do not want any atrocities committed in Canada such as the Germans have committed in Belgium and in Northeastern France.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has given certain reasons why conscription should not be enforced in Canada. I want to give a reason which he placed on Hansard on January 17, 1916, when he said:

> Apart from any other, one paramount reason, which is on top of all the others, is that we could not adopt conscription in Canada without giving a severe blow to our policy of immigration.

That was the reason advanced against conscription by the right hon. gentleman on January 17, 1916. Well, if Germany wins the war, neither the right hon. gentleman nor anybody else will need to concern him-

self about an immigration policy for Canada. Germany will look after that part of it; Germany will conduct a vigorous immigration policy if she wins in this war. The right hon. gentleman went on to say:—

> But if it were to be known that conscription existed in Canada, it would, I repeat, deal a severe blow to our hopes in that respect. Why, the very thought of conscription has had a detrimental effect on our settlements in the north-west.

He went on to quote a report published in an American newspaper, stating that certain American farmers who had made their way into the Canadian Northwest had, on the outbreak of war, taken fright and gone back across the boundary line into the United States. May I ask what people are going to be scared from emigrating to Canada because of conscription? Not the people of the United States, because they have conscription there, and they know what it means. Not the people of the British Isles, for they have conscription there also. Not the people of France, Russia, or Italy, for each of those countries have conscription. What peoples, then, are likely to be prevented from coming into Canada after the war is over because of our having adopted a policy of conscription? I maintain that there is absolutely nothing in that argument advanced by the right hon. gentleman.

The right hon. gentleman advanced other reasons, which were not so much against conscription, I take it, as they were reasons why enlistments had failed so lamentably in the province of Quebec. He said that when the war broke out both parties in the House agreed that it was the duty of the Canadian people to participate in the war to the fulness of our resources. "To the fulness of our resources" includes men as well as everything else. He went on to say:—

> I must make an exception to that. The ratification was not unanimous. There has been a minority which has always protested against our attitude, and that minority is the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec, who took the position from the start that it was a crime for the Canadian people to participate in this war. Not only did they use that strong language, but again and again in the Nationalist press they have asserted, and still assert, that we have taken our present position simply because we are subject to the imperious dictation of the British authorities.

Further he said that these

> same Nationalists would deny us the liberty, when we see France threatened with dismantlement, when we see Belgium actually under the foot of the conqueror, of helping in the defence of France and of Belgium.

He said further:—

> It is not because they hate France, it is not because they hate Belgium, but because we cannot in this war help France or help Belgium without at the same time helping England.

Further on he said that the Nationalists asserted that Canada had no direct or material interest in this war. He continued:—

> And, every day we read in their press that if Germany were to triumph it would be of no material injury to Canada, that Canada would remain just in the position that Canada is in to-day.

I think I am right in drawing the conclusion that in these expressions regarding the minority in Quebec we have a reason, in part at least, why men have not enlisted in greater numbers in that province.

The right hon. gentleman also said:—

> Should Germany triumph there would be nations that would rue the day of their indifference and supineness.

May I not also say that should Germany triumph, Quebec would rue the day of its indifference and supineness in the matter of enlistment? Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe that the worst enemies of Quebec and of the French Canadians are those men in and out of that province who have tried to prevent the French Canadians of Quebec from enlisting as they should enlist, having regard to their numbers. I care not whether they live in Quebec or are members of this House; I say that the men who have by word or deed encouraged men in Quebec not to enlist are the worst enemies of that province. I believe that, in time, the people of Quebec, realizing that, will look upon these men not as their champions and friends, but as their worst enemies.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: Do you mean by those words that the Nationalists of 1911 who are now sitting on the Treasury benches are responsible for this condition?

Mr. EDWARDS: That is a question that ought to be answered, and that I will answer; I have no intention of evading it. I am going to refer to the Nationalists, and I am going to refer also to some who are not Nationalists, including the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I do not want to be misunderstood in my references to the Nationalists; I have no use for them—and I have said so in this House before now.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: But your leader seems to have had some use for them.

Mr. EDWARDS: And your leader seems to have a good deal of use for them now.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Oh, no.

Mr. EDWARDS: Let us come out into the open, face to face, and find out where we on this side and hon. gentlemen on the other side, including the leader of the Opposition, stand in regard to the matter. I believe it is my duty as a representative of the Canadian people to place these matters squarely before the House and the country as I see them; and if I am wrong, I shall be glad to be corrected and to be shown wherein I am in error. Where does the right hon. gentleman stand, and where has he stood, in regard to Canada's participation in Britain's wars? Where did he stand in regard to Canada's participation in the South African war? Is it not an historical fact that he held back on that occasion until public sentiment practically compelled him to send our soldiers overseas—and that he then sent them on the c.o.d. principle? I may be accused of recrimination when I make that assertion, but it is either true or not true. I make it because I believe that it is true, and if hon. gentlemen challenge it, I want them to show me in what respect it is wrong; I want them not to abuse me because I state what I believe to be a fact.

Where did the right hon. gentleman stand in regard to Canada's participation in the wars of the Empire when he attended the Imperial conferences in London? Did he line up with those who want to prosecute the war to a finish, or was not his stand at those conferences more in line with the first plank of the Nationalist platform, which is, "No participation by Canada in the wars of Great Britain? What was his position in regard to the proposal of the Government for contributing three dreadnoughts to the British navy? Was he for participation? Was not his stand exactly in line with the first plank of the Nationalist platform? Accuse the Nationalists, if you like, and I am with you in regard to the first plank of their platform, which is absolutely indefensible; but do not think that by abusing the Nationalists you can exculpate the right hon. leader of the Opposition in regard to the doctrines which he has repeatedly endorsed in this House and country. How did the German press regard the action of the Canadian Senate in voting against the three dreadnoughts? We know what the naval expert of the British Government said in regard to the battle of Jutland, that great battle of Beattie's: "If we had had three or four more dreadnoughts on that occasion we could have wiped out the German navy." Why did not we have three or four dreadnoughts there, and why was not the German navy wiped out? It was because the right hon. leader of the Opposition was opposed to Canada giving three dreadnoughts, and because his partisan Senate did his bidding and killed the Bill. What did the German press say about the action of the Canadian Senate? On June 5, 1913, the Hamburger Nachrichten said:

> Whatever may be decided upon later, the actual decision of the Canadian Senate means at any rate a heavy moral and material loss for the defence of the Empire, for Mr. Borden's promise had been foolishly enough counted on. His offer made an enormous impression on the whole world. This impression will not only now be destroyed but people will everywhere obtain the conviction that England cannot depend upon such help from her colonies.

The Morning Post, an English newspaper, said:

> By rivals and enemies the decision will be eagerly welcomed. By friends it will be regarded as ominous. The impression must inevitably be created that the solidarity of the Empire is a myth and that those powers which would like to see the overthrow of British naval supremacy need not be discouraged with their efforts by the thought that their challenge would be met by the united resources of the mother country and of every one of the daughter States.

Is not Germany to-day getting encouragement from the referendum proposed by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and just as much encouragement as she is getting from the dastardly doctrines preached by the Nationalists in the province of Quebec? Are not the enemies of Great Britain and our Allies taking encouragement from this referendum proposal? Are they not justified in regarding Canadian unity as a myth in the face of that referendum proposal?

But let us go a little further. In a former session the present Prime Minister asked Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then Prime Minister, what a Canadian ship would do if she met an enemy ship on the high seas; would she attack the enemy ship? What did the right hon. gentleman reply?

> I do not know that she will fight.

That is what he is saying by this referendum: I do not know that we will send the men. He goes on:

> I do not know that she should fight, either.

That is just what is being said again to-day in regard to sending men overseas. Some men say: I do not know that we should send any more men overseas. He goes on:

She should not fight until the Goverment by which she is commissioned have determined whether she should go into the war. That is the position we take, my hon. friend takes a different position. He says that without any question, under all circumstances, we are bound to send our ships into the war. We take a different position, and we say:—Let the country judge between us

I maintain that the attitude adopted by the right hon. leader of the Opposition was certainly more in line with the first plank of the Nationalist platform than with the Conservative platform. In the same debate Sir Robert Borden said:

I understood the Prime Minister to say that our ships would not fight until they were ordered to do so, and, therefore, they would in effect be neutral until the Governor in Council had made an order that they should participate in the war. Have I mis-stated my hon friend's position?

Sir Wilfrid Laurier—No.

Mr. R. L. Borden—Then, inasmuch as our ships, under the conditions mentioned, will be practically neutral, I would like to know whether our ports and harbours will also be neutral in the same way?

Sir Wilfrid Laurier—I do not understand what my hon. friend means by asking if they would be neutral. If he means after an enemy has come into our harbour, then it will be time to resist them with our fleet.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are to-day preaching the same doctrine, whether it be Nationalist doctrine or anything else. They say: It is time enough to fight the Germans when they invade Canada; it is not up to us to send men overseas to fight them. Sir Robert Borden continued:

Mr. R. L. Borden—But if our ships do not attack the enemy when they meet the enemy on the high seas, on the same principle may not the enemy's fleet come into our harbour without resistance or attack, without fear of aggression? Surely, that can be done, if it is feasible for the country owning those harbours to maintain neutrality on the high seas.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier—That would be a question to determine any time that a warship entered a Canadian port.

That is what the right hon. gentleman said: Wait until the German cruisers put into Halifax or St. John Harbour or arrive off the city of Quebec. Then let the Government summon Parliament to decide what is to be done with those enemy cruisers. I say that the position taken then by the present leader of the Opposition is exactly in line with the first plank of the Nationalist platform, No participation by Canada in the wars of Great Britain. Our position is exactly the opposite. We say: Do not wait until the German cruisers get into our harbours, but fight them on the high seas. Do not wait until the German puts his dirty foot on our Canadian soil and butchers our women and children, before taking up arms. Take the war into his own territory and see that there are not enough Huns left to perpetrate the atrocities here that were committed in France and Belgium.

Who first suggested the referendum? Was it the right hon. leader of the Opposition? Every hon. gentleman in this House knows that when this Military Service Act was submitted to the House by the Prime Minister, the leader of the Opposition skated all round it; he took time to consider it. If at that time he had got right up in his place and said: You have been to the front and have consulted with our generals and the men in possession of the facts, and you come back and say that men are urgently needed at the front, therefore, although I am opposed to the principle of conscription, in view of the urgent need, I will favour that method of getting the men—if, I say, he had risen to the occasion in that way as a great statesman would have done, I venture to say that we should have heard very little, if any, of this talk in the province of Quebec. We should never have heard men in that province threatening to turn their guns against their neighbours in Canada rather than against the enemy. The population of the province of Quebec would have suppressed men like Tancrede Marsil, Bourassa and Armand Lavergne, who should have been put in prison long ago.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: How about Mr. Blondin?

Mr. EDWARDS: He has taken a course in the last few months which my hon. friend might very well emulate. But who was it that suggested the referendum? The first man in the province of Quebec to suggest a referendum was that man, Henri Bourassa, in his paper, Le Devoir. This referendum was suggested by the leader of the Nationalist party; it was proposed in this House by the leader of the Liberal party. And it was seconded here by a man who, if his words mean anything, while opposing conscription in this House—for he seconds the motion for a referendum—is in favour of conscription and would go so far as to take every man from the province of Quebec to make up the hundred thousand.

What is the second plank in the Nationalist platform?

To spurn attempts at recruiting for British troops.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) rolled that under his tongue and dwelt upon it in his speech. Who is it who for months past has been giving effect to the second plank of the Nationalist platform? Can he say that a single man in the Conservative party has given encouragement or effect to that plank? But who has given effect and encouragement to it? The Lemieux Clubs, the Young Liberal Clubs, of Montreal and other places in Quebec. Not for one moment can he deny it. Again and again the young Liberals in the city of Montreal have carried out that second plank. What did they do at the meeting in Montreal addressed by General Lessard and Colonel Blondin? Did not they do their utmost to prevent recruiting? Did not they again carry out to the letter the admonition given in the second plank of the Nationalist platform? These are the men, these Nationalists of the province of Quebec, who are lined up to give opposition to conscription to-day. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot truthfully deny that.

The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) says that the French Canadian mind is a logical mind, because it does not change with changed conditions. He says that the French Canadian does not change overnight, and we do; therefore, we are not logical. It seems to me that that is the reverse of logical. I do not see how one can claim that a man is logical who will stick to the same opinion notwithstanding changed conditions. I should suppose that the man was giving evidence of a logical mind who would change his position as conditions warrant. However that is the position taken by the hon. member for South Renfrew. He also went on to refer to the Nationalist platform adopted in 1911, as did other hon gentlemen; and, as questions have been asked me, I am justified in going into this matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) said:

The doctrine preached previous to 1911 in Quebec that we owed nothing to Great Britain and should not send a man to fight her battles had more to do with the slowness of recruiting in Quebec than any other cause.

I believe that is true. The doctrine preached in the province of Quebec in 1911, and since, and before—

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: Since Confederation.

[Mr. Edwards.]

Mr. SPEAKER: If an hon. member wishes to speak he should rise and address the Chair. Interruptions of this kind do not accord with the decorum of debate.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member for South Renfrew said, in approaching this particular question:

This is a delicate point. I wish to speak of this without recrimination but merely as a matter of history and of fact.

May I be allowed to preface the remarks I am about to make by taking these words of the hon. gentleman as my own. He went on to say that men told the French Canadians that it was no part of their duty to enlist to fight overseas. I wonder if he thinks that talk of that kind is a greater encouragement for the French Canadians not to enlist than this referendum amendment by the leader of the Opposition? When did this sort of talk start in Quebec? Who encouraged it? Who was it who planted the seeds of distrust and suspicion of Britain in the French Canadian mind? Who nourished the idea of separation and kept alive in the French Canadian mind the thought of independence? Who taught the French Canadians to regard their connection with Britain as a yoke of bondage? Who gave encouragement and support to distrust of the Constitution in that province? Did all this start with the Nationalists? Why, Bourassa, Lavergne, and the other Nationalists were in the kindergarten class when the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was a professor in the college of that thought.

Mr. LANCTOT: That will help recruiting.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not think it will have much effect on recruiting, one way or the other, in the part of the country you come from.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is contrary to the rules of order for one member of the House to address another in the second person. A member of this House is to be referred to as "the hon. member."

Mr. EDWARDS: Then I will call him the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. Let us go back in our history. I wish to quote a few words uttered by one of the greatest statesmen this country ever produced, Sir George Etienne Cartier. Speaking in 1869 he said:

Canadian people desire to remain faithful to the old monarchial flag of Great Britain, that flag which waves over all seas, that flag which tyranny has never been able to overcome, that flag which symbolizes true liberty.

Canadians know that if they wish to become really great they have only to continue their union with the mother country, so as to share in her power, her prestige and her glory.

I venture to say that if we had a Sir George Etienne Cartier to-day as leader of the French Canadian race in this country, instead of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, we should have had from the province of Quebec as many recruits in proportion to its population as we have had from any other province of Canada. Let this House contrast the words of that great statesman which I have just quoted with some remarks which have fallen from the lips of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. Then I would ask this House, in all seriousness, if these expressions of opinion are calculated to strengthen Canada's connection with Great Britain, or to increase the love for Britain or for British institutions. Let me quote further from some utterances of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in his past career. He once said:

The only tie that binds Canada to the mother country is a sentiment of affection. But this dependence will not always last. Even now Canada and England have very different interests, and the day will come—necessarily—when they will have to part.

Such expressions as that were preparing the French Canadian mind for separation from Britain and the severing of their connection with Britain and British interests. These are the words of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). These are also his words:

I hold out to my fellow-countrymen the idea of independence.

Again.

Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy?

Again.

I am ready any day, whether I am charged with annexation or not to take a yankee dollar in preference to an English shilling.

I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see an independent nation in due course of time.

It is the duty of every man here to state what he believes to be facts, to give an honest comment on those facts and to try and find out the causes of the attitude of the people of Quebec. I am not blaming the mass of the people of Quebec but I am blaming the leaders, or the men who call themselves the leaders of the people in Quebec. I am honestly endeavouring to get at the cause of the condition that exists at the present time. Let me quote from another French Canadian.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will the hon. gentleman give me the page of Hansard where he will find these words of the leader of the Opposition?

Mr. EDWARDS: I regret that I am unable at this moment to give the hon. gentleman the page but I will promise him that I will get for him the page of Hansard where these words are.

Mr. DEVLIN: Could the hon. gentleman give me the year?

Mr. EDWARDS: No, I will not undertake to specify the year nor the date, but I will undertake to make good my assertion that these words were used by the right hon. gentleman. I think my hon. friend will admit that that is fair.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the hon. gentleman refer to all his extracts when he says that we will find them in Hansard?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, all of these will be found in Hansard. Mr. Mercier, who was Premier of the province of Quebec from 1887 to 1891, spoke at Sohmer Park advocating cutting the tie with Britain and the establishment in Quebec of a French Canadian nation. He used these words:

Taking everything into account French Canadians owe nothing to England. If they had prospered it was not because of England but in spite of her and if England had done them good it had also done them still greater harm. You have colonial dependence. I offer you independence; you have ruin and misery; I offer you fortune and prosperity.

Speaking later at Fall River, Massachusetts, to a meeting composed of French Canadians, he said:

I appeal to you to always be ready to assist your compatriots in Canada who are struggling for liberty and the only thing wanted to release them from their present bondage is independence

I quote these words for the reason that that gentleman occupied a very prominent position in public life in the province of Quebec. He was seeking re-election after he made use of the words I have quoted. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition went to Quebec and uttered these words:

Mr. Mercier is the greatest Canadian since the time of Papineau. I believe with Mr. Mercier and I am here to make him prevail.

So that, Mr. Speaker, in considering what the Nationalists have done and what the

Nationalists say, and their attitude at the present time, it behooves us to go back in history and find out if the Nationalists are entirely to blame for the state of mind which exists in Quebec at the present time. I contend they are not entirely to blame. The right hon. gentleman at various times in his career has unfortunately given expression to opinions and let words drop from his lips which were calculated to weaken the tie which binds this country, and the French Canadians, to the Mother Country, and which were calculated to lessen their respect for Britain and British interests. I repeat what I said at the outset. These things which have been lying beneath the surface of the political stream for years and years and threatening the very existence of this Confederation, have now come to the surface, and the expressions which have fallen from the lips of the right hon. gentleman are, in my judgment, largely responsible for the condition of affairs existing in Quebec to-day.

5 p.m.

But, are the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) and other members of the Liberal party entirely clear with respect to this matter? They have in times past voted for a doctrine designed to separate this country from Britain and the Empire. In proof of that statement I want to refer them to some of their literature which was issued in 1891, and which is entitled "Facts for Farmers." If you will look at page 12 of this interesting pamphlet, you will find that these hon. gentlemen advocated annexation to the United States, and told how it would be brought about, said that God would bless the union, and all the rest of it.

Mr. DEVLIN: By whom? Will the hon. gentleman not admit that that movement was started by Sir John Abbott, at one time the Prime Minister of Canada?

Mr. EDWARDS: I repeat that the Liberal party in 1891 scattered literature throughout this country advocating the annexation of Canada to the United States. Does the hon. gentleman deny it?

Mr. DEVLIN: I never received any and I know of none.

Mr. EDWARDS: Probably in your case they did not think it was necessary to send you any. It was sent nevertheless.

Mr. DEVLIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I not only ask for a retraction, but I also ask that the hon. gentleman in retracting give the reason why he made that statement.

[Mr. Edwards.]

Mr. EDWARDS: What is it that you want me to retract?

Mr. DEVLIN: I presume the hon. gentleman knows what he says when he makes a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) had in his mind a question as to the loyalty of the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin), he should retract.

Mr. EDWARDS: Whatever I may have had in my mind, I cannot retract what I did not utter. If you will show me anything I have said which in your opinion I should retract, I shall do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understood the point of order raised by the hon. member for Wright, he had the idea that the remark of the hon. member for Frontenac questioned his loyalty. If the hon. member for Frontenac did so, he would not be in order.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have no desire to evade the rule in any particular. I did not impute disloyalty to the hon. member for Wright. If he so understood me I am very sorry. I said that the Liberal party, in 1891, issued literature—which they did issue—advocating the annexation of Canada to the United States. That is what I said. The hon. gentleman said he did not see any of that literature. I am not responsible for that; I did not have charge of sending it out. As a matter of fact, I repeat again that the literature was sent out. Now, since the matter has gone that far, I shall quote from their campaign literature of 1891.

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We are discussing a certain question and debating it before you. We are debating whether we should approve the principle of this Bill which has been brought down by the Prime Minister. I submit that there must be some relevancy in the remarks of any hon. member. It is ruled in this House by a preponderating majority that it is out of order to read newspapers that are up to date, which are only a few days old, and I submit that it is much more irrelevant to read an alleged and as yet unproved pamphlet which seems to have been resurrected from a period of twenty-five years ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the point of order has reference to the reading of selections from newspapers?

Mr. KNOWLES: On the ground of irrelevancy.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is quite competent for the hon. member to read extracts from newspapers if they have a bearing on the argument, and, as I understand it, his argument has to do with the matter of recruiting in Quebec, and he is proceeding to give his reasons. It may be that his argument is somewhat remote, but, as I understand it, it is relevant and in order.

Mr. EDWARDS: The point I have been endeavouring to make, perhaps not with the astuteness and cleverness with which it would be made by a gentleman of the brilliancy of the hon. gentleman from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), is that it was our duty as representatives of the people to try to ascertain the causes for certain sentiments which exist in this country, and, having ascertained them, to honestly seek to arrive at a remedy. I maintain that I have a perfect right to quote anything which, in my judgment, tends to show those causes.

Mr. KNOWLES: I submit that the hon. member is out of order in discussing a point of order already settled. The point of order has been settled in his favour, and now he is proceeding to discuss it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has the floor. So long as he does not question the decision of the chair it is quite competent for him to refer to it.

Mr. EDWARDS: The pamphlet that was issued by the Liberal party in 1891, and which, in my judgment, had a tendency to mould public opinion in the wrong direction, on page 12, contains the following:—

> But supposing that a better relation with the United States did contribute towards a growth in the annexation sentiment. Suppose if, on the one hand, she consented to a commercial union between her children on this side of the ocean and the result was an enlarged emigration from the U. S. and a changed political condition in Parliament by which an annexation resolution should pass—what is there to be horrified at in that prospect? If, in the future, the people of Canada desire to join the great constellation of commonwealths that so illustrate the greatness of this continent, what possible objection could there be? Annexation is a bugbear which a weak sentimentality has clothed with features that are repulsive, but which, upon examination, might be found to be the most attractive and most winning of events.
>
> This we certainly can do by breaking down the commercial barrier between the two countries, learn to understand each other better and if the winning forces of commerce and their attractive institutions make the great continent of North America one nation, then God will bless the union. To achieve a commercial relation with the American people is an object therefore, of the highest duty, worthy of the noblest efforts of the best men of the country.
>
> The great Liberal party, which to-day represents a majority of the voters of the Dominion in Parliament, but which is in opposition to the existing Government, has adopted as the main plank in its platform this question of unrestricted reciprocity, and it will go to the polls within eighteen months with that cause inscribed upon its banner.

I think that sort of doctrine was unfortunate, unfortunate because it tended, I allege, to mould public opinion in this country in the wrong direction. But, Sir, the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), in the course of his remarks, deprecated the raising of racial issues. The hon. gentleman attended a convention of Liberals in Nipissing in April, 1915. A Mr. Young was nominated as the Liberal candidate for this House. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), in the course of his remarks on that occasion, called on all French Canadians to vote for Mr. Young and thus support Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He then went on to say:

> Every French Canadian who allows himself to be led away by voting for a Tory was sticking his knife in their great Chief's back.

That is the report of the Toronto Globe on April 15, 1915. I say that the hon. member for South Renfrew, in making that appeal, was making a direct appeal to race against race. There is no getting around that. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) was present on the same occasion and addressed the convention in his native tongue, condemning Mr. Gordon, now Senator Gordon, for wanting an appeal to the people on the Naval Act. So that we have, I think, on that occasion the member for South Renfrew and the member for Kamouraska, while the war was in progress, making an appeal to the people along racial lines. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) the other day in the House made use of this statement:

> If it requires 100,000 men from the province of Quebec for the province of Quebec to do its share, then certainly take the 100,000; but my hon. friend does not suggest that it requires that.

Now, Sir, Quebec's share of the 500,000, as I said a while ago is 138,298. She has given 8,000. Alberta has given 102 per cent of its share of the 500,000. Alberta has given 7,800 more than its share of the 400,000 that we have already raised. Quebec has given 102,560 less than its share of the 400,000 already raised, according to her population. Therefore, according to the

statement of the hon. gentleman who seconds this motion for a referendum, the proper thing to do is to make each province or each part of the country first of all contribute its share until all are on an equality, and then go ahead with whatever scheme you think fit. The hon. gentleman who seconds this resolution would take every one of the 100,000 men asked for from the province of Quebec before he took a man from any other province. There is no getting away from that, it is absolutely indisputable. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) was asked a question by Sir Herbert Ames:

Sir Herbert Ames: What do you propose to do for the men at the front?

And his answer, as it will be found in Hansard, was:

Hon. Mr. Lemieux: To keep the men on the farms of Canada to produce wheat and send them food, for one thing, and to equip them with munitions.

So here we have what the hon. member for Rouville conceives to be his duty in this matter, what he conceives to be the duty of the people of Canada. If he is consistent he is telling the people of Quebec: it is not up to you, it is not up to this country, to conscript men to send overseas; but it is our duty to see that the men who are already over there shall get all they want to eat, shall have plenty of guns and plenty of ammunition. And if you follow out his argument to its logical conclusion, he takes the position that the men who are overseas now shall go unsupported except in regard to their food and the provision of arms and ammunition to enable them to carry on the fight.

They may stay there until the last man drops, but according to the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) no recruits will be sent over to help them, unless they can be obtained by voluntary enlistment. The hon. gentleman from Rouville on the 18th January, 1916, in the House of Commons, made a definite promise to the people of Canada and the men overseas. He said:

In six months, the turn of the tide having taken place, the public of the province of Quebec will have been educated—yes, educated as regards this war, because the population being largely rural, and having enjoyed peace for a hundred years, is not, as many would think, so much affected by events in Europe as other sections of Canada, because it is Canadian born, seven, eight, nine, ten generations back. I say that the public, having been made acquainted with the facts concerning the war, thanks to the eloquence of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, thanks to the campaign of my hon. friend the Postmaster General, thanks to the articles published by the Quebec press—within six months we shall have nearer 20,000 that 15,000 new recruits in the province of Quebec.

[Mr. Edwards.]

When the hon. gentleman made that statement and gave that pledge on the floor of this House, it was up to him to try and carry it out, and to see that men were sent overseas. Perhaps he did try to carry it out. If he honestly tried to implement his promise, and failed, it seems to me he should support this Bill and see that the men he promised shall go overseas to the assistance of the men already there. The hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Pugsley, in his opening remarks, was somewhat facetious. He followed the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny), and he made the following statement:

I think there is no better food than the food which the hon. gentleman gets at the Government crib, for it seems to have developed his intellect and to have brought him at last to a right way of thinking, and to an appreciation of the duty which every man in this country owes to Canada and to the Empire.

The hon. gentleman spoke feelingly in regard to the hon. minister feeding at the Government crib. The hon. member for St. John fed there many long years, and there was no restriction on the quantity of pap the hon. gentleman took. There must have been something wrong with the quality of it, for it never had the same effect on him as it had on the Minister of Inland Revenue, for it never seemed to inspire him to right methods of thinking, or to awaken him to the needs of Canada or the Empire. The hon. gentleman from St. John has been suffering from political indigestion for a period of about eight years, and it is not to be wondered at. He has acute attacks of that malady at different times. He says that we should have adopted compulsory service at the beginning of the war, that the Government knew that Germany had been preparing for the war for 50 years, and that it would be a gigantic struggle. What position did the hon. gentleman take in this House just a few months before the war began? Did he not jeer and sneer at this Government when the Prime Minister told this House and the country that danger was imminent? He laughed at the idea of Germany having any sinister motive, and scorned the idea of Germany attacking any other country. The hon. gentleman from St. John made another reference in his speech, which I cannot allow to pass. He said:

The voice which he heard in regard to infantry is, I believe, not the voice of the Imperial authorities, but the voice of Toronto; it

is the voice of those who do not want to see voluntary enlistment carried on; it is the voice of those who want a measure of conscription introduced; it is the voice of those who wish to raise racial cries and issues in this country.

That was the statement made by the hon. gentleman from St. John. It was the voice of the people of Toronto raising racial cries and issues in this country. A short time ago a large meeting was held in Toronto, called by the Liberals of that city, and the men who addressed that meeting were the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), Mr. N. W. Rowell, leader of the Liberal party in Ontario, the Rev. Father Minnehan, George Lindsey, and Robert McKay, K.C., and the advertisement calling that meeting was signed by fifty prominent Liberals of Toronto and Ontario. I find there such names as W. I. Jaffray, Aemilius Jarvis, Dr. G. W. Ross, son of the former Prime Minister of Ontario; A. E. Dyment, S. V. Blake, H. M. Mowat, K.C., George Lindsey, Leighton McCarthy, and others. These are the gentlemen who, according to the hon. gentleman from St. John, wished to raise racial issues in this country. That is his statement. What has been the record of the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). Away back in 1896 he was an outstanding Liberal-Conservative, and was chosen by the convention to run as the candidate in Kings county, New Brunswick. The issue in 1896 was the Manitoba School Act, and the Remedial Bill, proposed by the Conservative Government. Owing to some local difficulty, or dissensions in the party, the present member for St. John withdrew his candidature in Kings county, and, in withdrawing, expressed his loyal adhesion to Conservative principles and the Conservative party, and stated it would be better for the party if he withdrew from the contest. A short time later an independent party arose, and asked him to run as their candidate, and he took the platform as an independent. He ran as the candidate of the independent party, and appealed to the people showing his hostility to the Remedial Bill, and appealed to the people on racial and religious grounds for their support. I may say, in passing, that he did not seem to have the confidence of the people, because he was not only defeated, but lost his deposit. At all events, that was the position he took. Then the Liberals were elected in 1896, and within three weeks of the coming into power of that party, the hon. gentleman from St. John was the loudest and staunchest Liberal from the Atlantic to the Pacific. There is the gentleman, who, looking out for himself, undertakes to charge the most representative men we have in Ontario with wishing to raise racial and religious issues in connection with conscription. The hon. member for St. John, in his speech, made use of these words:

If we fail to put into force this law of conscription but take steps to stimulate recruiting, and if the war continues for one, two, or even three years, and Canada cannot send quite enough men to fill up the gaps, is it to be said that the Imperial army officers are going to leave the Canadians to be hacked to pieces in the great work they are doing for the Empire? Why, it passes my comprehension how any one can suggest such a thing. Is this the time to take this great departure?

So it passes the comprehension of the hon. gentleman from St. John how the people of England and France would allow our Canadian boys to be hacked to pieces, but it does not pass his comprehension how we, in Canada, can allow them to be cut to pieces. We can stand here with our arms folded, and let the war proceed. I would like the hon. gentleman from St. John, were in his place, to tell me how many meetings he has addressed in New Brunswick or in this country in favour of recruiting?

I venture to say that he has not addressed one meeting on behalf of recruiting—and I will tell you why: because somebody in the back of the hall might call up to him: why doesn't Lieut. J. A. Pugsley, of St. John, go?

Some hon. gentlemen have seen fit to blame the Government because a sufficient number of men have not enlisted. The reason why enlistment has been successful in Ontario and in the western provinces is because members of Parliament from Ontario and the West, Grits and Tories, have led in the recruiting. The reason why enlistment has not been as successful in Quebec as it might have been is because gentlemen like the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) were opposed to it. Can any one who listened to the member for Three Rivers yesterday imagine his being an influence in favour of recruiting in his part of the country? Is it any wonder that so few have answered the call in the Quebec military district, when persons in that part of the country take the attitude that the member for Three Rivers took here yesterday? During the course of his remarks the hon. gentleman said:

I say, if you cannot fill the gaps with five divisions, make it four; if you cannot do it

with four, make it three; but do not become guilty of murder, do not leave the man who has gone to the front to famish; do not let the soldiers die of hunger.

The member for Three Rivers says: Do not let the soldiers over there die of starvation. They may die any other way they like—bullets, shrapnel and that sort of thing—but do not let them die of starvation. The shame of it. An hon. gentleman priding himself on his French blood—I have nothing to say against that—with the tri-colour of France hanging in full view before him, gets up and says that if you cannot maintain five Canadian divisions at the front without sending more men, cut the number of divisions down to four, three, or even two, if necessary. But do not, he says, force men to go over to keep up those divisions. What does that mean? If you cut down the number of divisions from five to four, or from four to three, it means that France, who has enlisted the services of every available man, old and young; whose women and children have made sacrifices; whose clergy and priests have gone into the trenches to fight—France, bleeding from every pore, must take up more of that battle line. Either that, or Britain must do it—simply because we do not send more men across to France to back up our soldiers who are fighting. Shame on the man who comes into this House, whether he be French or English, who makes such a suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will refer to members of the House as "hon. members," not as " men."

Mr. EDWARDS: I shall endeavour so to do, Mr. Speaker. The member for Welland (Mr. German) and the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) reminded the House that Ireland had been exempted from conscription, and said that was a reason why we should exempt Quebec. Will any member of this House suggest that, as an amendment to this Bill, we should exempt Quebec? Would the member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) stand for that for one minute? I do not believe he would; I do not believe that the other members from Quebec would stand for it. To exempt Quebec from the operations of this measure would be to insult that province. But that Quebec should be exempted is the only inference we can gather from the argument adduced by the member for Welland. Canada and Ireland are not in the same position. Divisions of opinion with regard to Home Rule have been causing trouble in Ireland during all these years. There is no such issue as that in Canada, for we have Home Rule; therefore that argument was ill-advised.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have had some flings at the Minister of Inland Revenue. What crimes has he committed? They allege that in the election of 1911 the Minister of Inland Revenue took the position that the Nationalists take: No participation in Britain's wars. Well, whatever position the Minister of Inland Revenue took or did not take in 1911 or prior to that year, in the election which preceded his occupancy of the position which he now holds he did take a pronounced position against the doctrine of the Nationalists; he did take a pronounced position in favour of Canada's participation in the wars of the Empire. If there is anything in what hon. gentlemen opposite say, they contend that the minister should be punished because he did not stick to the doctrine which they allege, through their leader, to be a wrong doctrine. The member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) said in this House on January 19, last:

If the present Minister of Inland Revenue had preached this week and last week the same gospel to the electors of Dorchester that he preached in 1911, he would have been elected by acclamation.

The member for Bonaventure says that if the Minister of Inland Revenue had continued to preach the doctrine which he preached in 1911 he would have been elected by acclamation; but, because he did not continue to preach that doctrine, he should be punished.

The leader of the Opposition has said:—

I blame him—

That is the Minister of Inland Revenue.

—and his party for proclaiming in the province of Quebec that under no circumstances should Canada ever take part in the wars of Great Britain.

Surely, if the minister, having taken a position which was wrong, receded from that position to a right position, he ought to be commended, not blamed. But the leader of the Opposition blames him for receding from that position, and brings to bear upon him a cannon stuffed to the muzzle with the ammunition of anti-British doctrine.

Conscription of wealth has been referred to. Mr. Speaker, many men in this country have made millions by exploiting the resources of Canada, and I am in favour of the Government's taking such action as will get at some of the accumulated wealth of the millionaires. Perhaps it would be a good idea to constitute a joint committee,

consisting of members of both sides of the House, to take the necessary preliminary steps. Many hon. gentlemen in this House would be very valuable on a committee of that kind. If we are going to conscript wealth, a great deal of study will be necessary, and on such a committee we should have men who are well qualified by their experience to give valuable aid and advice. All the resources of the country will have to be considered. In considering the farmers, who would be able to give more admirable advice than the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell)? He ought to be able to make valuable suggestions to such a committee as to how to get hay and things of that kind which needed to be conscripted or commandeered. In regard to royalties on mines, and that sort of thing, the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) would be a most valuable addition to such a committee. The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) could surely give valuable advice and information as to how some people out West get hold of large land and timber tracts, and thereby enable the committee to get after those people and commandeer some of that wealth. Then, the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) would be able to give general information along all these lines. He would be specially valuable for the purpose of showing how bank overdrafts and things of that sort are handled. I say in all seriousness that such a committee could give very valuable advice, indeed.

I would also suggest as another way of raising money in this country that the Government should seriously consider imposing a heavy tax upon those who have been made Knights, Barons, Lords and that sort of thing. If we are to have conscription of men by classes, why not have classes in the conscripting of titles? A man with the title of 'Sir' could give, say, half a million dollars for the honour, and Barons and Lords could contribute at least a million dollars. It is remarkable that only those who are very wealthy seem to get these honours. If there are men in Canada who have exploited this country and become wealthy and have received knighthoods, let them give of their wealth, and give liberally. I would not suggest imposing a tax upon the honorary colonels, because really so long as the Government permits a man like Armand Lavergne to call himself a colonel, I would consider a dollar apiece too high for the title. I cannot really understand why men allow themselves to be called colonel, so long as Armand Lavergne retains that title.

Mr. PROULX: There are many honorary colonels in this House who have rendered little service but have received a large amount of military pay. Armand Lavergne has received no pay at all.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not know whether he has or not, but if he did not receive pay I presume it was merely because he could not get it.

Mr. PROULX: He is a real colonel, not an honorary one.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend may have his opinion of Armand Lavergne and I have mine, and mine is not a very high one.

There is before the House the Bill for selective conscription, an amendment calling for a referendum, and another amendment calling for a six months' hoist. It is worthy of note that the mover and seconder of the amendment for the six months' hoist are alleged to have been made lieutenants in 1915. I wish to place on Hansard the opinion which one of these gentlemen expressed in 1915.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt, but I wish the hon. gentleman, in referring to members of this House, would speak of them as hon. gentlemen or hon. members.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do I understand that it is not permissible to refer to a member as a member?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is quite proper, but I understood my hon. friend to say "gentleman," instead of "hon. gentleman."

Mr. EDWARDS: I will try and remember to use the adjective in future, but I did not think any man would take exception to my calling him a gentleman. I certainly did not use the word with any intention of being disrespectful. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Achim), who seconded the motion for the six months' hoist, and who, I believe, also seconded the Address in the session of 1915, spoke as follows on February 8, 1915:

> Not a single one of these men (soldiers) has thought of arguing over his rights or duties not one of them has endeavoured to find out a clause of the Constitution behind which he might find refuge.
>
> Once the enemy is victorious on the continent and is master of the British Isles, it will be too late to take up arms for the defence of the country.
>
> I suggested a moment ago that defending the Empire under present conditions was equivalent to defending our own country.

I cannot see how the hon. member for Labelle can square his position of to-day

with his utterances in the House which I have just quoted; however, that is up to him.

The case against the referendum could not be better summed up than in the language of the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), who said:

> The referendum amendment recognizes no need, suggests no remedy, and applies no alternative.

Suppose a referendum is submitted to the people. Who is going to vote on that referendum? All those whose names appear on the voters' lists? If so, that will include thousands of Austrians and Germans who have been in this country perhaps only four or five years, and who might reasonably be expected to still have a warm regard for Austria and Germany. Would it be fair to allow these men to poll their votes on the referendum, when it would be impracticable to obtain the votes of the soldiers in the trenches? There is also in this country a certain sect called Mennonites, who I understand settled here on the distinct pledge of the Government that they would not be called on for military service. Their names, however, appear on the voters' lists. Would it be fair to allow these men who are exempt from military service to cast their vote in the referendum, when the soldiers at the front would not be allowed to cast theirs? I think it is only necessary to state these obvious objections to convince any person that this referendum should not receive the consideration of any person in this House or in the country. We are told that if the referendum carried it would be put into effect. What warrant have we for thinking that? Some years ago the right hon. gentleman who to-day leads the Opposition gave a distinct pledge to the people of Canada, when leader of a great party in this country, that if returned to power he would submit the question of prohibition to the people by way of referendum, and if the majority of the people of Canada decided in favour of prohibition, prohibition they should have. As it happened, the majority of the people of Canada did decide in favour of prohibition, but the majority of the people of the province of Quebec voted against prohibition, and the right hon. gentleman did not attempt to carry out his pledge to give the people of Canada a prohibition law.

The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) in his address the other evening said that the British-born in this country are against the Bill, that they had left the country so as not to be called upon for military service. I take strong exception to that. The manner in which the British-born have answered the call does not warrant the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe in making any such insinuations as that. His remarks were entirely unfair, uncalled for, and quite incorrect. He also took exception to the statement of the Solicitor General that the Bill in its working out would bear more lightly on the province of Quebec than on other provinces for reasons which the Solicitor General gave. Commenting on this, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) said:

> We resent the insult whether direct or indirect. Thank Heaven we do not belong to a race of cowards. We are willing to do our share to the bitter end, and no man in this House nor in this country can tell us that if we vote for the Bill we shall be exempted. We do not want to be put in reserve.

It is quite proper to mention that supporting this motion for a referendum is doing that very thing. The sentiment of the province of Quebec is undoubtedly against conscription, if we are to believe what we read in the press and what is stated in this House by some hon. members. I contend that the course taken by the leader of the Opposition has the effect of placing the province of Quebec in reserve. I also wish to call attention to the closing words of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe:

> I say to the Government: If you press this measure through, my people, declaring that this Government has no mandate, will use the very Bill itself to fight the matter out. We acknowledge that in this fight there will be pain and suffering. We may have to go to the direst consequences. My people are willing to go to the limit if you impose upon them such a piece of legislation; I believe they are right, and I will do as they intend to do.

That language is not calculated to bring recruits from the province of Quebec, nor to bring unity in this country. It is most unfortunate language for any hon. member of this House to use. Are we to believe that if this Bill passes—and becomes law—and it can only pass by obtaining the support of a majority of the representatives of the people gathered here from all parts of Canada—that the people of the province of Quebec will resist it to the point of violence? That is the only inference we can draw from the statement made by the hon. gentleman. If I were to make a statement of that kind in this House hon. gentlemen from Quebec would resent it very strongly, and would say that I had no right to use such language. I say that we have as much right to resent such a statement coming from one of the members from the

province of Quebec as they would have to resent such a statement if made by myself. If the hon. gentleman's statement is true, we are certainly face to face with a most serious condition. The people of this country, no matter of what nationality, must understand that when the representatives of the people pass a law that law is to be obeyed. We cannot take any other ground. We cannot overlook the fact that we have people here drawn from all parts of the globe, people of all nationalities; and if the people of any one nationality carry resistance against the law to the point of violence, they are simply giving encouragement to those of other nationalities who know less about our laws and institutions, to do likewise. It is a state of affairs that cannot be tolerated for one moment.

The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) said that there was no call from the men overseas to come to their help. I may again refer him to the words of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks. We have a call from the men overseas, from the very soldiers who are on the battle line. We have a call from a Canadian leader, General Currie, who is in command of our men overseas. We have a call from the men who have fallen. We have a call from those who have been in the trenches doing their bit for months and months.

Some hon. gentlemen have advised the Government to postpone the bringing into effect of this Act. I do not agree with that view, and I will give my reasons. There are hundreds of men overseas to-day who never should have left Canada; there are hundreds and thousands of men in Canada who should be overseas. The voluntary system was all right, up to a time. By that system we were gathering men faster than we could equip them and send them overseas. But every hon. member knows that there came a time when it seemed necessary to send men out on the platform to urge, and, it would seem, to cajole and browbeat men into joining the ranks. There are some men who had courage enough to face the German bullets who had not courage enough to face the reputation of being slackers. As a result, many of these men who had not the courage to face the sneers of their compatriots enlisted and went overseas though they should never have gone. During the last week I received a letter from a lady in my constituency asking me to intercede with the Government to have her son returned. He is her only son. Her husband is ill and has been sent to a hospital, and will not be able to take up farm work. So that lady and her daughter are left to run a farm of 125 acres with about 25 head of cattle. That young man ought never to have gone overseas. But there are others who could be spared, easily spared, and who should be over there to take his place.

Furthermore, I wish to impress upon the House, in all fairness to the boys at the front, one plain fact. Many of those men have been over there a year and a half or two years, or more. They have been called upon to endure extreme hardship in the trenches. These men have bravely offered themselves and are ready to face all dangers. Under present conditions, they are kept on the firing line week after week and month after month, without any chance to rest and recuperate. These men are not only doing their bit but each of them is doing the bit of two or three others who are staying in Canada and making big money. That is not fair, it is not just, it is not right, it is not reasonable. I appeal to hon. members of this House to give this matter their earnest and careful and favourable consideration. I urge them to support this Bill, for I am firmly convinced that it is the only way in which we can at the present time supply the reinforcements for our men at the front of which they stand so much in need. We are not worthy the sacrifices they have made if we do not give them the reserves they need and the support they expect at our hands.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): Mr. Speaker, the subject which is now before the House for discussion is certainly one of the most serious subjects we have had to decide on since Confederation, and no doubt one of the most serious subjects since the time of the cession of this country from the French to the English. In the few remarks which I purpose making this evening, I am going, even at the risk of lèse majesté, to treat the subject purely and simply from the point of view of a Canadian. I might preface what I intend to say by a word or two in answer to the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Edwards). He asks the question, why is it that in the province of Quebec there should not be more enthusiasm in favour of con-

scription. If I know anything about the province of Quebec, and I think I do, I have no hesitation in telling him that speeches such as he delivered this afternoon, and such as were delivered by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) yesterday, have more to do with inciting the people of Quebec against conscription than anything else I know of. When an hon. member of this House stands up to give his views upon a certain subject, and a subject of the gravity of the present one, and contents himself solely with making an attack upon one province, and then asks that province to be enthusiastic towards the measure which he pretends to advocate, I desire to say that such a position is illogical. I wondered when I heard those attacks whether those hon. gentlemen really wished to win this war or really wished to damn the province of Quebec. The hon. member from Frontenac has asked two questions. One is: Where was my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in connection with the Boer war? The next question was: What was his position in the Imperial Conference, or Conferences? Whilst I am speaking I propose to say a few words as to the position of the leader of the Opposition both in connection with the Boer War and in connection with the Imperial Conferences. Further than that, the hon. member for Frontenac will pardon me if I pass over his other remarks in silence, as I think this House would have been better off, certainly Canada would have been better off, and certainly national unity would have been better off, if such utterances as he made had never been made in this House or out of it.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the measure which is before the House until it is submitted to the people for their opinion. Personally, I stand with the great majority of the people of the province of Quebec upon that ground and, personally again, when I say that I am opposed in principle to conscription, with the people of Quebec I am ready to forego my personal opinion and submit to the popular will. I am opposed personally to the measure before the House, first, because I do not believe that it is, in its present form, constitutional. Even if it were constitutional, it would so affect the national life of this country as to constitute a radical change which neither you, Sir, nor myself, nor, I claim, any hon. member of this House with the powers and the mandate which we have held since we were elected,

has a right to commit the people to without their having first had an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. I say I do not believe that the measure in its present form is constitutional. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) has made the statement in this House that the principle of conscription for overseas service has been in the law since the time of the Act which was passed by Sir George Etienne Cartier and the members of this House in 1868. I want to deal with that question for a very few minutes. The section referred to is section 69 of the Militia Act, reading as follows:

> The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

When Sir George Etienne Cartier introduced that Act, he spoke as follows in this House on the 17th February, 1868:

> I deny that the proposed military system of the late Government would have implied, as Mr. Rankin asserted, the putting in usage of conscription.

"Pour mettre en usage la conscription" are the exact French words. Again, on the 31st March 1868, he said:

> The sole essential difference between this Bill and the one we proposed in 1862 is upon the subject of enrolment for which I did not ask consent. Under this new law enrolment by captains will cost $32,000.

Throughout all the speeches, if you read them carefully, you will find the idea of providing for military defence is based upon possible incursions or invasions from the United States. So strong was that idea in the minds of the legislators of that day, and immediately prior to it, that we find that Lord Carnarvon, in introducing the British North America Act in the British House of Commons, after his conference with the delegates of the Dominion of Canada, used this language:

> The question of military defence is a somewhat delicate one on which to touch. Military defence supposes war, and war in that part of the world could only be with that great Republic which lies south of our border.

Not only was that the doctrine followed by the men of 1867 and 1868 but, Sir Adolphe Caron, later on Minister of Militia and Defence, in introducing into Parliament the Act of 1883, which was practically a reproduction of the Act of 1868, spoke as follows in the House as reported in Hansard of April 10, 1883:

In Sir George Cartier's time, as now fortunately, we did not require a force for any aggressive purpose, or any other purpose, save securing the safety of the person, protecting property, and defending ourselves against any attack which might, as previously, give us occasion to resist and repel any disorganized, or small organized band crossing the frontier.

That position was thoroughly well recognized by the Prime Minister, because in the message which was sent by His Royal Highness the Governor General on August 1, 1914, we find:—

A question has been mooted respecting the status of any Canadian force serving abroad, as under section 69 of the Canadian Militia Act, the active militia can only be placed on actual service beyond Canada for the defence thereof.

At that time there was just as much necessity of placing the militia of Canada beyond Canada overseas as there is to-day; but the Prime Minister did not wish to take that attitude in this House and commit himself as a constitutional lawyer without saying that he had very grave doubts in his mind as to whether he could rightly take that attitude, and he sought the advice of the Imperial authorities.

The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) wished to know what was the attitude of the right hon. leader of the Opposition at the Imperial Conferences. I will tell him that at the Conference of 1902 a memorandum of the War Office contained the following:—

Prior to the outbreak of the war in South Africa, so far as any general scheme for the defence of the Empire as a whole had been considered, it was assumed that the military responsibilities of our great self-governing colonies were limited to local defence and that the entire burden of furnishing reinforcements to any portion of the Empire against which a hostile attack in force might be directed must fall on the regular army. There may possibly have been some pious hope that in time of need the colonies might rally to the Mother Country, but no definite arrangements were made, nor were inquiries even on foot as to whether such aid might be expected, and if so, in what strength. Indeed, the necessity for it was by no means realized, and its reliability was doubted.

You will remember that at that time Mr. Chamberlain was making a desperate effort to commit Canada to take part in the wars of the Empire. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), then representing Canada, was strong in his stand that the delegates of Canada would not commit Canada to any policy wherein the troops of Canada would be called overseas, until first the people of Canada had pronounced upon it. To such proposals the Canadian delegates answered as follows:—

The Canadian Ministers regret that they have been unable to assent to the suggestion made by Lord Selborne respecting the navy, and by Mr St. John Broderick respecting the army. The Ministers desire to point out that their objections arise, not so much from the expense involved, as from a belief that the acceptance of the proposals would entail an important departure from the principle of colonial self-government

So strong was that opinion in the mind of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) that he made the statement in this House, not that the Militia Act of 1868, or the subsequent Militia Acts, including the most recent amendments, would be put in force, but that no law of conscription would be introduced, thereby acknowledging that conscription was not in force in this country. The right hon. leader of the Government said that the first line of defence is in France and in Flanders. Theoretically and for all intents and purposes he may be right, but will he still contend that the putting of the principle of conscription into force, whether the Act is constitutional, or whether it is not, does not constitute a radical change in the national life of this country? I do not think so. I hardly think that the Prime Minister will go that far. He says that the first line of defence is in France and Flanders. Theoretically, I say again, he may be correct. He says, further, that Canada is defending herself and the Empire. I cannot follow him in that reasoning. Great Britain is defending France and Belgium; Canada and the other Dominions are aiding. So far I cannot admit that the Empire is on the defensive; I believe that we are still attacking. I cannot believe that our soldiers are called out to defend Canada. I take it that they are still voluntarily departing from our shores, imbued by the highest motives which can stir the hero, to defend Belgian neutrality and the rights of smaller nations to live a free life, fighting for the highest ideals of freedom and liberty. Will any man tell me, even my friend the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who was so stirred after reading in the bulletin the other day that some bombs had fallen over England, will even he tell me that Great Britain is now on the defensive? The right hon. gentleman says so, but I have yet to hear any statesman in the Empire other than he make the statement that the Empire is now on the defensive. I cannot believe even the Prime Minister, when, standing alone in this House, he dares to make such a state-

ment. But I can tell you that I do believe that the moment that Canada is in danger and the moment Canada is on her defence, then it will not be a matter of getting 500,000 men to rush to the colours, but every man, young and old, in this country will take up arms.

I object to conscription, Sir, because I am opposed to the principle of coercion. I am not a believer in coercive measures. The whole history of our country has been against coercion. Confederation was formed by the free will of the provinces to enter into a union. At the time of Confederation, whilst we had the might we did not consider that we had the right to coerce any other province of this Dominion into the union. Whenever any question arose as to coercing any section of the community or any province of the Dominion, immediately men in this House, upon both sides, stood up and said: hands off that section, or hands off that province. Coercion has proved a failure wherever it has been adopted, whether in Poland, in Prussia or in Ireland. Prussian militarism is the worst form of coercion. Our men are to-day fighting Prussian militarism—and yet there are hon. gentlemen in this House who are trying to establish it here. If, on the other hand, we are not going out from our shores to prove our attachment to British institutions, then I say that every Dominion sharing equally in Empire benefits must share equally in Empire obligations. Canada must not bear more than Australia, nor Australia more than New Zealand or India, in proportion to population and respective advantages.

My next reason for being opposed to conscription is that there are no military reasons given by the right hon. Prime Minister, nor by any member of this House who advocates the measure, why conscription should be enforced in this country. When the war broke out, all the Government was willing to do was to secure the financial and the industrial institutions of this country. All the Government seemed to be concerned with was to secure the manufacture of munitions in this country, and divide up the orders among their friends. The enormous war profits were to remain, and have remained, for the privileged few, and the Government, even to this day, has not the courage to say that they will conscript the wealth of this country and the industries of this country, but they are quite ready to say they will conscript the blood of the young men of this country. Patriotic citizens came forward, and did a great deal at the beginning of the war. They offered large amounts towards defraying the expenses of the young men who were eager to go to the fighting lines. Let me say, also, that I want to give credit to hon. gentlemen upon the opposite side of the House, as well as to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, for what they have generously done, in aiding the Allies and aiding this country. I wish to refer, for instance, to the gallant member representing Ste. Antoine Division, Montreal (Sir Herbert Ames). I am witness to the efforts which he has made towards raising money in order to benefit the families of soldiers who have gone to the front. I think, Sir, credit should be given to such men as the hon. member for St. Antoine, for the noble efforts they have inaugurated, to the mothers and fathers of this country, who allowed their sons to go out, in the first place, and to the sons, who nobly went out to fight for what they believed to be the highest principles of freedom and civilization. But I fail to see in what way the Government can claim any benefit for any action they have taken. What have the Government done? They have squandered the people's money. They paid out the money of this country. It was not their money, but the money of the people. It was the taxes paid by the people of this country. In regard to that, without wishing to enter into any recriminations whatever, I must say that most extravagant uses were made of that money, and we have had several years of war scandals. What the Government did, however, was this: they fixed the number of those who might go, but they made no provision for the families of the men who went, or for the men who might return. When the storms of indignation arose in certain parts of the country, a half-hearted action was taken, in the way of pensions. So many men agreed to go from every province of Canada, but, according to the Minister of Militia, the Prime Minister instructed him to go slowly in recruiting. The time having come to meet the ultra imperial clamour in the country, the Prime Minister made up his mind, and made the statement upon his own authority, not upon the authority of this House, nor upon the authority of Council, that 500,000 men should go. He did not give any military reason for that. He did not supply this House with any information. He simply said that 500,000 men would go. Now he says that he cannot get this 500,000 men, and the only way to obtain them is to con-

script those who remain, in order to make up the 500,000. I should like to know, Sir, before I cast a vote in favour of conscription, have the Imperial authorities asked us for more men? I see by the papers that General Currie, the general commanding the Canadian forces abroad, has said he requires more officers and more men. A statement was laid on the table of the House a few days ago, by the Government, to the effect that there were thousands of officers in England at the present moment. We know that officers are being returned to Canada, and the reason given is that there is no work for them to do. Does the Government wish to assume that, as General Currie said more officers and men are required, and that we must send more men and officers, or that we are simply to send the men. We have not that information, Sir, and in order to make up our minds just how we should vote, it is necessary that we should have it. Does England ask for reinforcements? We are told that there are 2,000,000 men in the way of reinforcements, in England. Further the statement is made that there are some 3,500,000 in England at the present moment of military age, who have escaped conscription. We are told further, since we must rely upon statements for our information in making up our minds upon this question, that there are in England, at the present moment 1,200,000 men who are occupied at works which are entirely useless in connection with the war, engaged in hotels, brokers' offices and theatres. I wonder if the hon. gentleman from Red Deer thought of those 1,200,000 men when he turned to us upon this side of the House, and said: "Do you know that at this moment, according to the bulletin, bombs are falling over the city of London?" That is information which we should have, and no such information has been given to us. What was the attitude in the British House of Commons when information was asked? It is to be found in the words of Sir Edward Grey, when he was advising the House of Commons what attitude should be taken. Here is what he said:

> The most awful responsibility is resting upon the Government in deciding what to advise the House of Commons to do. We have disclosed our mind to the House of Commons. We have disclosed the issue and the information which we have.

I ask hon. gentlemen, in all fairness to the members of this House, who have given this matter just as serious consideration as they have, in all fairness to the men throughout the provinces of this Dominion, have they given us reasonable information upon which we can base a judgment, or upon which they may base a judgment? Will the right hon. gentleman tell us that he has not that information? What does he say in this House? On June 15, 1917, in repeating the words of the Prime Minister of England; he said:

> The British Cabinet became for the time being an Imperial War Cabinet. While it was in session, its overseas members had access to all the information which was at the disposal of His Majesty's Government, and occupied a status of absolute equality with that of the members of the British War Cabinet. It had prolonged discussions on all the most vital aspects of Imperial policy, and came to important decisions in regard to them—decisions which will enable us to prosecute the war with increased unity and vigour, and which will be of the greatest value when it comes to the negotiations of peace.

I wanted to find out, before making up my mind on the subject, what information the Prime Minister had that he might give to this House. I asked him this question:

> Mr. Devlin: Was there any discussion as to what would be the best form to be adopted in prosecuting the war for a concerted action on the part of the different dominions beyond the seas?

After which the discussion proceeded:

> Sir Robert Borden: The institution of the Imperial Cabinet itself was entered upon with the view that the consultation thus brought about would result in greater unity of purpose and in more effective co-operation.
>
> Mr. Devlin: Was any decision reached by the members of that committee or Cabinet as to what concerted action should be taken by the Dominions beyond the seas?
>
> Sir Robert Borden: No special consideration was given to any matter of that kind. The deliberations were of a general character with regard to the conduct of the war and the task that had to be accomplished, and the best means of fulfilling that task.

And, Sir, the Prime Minister says that this measure is the result of his own judgment, not of anything that he heard during his attendance at the Imperial War Cabinet or from the Imperial authorities. He did not even question the Imperial authorities; he said that he would resent any questioning of the Imperial authorities on a matter of that kind. But when the naval proposals were before this House the Prime Minister did not hesitate to ask the Imperial authorities for advice. He then said that he had sought and obtained information from the Admiralty Department, which information was in the form of a memorandum; and wanted to commit the members of this House and the people of Canada to that memorandum, which was dictated by a gentleman who has since been

put out of the British Cabinet. But would the Prime Minister refuse to seek information from the Imperial authorities upon a matter as weighty as this? Let me again refer to that famous despatch sent by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught from Ottawa on August 1, 1914, to the Imperial authorities. The first part of this despatch, which had been placed in the hands of His Royal Highness by the Prime Minister, says:

> 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 the Imperial naval and military authorities may deem it expedient to offer.

The Prime Minister of England tells us that the Prime Minister of this country has all the information necessary, but the Prime Minister says that he has no information bearing upon that point. He adds that he would repel any suggestion on the part of the Imperial authorities, though the very document which I hold in my hand shows that he sought their advice.

I am opposed to the adoption of the measure of conscription which is before the House until the people shall have pronounced upon it. It is suggested by way of amendment to the measure that a referendum be taken. The member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) says that the proposal of a referendum originated in the province of Quebec. I say that the referendum originated from the people throughout Canada who wish the principles of democracy to continue in this country and who wish government for the people and by the people. The member for Red Deer, like a good many other hon. gentlemen in this House, is a thorough believer in anything and everything that comes from England. I should like to read to him the words of Mr. Balfour, leader of the Unionist party, delivered at a meeting in the Albert Hall in London on November 29, 1911, when the question before the people was that of tariff reform. Here is what he said:

> 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.

Whether or not you believe with me, Mr. Speaker, that section 69 of the Militia Act of Canada does not authorize conscription for overseas service, there is no doubt that the Government wish this House to concur in the principle of conscription for overseas service. I repeat what I said at the opening of my remarks; that the application of that principle, even if the principle be admitted, constitutes a radical change in the life of this country. I was elected in peace time to vote under the general mandate usually given members of Parliament, and have continued my tenure of office by my own vote. Can I conscientiously commit the 45,000 or 55,000 people whom I represent to a law such as this—changing, as it would, our national life—without first submitting the question to them? The debate so far has stirred men as no other debate in this House ever did. Each member is answerable to the dictates of his conscience; for my part, I cannot find it in mine to commit my constituents to such a radical change in their national life before they have pronounced upon the question.

A further consideration impels me most strongly to support the amendment of my right hon. friend. I have always been a firm believer in the national unity of this country. This measure, unless submitted to the people, will cause national friction; of that, Sir, you are as well aware as I am. If any hon. member had any doubt about it, he would have only to listen to the two speeches to which I have referred—those of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) this afternoon and the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) yesterday—to understand that the people of Quebec would naturally resent such statements made by such men, who, while not members of the Government, are of high standing among the Government followers. You will readily understand that the people of Quebec will resent such statements; that they will not accept the proposal made by the Government unless it is first submitted to the will of the people; unless the people shall have had a chance of declaring themselves upon it—if for no other reason than for the insults offered against that province by hon. members of this House.

Apparently the slogan has been "Win the war." But really it has been "Win the war and damn Quebec." If I had no other reason to say that there would be civil strife in the province from which I come, I need simply point to what was given by the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) in his letter to the Prime Minister of this country as his sole reason for resigning from the Cabinet. This is what he said:

> From the moment you submitted this intention to the Council, I drew your attention to its extreme gravity and to the consequences which to my mind, would follow.

Further on he said:

> I have always thought, and do yet think, that the best interests of Canada make it a duty for the country to give to the cause of the Allies its most generous support. But to do this, I cannot concur in any measure which, in my estimation, imperils national unity. The proposed law, I have every reason to fear, threatens to destroy this unity, and to give rise throughout the country to keep internal divisions, of long duration, and even detrimental to the needs of the present moment. Indeed it is better to keep the country united in the present effort, than to attempt a mightier one at the cost of national disruption.

I wish these words were not true, but I think I know enough about the province of Quebec to know that they are true. I believe further, that if in support of the stand which I have conscientiously taken in this House, I were to make an attack upon any other provinces in the Dominion, hon. gentlemen of the House would resent it even more bitterly than I resent the attacks which have been made against my native province. But such an attack, so far from supporting the cause which I am advocating, would in my opinion tend solely to aggravate the ill-feeling that exists at the present time. To say that the people of the province of Quebec are not concerned in the welfare of the boys in the trenches is going very far, very far indeed. French Canadians may be at the front in only a few thousands, but those thousands of boys who have enlisted and gone overseas are as dear to the mothers and fathers and families of the province of Quebec as are the boys who have gone from the sister provinces imbued with the same idea, and the people of the province of Quebec will stand by those boys in the trenches in the way they deem best.

It has been urged that the right hon. leader of the Opposition has had a great deal to do with the lack of recruiting in the province of Quebec. I would humbly ask his pardon for touching on this matter at all, but some hon. members have made the statement that my right hon. leader has addressed only one recruiting meeting. Now I have been present upon the platform on several occasions when the right hon. gentleman has made speeches in the province of Quebec urging the young men to go of their own free will, saying that if he were young enough to take up arms he would be over there himself. An attack has been made against the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and at the present moment that attack comes from other provinces than the province of Quebec. I hardly think the right hon. leader of the Opposition requires any defence on my part, but if he would allow me to say a word, it would be this: No man in this country since the days of Lord Durham has devoted more time and attention to the study of the question of the races in this country than has the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and no man has been more successful than he in uniting the various elements in the population of this country. No man has been so tried by racial prejudices as he. Have you not felt, Mr. Speaker, over and over again since you and I came into this House that the right hon. gentleman has courageously faced the storm of conflicting opinion, never faltering in his devotion to the Empire, never failing in his love for his Canadian people. He has ever risen above race; he has been blind to prejudice; he has given his whole soul to the nation, and the nation has ever held him as an ideal. My hon. friend the member for Frontenac wants to know what stand the right hon. leader of the Opposition took in connection with the Boer war; I will tell him. He stood by the constitution of this country, and by the interests of the Empire. He faced prejudice coming not from other provinces alone, but from his own native province of Quebec. Seventeen years ago, under circumstances similar to those now prevailing, he said:

> If there is anything to which I have consecrated my political life it is the development of union and harmony between the different elements of our people. My friends may abandon me and withdraw their confidence from me; my party may take from me the leadership which they confided to me, but never will I deviate from the line of policy which I have traced for myself.

Would the hon. member for Frontenac get up in the face of prejudice from his own province and utter words as noble as those?

Mr. Speaker, friends to-day may differ. We on this side of the House have differed on this subject, it is a subject which lends itself to differences of opinion, but to-day the right hon. leader of the Opposition remains and will remain the most trusted, the most respected, and the most honoured leader of Liberalism in Canada, commanding the esteem and affection of every hon. gentleman who sits on this side of the House, and I ask hon. gentlemen to bear me out in that statement.

My concluding words are these. If I understand the basic principles of our Parliament, its attributes, and its constitution, they are founded upon the rights of the

people and for the people of Canada. As a Canadian I want to say that the moment you attempt to legislate against the will of a great section of the people without giving them a chance to pronounce upon the measures proposed, you are legislating in spite of the rights of the people, and are infringing upon that constitution which has always been the guarantee of Canadian liberty and Canadian security. You are disrupting the work of Confederation, and that on the eve of the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation. You are throwing our province into the turmoil of strife, thereby defeating the very aim which we all have in view, the aiding of our Allies and standing by the boys in the trenches. No Government in this country, no Parliament, no political party, has a monopoly of patriotism, but all are imbued with the strongest possible love of country. You want to stand by the boys in the trenches? So do we. Those boys are as dear to us as they are to any hon. gentleman seated opposite. We will stand by them, and we will stand by them with hon. gentlemen opposite; but we must at least be allowed to say that in our judgment and in our conscience the measure taken by this Government will not have the effect of standing by the boys in the trenches.

Coercive measures are unnecessary, and they will be resented. Economy in your expenditure; the organization of your efforts to develop trade and industry; the encouragement of agriculture; increased production, are the urgent needs of to-day—to-morrow will bring other and new problems. Mr. Speaker, I have heard since my childhood that "Britons never shall be slaves." I say that Canadians never shall be slaves to an autocratic and irresponsible Government. And any Government which to-day, in view of the opinions openly expressed in this country, and knowing the temper of the Canadian people who may be for, or who may be against, the measure now proposed, attempts to enact it without the free will of the people being heard, is both autocratic and irresponsible.

Sir HERBERT AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine): Mr. Speaker, when a member of Parliament is called upon to decide his course of action, there are two conceptions of duty which have to be reckoned with. On the one hand, he may regard himself as the mouthpiece of his constituency; he may consider that he is here to record what he believes to be the will of the majority of those who sent him. On the other hand, occasions sometimes arise where he is in possession of fuller information, and has greater opportunities for consideration of a question than his constituents, and where the duty rests upon him to follow his conscience and to lead rather than follow those whom he represents. Most of us have been elected in this House as exponents of certain fixed principles. When a question arises that affects those principles, our course is easy, our constituents know what to expect of us, and we do what they ex-

unforeseen and unexpected, we are thrown upon our own resources. We then are compelled to take stock of the situation; to arrive at decisions; to take a position; and we must be ready to stand or fall by that decision when the time comes for us to again meet those who sent us. Fortunate indeed is the member of the House whose personal inclinations, the known views of whose constituents, and the tenets of whose party all coincide. He has only to swim down the current; everything is going his way. He has very little occasion for self-glorification, less occasion for criticism of others whose position is difficult, and no occasion whatever to condemn the conscientious action of his fellow-members.

Since this measure was introduced in the House, I have received a number of communications from my constituents. These have come in the form of petitions, of resolutions, of personal letters. They are on both sides of the question; some are for and some are against the Bill. An organization in Montreal known as "La Ligue Patriotique des interets Canadiens," sent me a number of petitions signed extensively by people I know. Many of these are citizens of standing in my constituency; many of them are the wives and mothers of persons well known in my city. That is an example of what is coming on one side. On the other hand, I have received a resolution of the Board of Trade, the President of which is a French-Canadian, in favour of conscription. I have received

9 p.m. resolutions from various church organizations. And I have received two resolutions, one from the English and one from the French branch of the Great War Veterans of the Province of Quebec. Among the petitions I have received the one which in some respects is the most notable is that which comes from the French section of the Great War Veterans of the city of Montreal. I know the men who make up that organization. Many

of them have served at the front with honour to themselves and to their race. The president, the vice-president, the secretary and the treasurer were all members of that famous 22nd Battalion which again and again has had its ranks filled up, and which has covered itself with glory, as we all so well know. These men, I think, can speak with some authority. They have been overseas; their motives cannot be impugned; they have themselves seen conditions at the front; they know the needs and the wastage; they have left their comrades still fighting; they have seen what it means when the Hun retreats from devastated France; they have every reason to know, to know to the full, what it would mean if we should lose this war. A resolution passed unanimously by a body of that kind is a resolution which I must certainly receive with respect. Let me read it to you. It is in French, but I think we shall all understand it just the same:—

Association Canadienne des Vétérans de la Grande Guerre, section française.

Proposé par J. C. Poirier, appuyé par E. Frereault.

Considérant que l'enrôlement volontaire non-seulement dans Québec mais le Dominion entier est devenu pratiquement chose du passé. Considérant que pour seconder les efforts des Alliés et mener cette guerre à bonne fin, de nouvelles troupes sont immédiatement requises. Considérant que le Gouvernement a le pouvoir de mettre en force l'Acte de la milice.

Qu'il soit résolu:—

Que la section' française de Montréal, branche de l'Association des Vétérans de la Grande Guerre demande au Gouvernement d'imposer le service obligatoire pour tout homme valide de 20 à 45 ans de manière a ce:—

Riches comme pauvres
Professionnels comme ouvriers
Patrons comme employés
Mariés comme célibataires
Etrangers comme citoyens puissent faire leur part pour la cause commune des Alliés.
(Adopté à l'unanimité.)

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us by whom that is signed, or if it is signed at all?

Sir HERBERT AMES: It came to me in the official envelope of

Association Canadienne des Vétérans de la Grande Guerre, section française; chambre 20, édifice "La Presse". Comité exécutif: N. Marion, président, C. Poirier, vice-président, E. Frereault, secrétaire, J. Boulay, trésorier, E. Turcot, sergent d'armes. Conseil: P. Vadboncœur, docteur E. Turgeon, H. Portugal.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. I have received a similar document, but there are no signatures to it and no certificate with it.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Mine came in the official envelope from the Secretary's office.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: Do you know how long that society has existed?

Sir HERBERT AMES: I understand that it has existed ever since these brave men came back from France.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Can you find in the resolution anything relating particularly to the Bill that is before the House? You read it in French but I would like you to translate it into good English to show this House that it does not refer to the Bill before the House.

Sir HERBERT AMES: I will be glad to translate it into English or to read the English version as published in the papers. I shall read the whole extract:

At a meeting of the French section of the War Veterans' Association (L'Association Canadienne des Soldats de Retour du Front), held this morning in the rooms of the association, 20 La Presse Building, the following resolution, which will be sent forthwith to the Prime Minister of Canada, was adopted unanimously:

"Proposed by J. C. Poirier, vice-president of the association, seconded by E. Frerault, secretary:

"Considering that voluntary enlistment has practically ceased, not only in the province of Quebec but in the whole Dominion generally;

"Considering that the Government has the power to put the Militia Act into force, be it resolved:

"That the French Section of the District of the War Veterans' Association request that compulsory service be imposed on all available men in Canada between the ages of 20 and 45.

They go farther than we do.

"So that rich and poor, professional men and workers, employers and employees, married and single, aliens and citizens may take their share in the sacred cause which the Allies have been defending for the past three years."

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Does not my hon. friend notice that in the resolution they are speaking of the Militia Act and is not that a very different thing?

Sir HERBERT AMES: I am quite willing to accept this as proof that they favour conscription. The last words of the resolution are sufficient indication as to what the purpose of the conscription is. Can I be of any further service to my hon. friend?

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: The hon. gentleman did not answer my question. I happen to have known the hon. gentleman for many years and I know how he can skip around questions.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Now, I cannot hope or expect to be able to satisfy all the signers of these petitions because they ask

for absolutely opposite things. It remains for me only to pursue conscientiously my own path, and even if that does not appear to be in the interests of harmony, to do the best I can to persuade those who differ from me that the course I have adopted, is reasonable, right and necessary.

Now, what are the facts? No country was ever more unprepared for war than was the Dominion of Canada on the 1st of August, 1914. We had a standing army of 3,000 men and we had 60,000 men who had some little militia training. We had no expectation of being embroiled in any war either on this continent or anywhere else. The war came very suddenly, and, as the legislation under the constitution, provides, Parliament was summoned within fifteen days and Parliament met here and faced the situation as it then existed. We came from every part of Canada, the facts were laid before us, and, what did we do? We decided without a dissenting voice, without a word of protest, that Canada was in that war, that she was in it to the very limit and that the only bounds we should set would be the extent of the need and the maximum of our capacity. It was a unanimous decision. We reached that decision in ten days, adjourned and went to work as best we could, each one of us, to carry out the spirit and letter of that decision. We have met again and again and each time we have found that there were greater developments, greater calls upon us, greater needs, and we have tried to face them as they have come. The men of our first and following contingents went over with the understanding that we would back them up. The wives, mothers and relatives of those who went had the promise, not merely the implied promise, but a promise as formal as any Act could give them that if their sons, brothers and fathers went to the front, those who did not go with them but who remained in comfort at home would support them so long as they defended our interests over there. That was the pledge; that was the promise.

Hitherto we have been able to carry out that promise by voluntary effort. I have only words of the highest praise for the magnificent voluntary effort that has been put forward. It has been a marvellous thing that it has not been necessary before this to resort to conscription. If any one had asked me at the beginning of the war if we could raise 50,000 men, or 150,000, on the voluntary enlistment principle, I would have said: I doubt it. But, we have sent overseas 330,000 men raised by voluntary enlistment and we have enlisted a still further number. The response has been magnificent. But voluntary recruiting has reached its limit. It is a fact that we cannot get men by that method to-day. The figures are there. The voluntary method, do what we may, will yield but few more men. There is no use in our indulging in recriminations as to whether we have carried on the voluntary method in the best way or not. There is no use in talking first of one province and then of another along that line. The situation is too serious at the present time to permit of the waste of time in that sort of business. What we want to do here is to see how we can reinforce these men who are at the front. To abandon them would be unthinkable. To ask them to contract their lines, the lines that they have won inch by inch and foot by foot, lines on which their comrades have died, lines in which are the little cemeteries with their brave dead—to ask them to contract those lines and to entrust the holding of a certain section to others, would be to break their hearts, to weaken their morale and to make them feel that they had been abandoned far away from home by those for whom they were fighting.

They must be reinforced. But how? I take it that every man in this House wants to see them reinforced. I do not think there is any question about that. The only question is: How shall we do it? None of us desires to resort to compulsory enlistment, but will any one say that he knows of any other method by which these reinforcements can be obtained? They must be obtained and if they cannot be secured in any other way we shall have to do so as all the fighting nations are doing to-day, that is resort to the one systematic and scientific method, we shall have to resort to conscription.

There is nothing new about conscription. It is an absolutely fundamental principle of self-government. The enjoyment of liberties brings with it responsibility. Ever since the world began, and ever since civilized communities began to exist and govern themselves, we have necessarily had organization for defence. In the last analysis, every man, every woman and every child in this Dominion could be called upon to defend our rights, our liberties and our land. There is no questioning the fact that a conscription law has been in force in Canada for one hundred years at least and that as far as the statute-books are con-

cerned, although many of us have not known it, and it could have been invoked legally at any time had the necessity arisen.

There was cited in this House the other night an extract from a judgment which expressed in better terms than I can state it what the defence of Canada implies. I refer to a judgment by the Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Quebec, the Hon. Sir Francois Lemieux. The judgment will be found in the records of the Superior Court of Quebec, volume 1, 1916. It is to be found at page 490 of the French version. Let me read the French version:

A mon humble avis, la défense du Canada comprend non seulement le droit de sauvegarder son territoire et la vie et la propriété des habitants, mais comporte de plus la faculté reconnue d'ailleurs par le droit international, de prévenir par tous les moyens admis la ruine et la dévastation du pays, en attaquant l'ennemi chez lui, en le poursuivant partout, en paralysant ses moyens d'action, le harcelant sans trève et le réduisant à l'impuissance. La nécessité bien légitime de la défense contre l'agression autorise naturellement l'attaque de l'ennemi chez lui ou ailleurs. C'est souvent en semant la détresse en pays ennemi qu'on assure le mieux la défense de son propre pays. Ce serait bien imprudent, pour ne pas dire plus, pour un pays en guerre, de s'en tenir à la defensive, d'attendre que son territoire fût envahi et dévasté pour songer à repousser l'ennemi.

This was read in English the other night, so perhaps I need not repeat it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read it.

Sir HERBERT AMES: It is as follows:

In my humble opinion the defence of Canada implies not only the power to safeguard the territory itself and the lives and property of Canadians, it further includes the faculty recognized in international law to prevent, by all legitimate means, the invasion, ruin and sacking of the country, in attacking the enemy in his own country, pursuing him everywhere, destroying his resources, giving him no rest until he be reduced to utter powerlessness. The very legitimate necessity of opposing an onslaught quite naturally justifies the attack of the enemy in his own country or wherever he may seek refuge. It often is by taking the offensive, attacking and invading, that the defence of one's own country may be better attended to. It would indeed be imprudent, if not utterly reckless, for a country at war, to be content with a defensive strategy and to refrain from hostilities until the country were invaded and sacked.

I am sure that no one in this House or out of it will venture to suggest that the Chief Justice of Quebec, the Hon. Sir Francois Lemieux, is not an authority on matters of that kind, that he does not speak as a man who knows what he is speaking about. Every one will agree that he speaks as one who has studied deeply constitutional questions and is well qualified to give an opinion thereon. In his opinion, the best war of defence is a war of attack, wherever the enemy may be.

A good deal of time has been spent in this House in explaining the origin of the Militia Act of 1904, and going back and citing many of the opinions held at the time of the enactment of the original Militia Act and its various amendments There seems to me no real ground for contendng that even under the Act of 1904 conscription is not permissible. I think we all admit that the Act of 1904, under certain circumstances, contemplates wholesale conscription. The only difference of opinion is as to whether, under the old Militia Act, that conscription should be for men who could be sent, against their will, overseas. I do not pretend to discuss that point. I understand that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, who was at the time Minister of Justice and who is now Chief Justice of Canada, was of opinion, when that Act was passed, that it did permit men to be sent overseas. I understand that that is the opinion of the law officers of the Crown to-day. Not being a lawyer, I am willing to accept that opinion, considering my own in that respect to be of no great value. But I do not think that is the vital question. In any event the principal question with us is, how can we do what we want to do? And if the law already on the statute books is not sufficient, the quickest and simplest course is to pass an Act that will be sufficient, and if I rightly read the Bill that is now before the House, section 2 covers the situation as fully as an Act can.

Every male British subject who comes within one of the classes . . . . shall be liable to be called out as hereinafter provided on active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force for the defence of Canada, either in or beyond Canada,—

—unless he falls under certain exemptions. We will all admit, I think, that this Act will meet the circumstances of the case, and if the old Act leaves any doubt, the sooner we can pass an Act in which the purpose, the destination and the method is clear, I think the better it will be for our country and its defence.

I have listened attentively to many of the speeches made in this House since this Bill was introduced. There is very little new that can now be said. We all admit that it only remains for us individually, so to speak, to make our confessions and to endeavour to clarify the situation in our own minds and those of our constituents. But certain objections have been raised, and those objections have been put forth

with logic, with reason and with sincerity. I for my part feel that some of the objections should be answered, or that at least an attempt should be made to answer them.

The first objection that has been advanced is that the need for men is not so apparent as to justify this measure. The other night the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), who sits on the opposite side of the House, attempted to show that there were 126,000 reserves in England and 90,000 here. His figures fell down completely when they were analyzed, but it is well that the actual figures should be placed on Hansard in concrete form. It is true that there are 126,000 men in England, but only one-half of those are combatants, 30,000 of them are ready for the firing line, 35,000 more will be fit in the course of the next few months; 65,000 all told will be the sum total of combatant reinforcements out of that 126,000 men. In Canada to-day there are less than 20,000 who may be regarded as in class A, that is men who will eventually be fit for the trenches. But the most significant figures of all are those in respect to infantry recruiting. We are told that the infantry losses are generally the greatest at the front. In April and May our casualties amounted to 23,939. These were largely infantry, and you will see that this involves a wastage of over 10,000 men a month.

How many men have we been recruiting throughout Canada during the last five months to make up the wastage in infantry? In January 5,707, in February there were 2,358; in March, 2,286; in April, 1,794; in May, 1,208 or an average of 2,670 infantrymen recruited in Canada since the year began. It needs no abstruse calculation in arithmetic to demonstrate that, if our casualties are 10,000 a month, and our infantry reinforcements not more than a quarter of that number, the time is not far distant when the infantry reinforcements on hand will be exhausted, unless some steps are taken to secure more men. It is true there were 34,376 enlistments in the first five months of this year, but a very large proportion of those is composed of non-combatants. They were 13,353 infantry, 4,187 artillerymen, 8,317 forestry and railroad construction battalions, 8,523 miscellaneous arms of the service. Not more than one half of the total number, therefore, may be considered as infantry and artillery, which are the real combatant forces. It takes from eight to twelve months to train men for the firing line, and, even if we should now raise the men authorized under the Bill, if it passes, it would be 1918, probably, before the first of them would be used for service in France. It, therefore, does not admit of delay, because the reserve that we have on hand will be exhausted by Christmas, and after Christmas, what are we to do for more men?

There is no man who is to-day better qualified to speak of the military situation than the commander in chief of our forces in France. Even at the risk of repeating what may have been said by others, I want to read the recent messages from General Sir Arthur Currie, who knows more about the military situation overseas than any other living man. When he received a telegram of congratulation upon his recent honour, from the Prime Minister of Canada, his reply contained this significant clause:

> It is an imperative and urgent necessity that steps be immediately taken to insure that sufficient drafts of officers and men are sent from Canada to keep the corps at its full strength.

And immediately after being interviewed by Mr. F. A. Mackenzie of the Montreal Star, General Currie said:

> "I've no wish to interfere with current political controversies, but my personal conviction is that the only solution to the problem of Canadian recruiting is conscription. I believe that many difficulties which now threaten the adoption of such a policy would disappear before prompt and bold action.
>
> "My experiences in France have shown me, not as a politician, but as a soldier, the necessity of conscription, if we desire to maintain at full strength our fighting divisions to the end."

Mr. MARTIN (St. Mary's, Montreal) (translation): Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

Sir HERBERT AMES: Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN: Is it not to your knowledge that the French Government has decided to send back home—unhappily I have not here the paper in which the statement is made—all the aged soldiers so they can help on the farms? How does the hon. gentleman explain the fact?

Sir HERBERT AMES: I am aware of that and we are doing the same thing here, for Canada.

Mr. MARTIN: It is better to keep them here, then.

Sir HERBERT AMES: In France, the Government has decided to send back home the aged soldiers, to do farm work. Here in Canada, we do not intend to send overseas old men and farmers; our aim is to draft young men only.

Mr. MARTIN: How will we then manage to turn out munitions? My hon. friend who represents St. Antoine division, in the City of Montreal knows as well as I do, that even at this moment it is very hard, if not impossible, to get all the labour required and that some very important work will have to be discontinued.

Sir HERBERT AMES: If my hon. friend will allow me we shall discuss this phase of the question later on.

Sir HERBERT AMES: There are none of us probably who have not friends overseas, probably none of us who have not relations and intimate friends in the firing line, and I ask those who are in receipt of letters from those boys overseas from week to week, what do the boys ask for? Do they not write and say: "Send us reinforcements; we need them more than anything else?" One of the bravest men I ever knew, and one of my personal friends, Colonel Victor Buchanan, killed not long ago, served in a Montreal Highland regiment. The last letter he wrote me had one note in it from end to end: "We need men; our Highland regiment is being filled up with drafts from every part of Canada; do tell the people of Montreal to send us more Montreal Highlanders, so that our ranks may be filled." Can any man with a sympathetic heart turn a deaf ear to letters from those he has known all his life, when they ask that they be not abandoned on the firing line?

Another objection which is raised is that this Parliament is incompetent to pass such an Act. It is said that Parliament is six years old, that there are twenty vacancies, and that a number of additional constituencies, under the new distribution, are entitled to members. That is an absolutely erroneous idea. No question can be raised, by any one who knows anything about legal or constitutional law, as to our right to pass such a measure as this. Our constitution is the British North America Act and its amendments. The amendments are just as valid as the Act. If the Act tells us that the life of Parliament is five years, and the amendment extends it to six, seven, ten, or twenty, the amendment is just as valid as the original Act, and any Act we may pass in this Parliament, while it is legally constituted, is equally valid, whether it be passed in the first or the last year of our incumbency in office. The question whether we have a moral right is another matter, but the legal right is absolutely incontestible. My hon. friend, the member for St. Mary's, the mayor of Montreal (Mr. Martin) asked me a question a moment ago as to whether we could spare the men. In his judgment, as first magistrate of the city of Montreal, he believed we could not. I would like to discuss that with him for a moment, because we are both interested alike in that great city. I have noticed in this Parliament that the hon. gentlemen who ask us to give the voluntary system another trial are the very ones who say we cannot spare the men. If we cannot spare the men raised by conscription, how can we spare them when they are raised by the voluntary system? In fact, the men that might be raised by a continuation of the voluntary system would be far less easily spared than the men that will be obtained by conscription.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Another plea that we sometimes hear is that conscription is going to tear the husband from his wife and the father from his little children, and break up the homes of this country by force. If we had had conscription at the beginning, there would have been no breaking up of homes. There are 75,000 married men that have left their wives and children and gone overseas. If there had been a systematic law upon the statute book at the beginning, it would not have been necessary to send these married men across, and, as I understand, under this Bill we expect to get 100,000 more men, I call the attention of this House to the fact that in all probability the full number would be obtained by calling up classes 1, 2 and 3, and those classes include only single men, or widowers without children, between the ages of 20 and 35.

The entire number of men, that this measure will call for, will be obtained without tearing a single husband from his wife or a single father from his loving children at home. Further, let me point out that there will be exceptions wherever they are expedient in the national interest. Men who are essential to the munition factories in Montreal will not be sent overseas; men who can be spared from the munition factories and whose places may be taken by returned soldiers, women or old men, will probably be sent overseas. But the readjustment will not seriously impair the efficiency of the munition factories.

We are told that it will ruin the country to send overseas another 100,000 men. According to the 1911 census, there were in

Canada at that time 636,746 unmarried men between the ages of 20 and 35. As nearly as I can calculate the figures of the Patriotic Fund permit me to get fairly near it—about 235,000 unmarried men between the ages of 20 and 35, have gone overseas. Deduct that number from the total and you still have 400,000 unmarried men in Canada between the ages of 20 and 35 from whom the choice can be made to make up the number required by this measure. If one-quarter of the unmarried men now in Canada are selected with care and discretion, I believe they could be sent forward without seriously handicapping our industries. It was said the other night by the Minister of Inland Revenue that the quota for Quebec might be 25,000 men. That would be the one-eightieth part of the total population of Quebec. We have already enlisted nearly twice that number in Quebec; I do not believe that it would stop our industries if one-half as many men as have already gone were further sent from our good province.

The enforcement of this Act will be in the hands of the Department of Justice. That is one of the departments which we all admit is likely to be the most impartial, the less liable to be influenced by outside motives. A board of selection will be chosen. I trust that that board of selection will be composed of men representing every section, nationality and class throughout the whole Dominion. I trust that both sides of the House will co-operate in choosing that board. I would suggest that on that board there be representatives of the French-speaking people of Quebec and representatives of organized labour. Further, we should be willing to go outside the House in making up that board of selection. That board will choose half the members of the local boards and the Superior Court judges or their appointees will choose the remaining half. In any event one-half the membership of every local board will be appointed under judicial authority and the other half by a board of selection which this House and the Senate shall name. If there is any method by which greater impartiality can be shown; if members on the opposite side can make any suggestion with a view of making this Act absolutely fair to all concerned, I am sure the Government will accept their suggestions with great pleasure and work them into the Bill.

During the last two or three months I have been very much interested in watching the wonderful manner in which our American cousins have gone into this war. It so happened that I was in Washington just before war was declared by the United States, speaking on behalf of the Navy League Fund, and I had opportunities of discussing with the leading naval and military authorities what would be done by the United States in case war was declared. Although the army authorities were strongly in favour of a selective draft system, they were not at all certain that they could secure its ratification by the Senate and House of Representatives. I was, therefore, considerably surprised when I found that the United States had adopted a measure of conscription by selective draft. They established a law which provided that every man between 21 and 30 should register on June 5. Ten million men throughout the United States registered on that day. They then made the allotment of quotas in the several states, and they are now by ballot drafting what men are needed to make up the first 500,000

The United States had apparently less reason for being interested in this war than had Canada. The United States, like ourselves, have no material profit to make out of this war and are less liable to be ravaged than we are if the Germans should win. Yet, profiting by the experience and mistakes of others, they are taking up their war measures with a wisdom and celerity which cannot be too highly commended.

Last week I was in Worcester and Springfield, Massachussetts, speaking to magnificent audiences in connection with Red Cross Funds. They raised, as you know, $110,000,000 in the United States for this purpose during the past week. I was entertained by a member of Congress in the state of Massachussetts, and I asked him about that registration on the 5th of June. I said: Did you have any trouble with your registration? None whatever, he replied. Did you find any unwillingness on the part of your population to register? None whatever, he said. You have a good many of my fellow-countrymen here; were they willing to register? Every man, he said, registered. When I went to the town of Northampton I was told something that made me feel proud of my country and of the province in which I was born. When the day of registration arrived every Canadian in that town went to mass in the morning. They arranged a procession, with their flags and full regalia. The whole Canadian population of that town went to the registration booth, with

the young men between 21 and 30 in a special platoon by themselves, and every man between those ages registered and is ready and willing, if drafted, to fight overseas in this common cause.

The example of Australia has been cited. That is not a very good example for hon. gentlemen on the other side to cite, because Australia, which has a population about two-thirds that of Canada, up to the first of May, had sent 362,000 men, or one man out of every fourteen. If we had done as well as Australia we should have sent 540,000 men and conscription would not as yet be necessary in order to keep up our lines. New Zealand has had conscription for some time, and has found the measure to work admirably.

The criticism that I believe to be of the greatest weight—the one which appeals to me more than any other—is the criticism that this measure finds our people unprepared for its acceptance. I think that is true. We all admit it; some of us admit it with considerable regret. The people of Canada were not prepared for this announcement. They are not prepared to-day for the acceptance of conscription, but I believe that they will be prepared for it by the time the law is put into force. We do not realize the enormous changes that each year brings in connection with the war. It is only now sinking into us what this war really means.

Each year our preconceptions are necessarily changed, and we find ourselves face to face with new conditions. It is my belief that the Prime Minister of Canada up to the end of 1916 had no intention or expectation of bringing in a measure of conscription. I believe he was sincere when he said he did not anticipate that that would be necessary. However, he went over to England and spent two months there. He took part in the Imperial War Council; he visited France and met our own boys at the front; he talked with our generals and considered the whole situation; and knowing him as I do, I believe that he was persuaded against his will. I know that when he came back to Canada he was convinced that conscription alone would keep up our lines, and therefore the announcement was made.

Things have greatly changed in the last few months. It is not fair to say, because we were unprepared for conscription six months ago and did not believe it would be necessary in this country, that therefore we are bound not to have conscription. What has happened? In the first place Russia has collapsed. Where we had expected to have the Russian steam roller moving this year with its millions on the eastern front, and bringing out German reserves to stem it, on the contrary we find that three-quarters of a million Germans have been withdrawn from the Russian front and sent over to France to fight against our forces there. Consequently the demand for reinforcements on the western front is far greater than was anticipated. More than that; it means that the war will not end this year, perhaps not next year, and possibly not the year after that.

There is another unexpected feature which has changed the situation, and that is that the United States have agreed to a measure of conscription. Look at the emigration figures for the last four or five years and you will see that there has been considerable egress of Canadians to the other side. It would have been unwise for Canada to endeavour to pass a measure of conscription while the United States did not have a similar law. It would have meant that a considerable number of people would have slipped over the line, and we would have lost just that number. But with conscription on both sides of the line that is avoided. The introduction of a measure of conscription in the United States has changed the situation here and makes it not only possible but advisable for us to have conscription here.

But the main reason for its adoption is the falling off in recruiting. When only 1,200 infantrymen can be recruited in Canada in a single month, and when our casualties for the same period amount to ten times that number, it makes every thoughtful man pause and say that something must be done. So a new policy has become necessary. The opposition to the measure is to my mind largely due to lack of appreciation of the conditions, and that imposes upon every true Canadian the necessity of endeavouring to make the actual situation known, and of meeting differences of opinion fairly by argument, and endeavouring to persuade opponents of the measure to adopt the course which he believes should be taken.

We sometimes hear in this House mention of the conscription of wealth. It is not unnatural that those who are called upon to send their sons to the front should feel that wealthy men should give handsomely of their money to support the Allied cause. I think I know something about how that general demand originated. Ever since the war began I have been travel-

ling up and down Canada, talking to people in an endeavour to get them to contribute to the Patriotic Fund. The people of this country have given magnificently, more than $25,000,000 having been contributed for the wives and dependent relatives of our soldiers. But again and again, when I have sat down with some of these patriotic committees and talked of raising large sums of money, they have said: "Yes we will raise the money, but there are one or two men here who will not contribute, and their refusal hinders us more than anything else." Many princely gifts have been made since this war began. I want to pay tribute to the men of wealth who have given over and over again in lavish measure. I know men of wealth who are living in the simplest possible manner, giving away as much as they are using—half their incomes. I had breakfast with a gentleman the other morning who has voluntarily given $200,000 since the war began to the various war charities, and he is prepared to give more. Now these men are giving today far more than they would contribute under any form of taxation that the Finance Minister would dare impose upon the people of Canada. He would not take by law one tithe of what some of them are giving voluntarily to-day. Yet there are the exceptions of which I spoke, and if the Minister of Finance can concoct any scheme by which these exceptions can be made to contribute in some way to the war, he will have my vote and heartiest sympathy.

I represent a constituency which is Canada in miniature. I have, in about the same proportion that you will find throughout the Dominion, the various elements which make up our total population. I regard that as one of the happiest circumstances in connection with my parliamentary career, as it gives me an opportunity to understand different points of view and to realize that there are many men who are just as conscientious in their views as I am or anyone else can be. In connection with this measure I shall find it necessary to offend some of these people. It will be my duty to endeavour to explain to them why I feel that this Bill must pass. I shall try to secure harmony by getting them to see the matter as I see it. I would not have the members of this House imagine, because some irresponsible young men break windows occasionally in Montreal, that we have not free speech in my province. I do not think there is a province in the Dominion where the two sides of a question are discussed more fairly or more fully than they are at the hustings and on the platforms throughout the province of Quebec. Free speech is not dead, and never will be. I expect to have the opportunity of meeting men whose opinions differ from mine, but I am confident that they will give me a fair hearing and extend to me the same courtesy that I should receive if I were speaking for the very cause which they themselves represent. I have represented for the last twenty years men whose views differ from my own, and I have yet to be treated for the first time with discourtesy, or not allowed a fair hearing.

In a newspaper I picked up the other day I saw a recommendation that Quebec should be exempted from this Bill. I venture to say that if any one should have the temerity to introduce into this House a resolution to exempt Quebec from this Bill, every French Canadian in the House would vote against it. Our people are a proud-spirited race. They may use every constitutional method of opposing what they do not endorse, but they do not wish to be classed with any specially exempted peoples.

I am opposed to a referendum because I think even after a referendum we should be no further ahead than we were before. I hope the Government will pass this Bill and that the Opposition and every member of this House will assist in every possible way to make it the most workable Bill possible. Personally I should be glad to see an opportunity given for the electorate to speak before the Bill is put into force, but that is my individual opinion. I believe that this Bill will pass this House and that when the need is realized and the conditions are understood, the measure will be accepted by the country. I believe that when it has passed this House and been accepted by a majority in the country, it will be obeyed by every class of our community.

M. C. A. GAUVREAU (Témiscouata) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, it is now twenty years that I have been sitting in this Parliament of Canada, and never before have we been confronted with so important, I should say so poignant, a measure as the bill introduced by the Prime Minister of Canada, to be known as: The Military Service Act of 1917. He might just as well have entitled it the Conscription law, had he not feared to impress somewhat too vividly the imagination of the people of this country.

For twenty years, with my colleagues in this House, some of them vanished long ago, the others still around me, I have witnessed the slow but progressive evolution of our country's politics, written every day, politics which our children will study later on, which we ourselves have studied before 1896, some of us to learn the great lessons of the past, the others to find therein inspiration and foresight, whilst arming ourselves for future struggles.

For twenty years I have witnessed in this House some memorable struggles, placing in now and then my humble speech, but always with a sincere desire of aiding to solve the great problems offered by the moral, industrial, religious and social development of a nation in course of formation and which asserts itself as the years pass by.

I have taken part in the debates upon important question, such as: the schools of Manitoba, the National Transcontinental, the Quebec bridge enterprise, Canada's participation in the South African war, Laurier's naval bill, reciprocity, the schools of Keewatin and the bilingual question. These questions have been the most important raised in this House, but, Mr. Speaker, none of them has ever been as momentous or as grave as the one which we are called upon to discuss to-day.

I understand that the war has given rise to new problems which have not only set athinking the great statesmen of Europe, but have given much concern to the statesmen of both political parties in this country, alike interested.

On August 4, 1914, when war was declared, Canada felt that she was perhaps at the turning point in her history, on a new road, and after three years of conflict, after three years of an atrocious and desolating war which makes Europe bleed, where perhaps, before long, we may see in France and in Belgium as many crosses on heroes' graves as we can see soldiers yet standing to defend Liberty's cause, we are asking ourselves what are we to do? That is the very question I am also asking myself.

In the first place, I ask myself: should we have taken part in this war? Without any hesitation, I answer yes. One day, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfred Laurier) stated in this House: that when England is at war, Canada is alike at war—which was not understood by a large portion of our population.

A certain school of thought that is well known, has made it its study to stir up the province of Quebec against the Liberal party and its leader, with what success everybody knows. But events as they unfolded have nobly vindicated our revered leader, as the very same words that he has uttered have also fallen from the lips of princes of the Church and from the mouth of eminent members of the hierarchy and of political men of both parties in our province.

Was it our duty to participate in this war? I unhesitatingly say yes. How were we to co-operate in this great work? Were we bound to participate in it to the fulness of our resources? Had we to take part in it, even at the risk of bankruptcy for Canada, as was stated at the outbreak of war, by the hon. solicitor general (Mr. Meighen)? I have the greatest respect for the opinion of the hon. Solicitor General, but I do not share his views in that regard, nor can I bring myself to believe in and endorse such principle, because, as the saying goes, "well ordained charity begins at home." Should we take part in this war to our last man and to our last dollar? This doctrine has been advocated in this House by honest and sincere men. Sir, I respect honest and sincere men who have the courage of their convictions, but I cannot subscribe to such a doctrine and I claim for my convictions the respectful consideration which should always be granted to conscientious opinions.

New, Sir, what were we to do? What we had to do, was to help Great Britain and the Allies in winning this war, to render all the assistance in our power, by any reasonable means at our command, in supplying such essentials for the successful pursuit of war operations as military man power, money, munitions and produce of the farm.

As to military man power, I shall deal with it later on.

As to farm produce, the tillers of the soil have resolutely set to work, thus showing that in that way not only could they help the Allies but that they might perhaps, some day, come to the assistance of the country, by preventing the gaunt specter of starvation stalking over Canadian highways.

Now, as to military man-power, Sir, we had to raise recruits. But under what system? Could recruiting be carried on under any other method than the voluntary system? It never occurred to or entered the mind of any man in Canada that troops could be levied in Canada, for the defence of the Empire, under any other system than voluntary enlistment? Such is the policy and the wording of the Act. The fathers of

Confederation never contemplated anything else, as witness this enactment in the Act: "Should ever conscription take place, it will be for the defence of the country, and whenever troops are sent outside of Canada, it will also be for the defence of the country." Should my statement be questioned, I need only cite the very statement made by the former Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), quoted by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), when he said that he could not read in the law that he had any authority to ask Parliament to allow troops other than volunteers to leave the country for the defence of England, except under such provisions as were made later on.

Should any doubts, still be entertained on that score, Sir, I would invoke the despatch sent by the Duke of Connaught to the Secretary of State for the Colonies:

Should we still harbour any doubts, they ought to be dispelled in face of the despatch that was sent which has been read to the House. How did voluntary enlistment work? Some say that it has been successful, while others say that it has been a failure.

For my part I say this, that in the province of Quebec, the voluntary system has not been given fair play nor such full scope as it should have had.

I was surprised to hear the statement made in this House the other night by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) in connection with recruiting in the province of Ontario.

I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state that but for the patriotic action of the Ontario people, at a time when the Government were doing absolutely nothing, there would have occurred considerable delay in the sending of troops overseas, while they were fighting like blazes around the table of the Privy Council about contracts to be let, the people of the province of Ontario were paying out of their pocket; they were busy organizing regiments and paying for their equipment. Meanwhile, men with a dismal countenance were seen prowling about the Privy Council and the Parliament buildings, awaiting an opportunity for hearing when they could grasp the fat contract which would allow them to pocket enormous sums of money.

This reminds me of a picture of the epic wars of the past, when, in the wake of great armies, vultures and ravens were often to be seen, on the watch for an opportunity to spring upon and lacerate their first victim, a soldier fallen on the battle field. Now, allow me, Sir, to give you an idea of

the kind of voluntary enlistment that has been carried on throughout the province of Quebec. In my opinion, Sir, the voluntary system could have worked wonders in the province of Quebec, had it been entrusted to men conversant with the mentality of the two great races in our country. Quebec could have supplied Great Britain and the Allies with all the troops such a self-governing colony as Canada could send across the ocean, for the defence of the most sacred rights of the nations trodden under foot by the barbarians of 1870, by the spoliators and assassins of 1914, and the baby-killers of 1917. Our fellow countrymen would have volunteered in larger numbers had the Government taken the necessary means but, as a matter of fact, they were first and last an out and out party Government. They were determined to prosecute the business of the war in their own way, so as to get all the credit for the winning of the war. They have made everything subservient to patronage, to political favoritism, by debarring the Liberals from any important post or office. Quebec was slighted and passed over, as if it were a negligible quantity in Confederation. They did not show themselves able to select, for recruiting, men who would have appealed to the heart of the people and won them over to the cause of enlistment by warning them against neglecting to answer the call of duty at this tragic hour for humanity and the liberties of the world.

As a consequence, our people, apparently it may be, did not display as much enthusiasm as the other races in this country, and what with the revival of the ill-feeling of old against the papacy, and with the memories of the frictions of the past between French and English springing up again in the mind of the sons of the former conquerors and the sons of those who were conquered—without having been so conquered, strictly speaking—there arose a premeditated conspiracy, which was even encouraged, as the sequel of a policy which will be termed by the future historian as nefarious to the best interests of Canada, in short, Sir, a policy in pursuance of which, the province of Quebec was branded as guilty of disloyalty. The province of Quebec guilty of disloyalty forsooth! the French Canadians a disloyal people indeed! But, Sir, our history, from the days of the conquest down to Confederation gives the most unqualified lie to such a statement.

They say that our people did not enlist in sufficient numbers. How could you expect recruiting in Quebec to have been as active and as successful as elsewhere, to quote the

eloquent remarks of my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe), in face of the slanderous campaign carried on against them and in view of the insults heaped upon the province?

Now, allow me, Sir, to give you a sample of the statements and editorials that appear in the press:

Let us have conscription, anyhow, and have civil war if necessary, has been the argument of the extremists. We have got to have war sometime to teach Quebec that Canada is an English speaking protestant country, not to be dominated by a single priest-ridden province. And we may as well have it now when we are armed for the fighting in Europe. We can let our loyal troops of Ontario and the Western provinces stop in Quebec on their way to Europe long enough to practice on the French Canadians as a part of their training for handling Germans.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon gentlemen opposite what would be their feelings if they were in the place of the French Canadians and subjected to such insults as are being launched against them? Would they not boil with anger on being thus insulted and vilified and if they did not carry things to extremes, I confess, I am unable to form a picture of English mentality.

Sir, when the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pusgley) alluded, the other day, to the editorial I have just quoted, hon. gentlemen were heard laughing and jeering.

As I mused on that incident, I though how strange was the mental make-up of some our fellow-countrymen. Better than ever I understood, Sir, what kind of political jetsam is drifting into this Parliament, on the waves of fanaticism, lashed into fury since 1911 in the English-speaking provinces and particularly in the province of Ontario.

Quebec, they say, did not answer the call of duty; they have not enlisted. Things have gone to such lengths, Sir, that a newspaper which does not sympathize with us, Liberals, La Patrie of Montreal, the organ of the hon. minister of Electioneering, has published the following editorial. Kindly allow me, Sir, to read that editorial which is not lengthy but very interesting. I should like some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to understand it and I hope a translation of it will appear in Hansard:

The French Canadians in the armies.

An official return which has just been brought down in the House of Commons shows that 14,245 French Canadians have enlisted to serve in the British army. Troughout the Dominion, 125,245 English Canadians have enlisted, while 155,095 British born have enlisted in the Canadian expeditionary forces.

These figures do not justify the reproaches, nay, the injuries, which certain newspapers of Ontario and elsewhere have with so much persistency flung in the face of the French Canadians of the province of Quebec.

The French Canadians' contribution to the defence of Canada and of the Empire should not be regarded as a contemptible one, so much the less that France, England and the Canadian army's chief commanding officers have on more than one occasion declared that no soldiers had shown more dauntless courage, more resourcefulness and more endurance than the French Canadians.

These official figures do not establish the fact that the French Canadians, in proportion to their numbers in the Dominion, have furnished as many recruits as the Canadians of English origin. And we know before hand that it is from that point of view they will be considered by those organs which are only looking for a new opportunity to slander the province of Quebec and the French Canadian race. Yet, that is a false and unjust way of looking at it. It is no more proper to upbraid the French Canadians for not having enlisted in as large numbers as their fellow citizens of English descent, than it would be to accuse our English compatriots in this country because they did not enlist in as large numbers as the British born Canadians.

In both cases, one must consider the circumstance, as pointed out by our local contemporary The Gazette.

The presence of fourteen thousand young French Canadians in the oversea contingents, says our confrere, should make an impression upon those who criticise their race. Our French-speaking fellow citizens in certain parts of the country have received less encouragement to enlist than those who are English-speaking; lately, they received no encouragement at all. Reproaches are no incentive.

Moreover, as enlistment was voluntary, it necessarily follows that no one had the right to blame our province, whatever might be the numbers of our fellow citizens answering the call.

On the whole, and under the particular circumstances offered here, as well as the irritating pressure made by the other provinces, the province of Quebec is far from having any reason to blush for the share it has taken in national defence.

Unbiassed opinion, when passions will have ceased to affect our English-speaking fellow citizens, will bear evidence to the fact that it has admirably behaved.

I will leave this clipping from La Patrie of Montreal to the meditation of my friends on the other side of the House.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, was it stated that we had not enlisted, but the most odious campaign imaginable was started against the French language in the province of Ontario. I will only refer to it to state that this irritating question has had some importance in Quebec; the rights of the French language have been ostracized to substitute the German in the schools of Ontario.

Now, Mr Speaker, to this iniquitous persecution and to insults of every kind, they have attempted to add the vilest calumnies. I intend to refer to the most deplorable

incidents which have happened, just whilst the French Canadians of the province of Quebec were doing even more than their best to show their sympathy to the soldiers crossing the province. I will mention the case of Fraserville, which is in the county of Temiscouata. When the trains full of soldiers passed through this locality, the ladies and the citizens of Fraserville would go to the station and give the boys cigarettes and other dainties. What was their reward? The most infamous accusations from the province of Ontario and, sometimes, even insults from the soldiers themselves.

A few days ago, the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) spoke of that bad father who gave his children stones when they were begging for bread. Did not the same thing happen in the province of Quebec, as the soldiers passed through it, when the citizens of Fraserville were insulted for having shown their sympathy? When this question was raised in this House, the right hon. leader of the Opposition was eager to have an investigation and it was granted to him.

The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) has given, last evening, the findings of that inquiry; that the people of the province of Quebec are exonerated of all offences charged, is the summing up of it all, and I was not surprised to learn that it was the very behaviour of the soldiers themselves that had occasioned those incidents, and that they had been prompted to such excesses, beyond measure, by the perusal of inflammatory editorials, daily published by the Ontario newspapers about the province of Quebec.

I would ask the Prime Minister to be kind enough to have a special copy of this report made and to address it to the member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) for the trouble he went to in laying before the House the charges I have just alluded to.

As he was acting, undoubtedly under the inspiration of a sincere desire to aid the union of races in this country, that copy of the report will be most valuable for him, especially so when a good Liberal will have beaten him, as he deserves it, in his constituency.

There is, in this country, a man who, more than any other one probably, has tried, by his articles, unjust as well as abusive, against the province of Quebec, to break up the union and the ' bonne entente' between the two races in this Dominion, and who, more than any other, has sought to abet the English provinces against the French province of Quebec, by his writings, so violent that they exceeded the limits of decency and of honesty.

This man, Sir, is called John Willison, of Toronto. Not the John Willison who has written the admirable life of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but the John Willison whom the Government of this country has had the weakness of recommending to our King to be knighted and who, to-morrow, perhaps, may be raised to the Senate by these gentlemen, for having overtopped by the full height of his narrow head the tallest detractors of the French race in this country. For men of John Willison's caliber, there is only one thing to do: To the wall! after Joffre's laconic but splendid expression!

We were living almost in peace before that. Our race has known the gloomy days of defeat; it has suffered the military yoke after the conquest; it has had the bloody hours of the rebellion of 1837-38, and when the Confederation at last melted into one Dominion the provinces of Canada, Quebec began to breathe more freely, having the idea that the British flag would be her best protection. Reverting with still greater energy to the tilling of her bountiful soil, she witnessed the growth, development and increasing influence of her peaceful population, obedient to the laws, respectful of order, of the civilian and religious authority which had always been her best safeguard. But Mr, Speaker, in the year 1909 at the very announcement of a naval policy, of a new scheme for a Canadian navy for the defence of the coasts of Canada, as well as to go to the assistance of the Empire in times of danger, after the Canadian government had so decreed it, we had seen, in the province of Quebec, men rise and the populous centers through the townships and the remotest concessions, and cry: "That means your own participation in the war. If you vote for Laurier's navy, it will be for England to whom we owe nothing, for England who is obliged to protect us and to defend us." I was then asked that Laurier be put out of power, because that would be so they said, the only way to prevent that nefarious measure becomng the law of the country.

Everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, the result of the Drummond-Arthabaska election. and then, September 21, 1911, the Borden party at the helm, with the Nationalists at their side, and since then, it has been Im-

perialism everywhere and before anything else, it has been the dreadnoughts at a cost of $35,000,000 of which the Liberal Senate has fortunately rid us, in the very interest of England and of the present war, as events themselves have demonstrated it to all on both sides of the ocean. War was let loose on the world in August 1914. Canada got into the war from the moment England did, nobly and valiantly, declare war, that, in honour and in justice, she must respect her pledged word and her signature affixed to solemn agreements.

It is here that the history of our participation in the war becomes interesting and discloses novel aspects as to our position in the Empire.

What should we do for the Empire and the Allies and how far were we to go in the sacrifice of men and of money, as our contribution to this grand work for the defeat of German autocracy? England never expected from us more than 150,000 men; the balance being unattached, were to remain on the land, in order to produce what was needed for the Allies as well as for the people of Canada, and the others should be employed in the making of war ammunition. But, Mr, Speaker, one fine morning as if he had suddenly awakened from a nightmare, the premier of this country, without consulting anybody, without consulting neither his colleagues nor Parliament, said to England: "Canada offers you 500,000 men."

What did we do, Mr. Speaker? We accepted the situation just as it was in the province of Quebec. The leader of the Opposition and his lieutenants, such as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) and the hon. member for Kamouraska and almost all the Liberal members of the province of Quebec, made it a point to tell their constituents that they should do their utmost for the defence of the Empire; we called public meetings. For my own part, Mr. Speaker, I have held meetings in my county—I have held several—it is true that I spoke against the Government, it is true that I denounced autocracy, it is true that I denounced robberies and plunders, but, Mr. Speaker, I had the courage to tell my electors: "This is a just war, it is almost a holy war, it is almost a crusade, and you must do your duty, ever without restraint, without being compelled by anybody." Mr. Speaker, we did go through our parishes and we told our electors to enlist.

Thank God! the Liberals of the province of Quebec are not preachers of disloyalty, we leave that to the people who, during the Dorchester election, told the voters: "If conscription is adopted, just cross the boundary." We do not belong to that class of people.

To those who could not enlist, we said: "Contribute money to the Patriotic Fund." I am glad to see here present the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames). He knows that at Rivière-du-Loup, we have a branch office of the Patriotic Fund which operates from Montmagny as far as Gaspé. I have the honour to be its president and the hon. member for Kamouraska is one of its members. There, we applied ourselves, from the outbreak of the war, to provide for the needs and comforts of the wives of the soldiers who had been sent overseas. It will not be a matter for surprise if I say that, at the present moment, we are paying, if I am not mistaken, $1,200 per month to the wives and children of our soldiers who have gone to the front.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we were urging, all along, our people to enlist and we always understood that there was no necessity for conscription.

The hon. member for Rouville did not need conscription to give his only son to the force which will soon cross overseas. My hon. friend, the member for Bagot (Mr. Marcile), has given his two sons and he did not require conscription and, if I wanted to make a personal reference, I would say, Mr. Speaker, I have not waited for conscription to give my eldest son. He is with the British fleet which perhaps saved the Allies, with that British fleet which may perchance be the one factor to ensure final victory to the forces fighting under the Allies' banners.

If the honourable minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) were here, I would ask him if, a fortnight ago, the second of the sons whom Providence has given me did not request from him his entrance in the navy to go on patrol duty along the coasts of Nova Scotia, and the third, the last one, who has just completed his education, would go and join his brothers, if he was not so weak; and I would be glad of it, Mr. Speaker, and do you know why? Not only to defend Canada and the Empire, not only to do his duty as a citizen, but to show to the people of Ontario that in the province of Quebec we are no cowards and that we know how to perform our duty without any admonition to do so.

Then, why conscription? Is there any necessity for it, Mr. Speaker? I answer straight forward: No. Why? For me, Mr. Speaker, volunteering has demonstrated that, with

more discrimination, there would have been a superabundance of recruits.

By sending over 400,000 men to the front, Canada has even exceeded the number that England expected from us, and it is more than our conditions warranted us to send, if we consider our daily requirements. If, with the sending of troops, conscription of wealth in this country had been immediately decreed, there would have been no occasion for our sending over these 100,000 or more extra men, whom conscription is intended to wrest from us to the detriment of Canada's economic organization.

And what, Mr. Speaker, of the disturbance which this measure cannot fail to create in our national life, of the trouble it will stir up, of the bitterness it will cause between the races inhabiting the country, of the misfortunes which will endure for years and years to come? For all these reasons and for many others mentioned by the speakers who have preceded me, I say that conscription has no justification and that is should never have been submitted to this House and to the country.

If the Prime Minister of Canada had risen above his desire of extricating his country from the difficulties which five years of maladministration have created for himself and for his colleagues; if he had devoted the energies of all those around him as well as of his fellow-workers, to the success of the cause of the Empire and of its allies, instead of trying to secure to his Government a longer lease of life; had he listened to the suggestions of Canadian patriotism, instead of catering to the wishes of unscrupulous and scheming politicians, Canada would have with her 400,000 men and her immense natural wealth, enormously aided the cause whose final success we all have at heart, and to-day the gaunt spectre of conscription, would not be looming over our national life, at a critical moment, to undo all that we have heretofore accomplished for England and for Canada.

Some statements of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) have shocked hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. What has he said that was so unusual? He stated to the Prime Minister of this country: If you want to force conscription without the consent of the people, we shall find a means of defending ourselves; we shall fight the Bill with the Bill itself. Has he said that we have done too much for England? Has he said that we ought to cease sending our men to the front? He only stated: We live in a free country; we want to hear the voice of the people and if you

[Mr. Gauvreau.]

are to force this measure through as autocrats would do, we shall resist. How? We will protect ourselves by means of this very Bill. The hon. member from St. Hyacinthe has warned the Prime Minister against what would happen if this measure was enforced. He told him that there might be tears and wailing. The right hon. gentleman has been well cautioned and forewarned means forearmed. The hon. member is certainly a good political opponent, having warned the Prime Minister that should conscription be forced upon the people without their consent, it would create indignation and ill-feeling all over the country. Some people will wash their hands of this whole affair, but the responsibility will be laid at the door of the Prime Minister.

Has the hon. member from St. Hyacinthe gone any further than Sir Edward Carson who threatened to rise up in arms against his King, should an attempt be made to force Home Rule upon Ulster?

Has he gone further than the labour unions who in a solemn convention stated that they opposed conscription by all available means? Is not the resignation of the former Secretary of State another warning to the Prime Minister?

The right hon. gentleman intends to enforce conscription in spite of all. I leave the responsibility with him. But there is this to be said: if the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe is to be blamed for having spoken his mind, for having told the truth, for my part I congratulate him and I shall tell the House that had he not done so, the member from Temiscouata would have said so. Even had I been alone, I would have so stated.

I would not like to be disagreeable to the hon. member from Kent (Mr. Robidoux), but I deny him the right to cast censure on my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe. The hon. member from Kent has his hands full justifying his attitude in the House; let him be satisfied with that. My hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe has been brave enough to speak his mind in the House, that is to state the plain truth. Has the hon. member from Kent voiced the opinion of those he is supposed to represent here? I do not think so. A short visit to his constituency might have convinced him that the Acadian people, the major part of them, are not of the same mind as he is. It may be that on the horizon of his brief political life he has gazed upon the big reward which would enable him to live happily during the remainder of his life. I will give him advice by the way. Let him hurry up before the election, because if

he does not get it before, I do not hesitate to say that he will be disappointed. The result of the election in New Brunswick shows which way the wind is beginning to blow, not only here, but in other parts, which have suprises in store.

An hon. MEMBER: In the West also.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to another question. I cannot close my remarks without attending to the hon. member from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who said yesterday in his address exactly what we expected him to say. He has been true to himself. Let me tell him that his remarks and his brutal attack upon Sir Wilfrid Laurier have not fallen on stony ground and that they shall bear fruit in the future. There is one sure thing it is that some insults are too vile to reach the serene spheres where the leader of the liberal party holds sway. It is strange how some people have but to go over the interprovincial bridge to become experts in the act of throwing mud upon all those who surpass them by all their glorious past, their honest conscience and their magnificent record as statesmen.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier may well rest in peace. Pigmies have never harmed giants, neither in politics nor even when conscription is spoken of. The hon. member has gone so far as to insult the province of Quebec. He did so, I shall not say, in the German style, but in that Teutonic style which characterizes him. He spoke of the lamb of the province of Quebec, meaning no doubt the emblematic lamb which we have in our national pageants during the St. John the Baptist festivities.

His intention no doubt was to reward those who had welcomed him so enthusiastically and who had feasted him in the old city of Champlain when he had gone to address them.

Mr. Speaker, I shall tell him, hoping that he will read my remarks, that there are lambs that are not easily shorn and that he and his new confederates might learn it at their own expense and sooner than they expect should they try to force conscription upon an unwilling people.

Before concluding, Sir, I would like to say a few words about the amendment to the amendment submitted by the hon. member from Berthier. Really, people should not care much about it for it is a farce, as the hon. member from St. Hyacinthe has so justly termed it. The trick is easily detected so much so that its author is soon found out. The right hon. Prime Minister stated in this House that the Government had not heard of it. He would not swear though that some member of his Government had no part in it.

It is held somewhere, Mr. Speaker, that by voting for the amendment to the amendment submitted by the hon. member from Berthier, we are striking at the very root of the Bill. I do not think so. The six months' hoist would leave too many chances of a revival, while by referring the Bill to the people, it would not be heard of in this country for all ages to come, when the people would have voted upon it and crushed it, as I believe they would do.

The amendment to the amendment is the exact counterpart of the petitions which have been sent to the hon. member and laid upon the Table of the House. What do those petitions say? That this nefarious Bill be not passed by the Parliament until it is submitted to the people by means of a referendum or an election. The hon. member from Berthier moves that the Bill be read this day six months. He is not serious; he has played his hand badly. I do not know whether he holds the joker or the blank card, but his hand is no good for the people hold all the trump cards and mind what I say, Sir, they shall win the game.

That is why I will vote against the conscription Bill with the full force of my convictions which I hold to be sincere for they are an heirloom from the past, from our history, from our situation within the Empire and from the requirements of the hour.

I shall vote first against the amendment to the amendment submitted by the hon. member from Berthier because, as I said, it is a farce, a clumsy snare laid for honest Liberals. We will not be entrapped.

I shall vote against the first and second reading of the Bill, because I want the people to have their say first, and should the amendment of our honoured leader be defeated, as it may be, then I shall oppose with the utmost energy the second and third readings, knowing beforehand that should this Bill be put upon the statute books of Canada and should it be attempted afterwards to enforce it disorders would ensue the disastrous results of which, not only for Confederation but for peace so desirable at this moment cannot be estimated at present.

I entreat the Prime Minister not to go any further with his conscription Bill, but to pause before plunging this country in the turmoil of conflict denunciations and all accompanying evils, and to accept rather the amendment submitted by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. While thus entreating him, I will make mine the words spoken by the late Joseph Adolphe Chapleau

during a memorable epoch of his life and say: "Then silence the sectarians and the irreconcilables and let the powerful voice of the people be heard by means of a referendum."

Mr. H. BOULAY (Rimouski) (translation): Mr. Speaker, at last we have reached one of the most solemn stages in our colonial history, namely, our formal and forcible participation in the wars of the Empire.

Notwithstanding the outcry of the newspapers and in spite of the solemn promises of many distinguished public men that there would be no conscription in this country, the Prime Minister, after offering 500,000 men, after going to England to be sure that conditions were urgent, comes back with a most outspoken and most foreboding statement, saying that he had made up his mind to enforce conscription. Universal rejoicing among the disabled and the exempted but sneers and gnashings among those who are liable to conscription.

It is not a source of great pleasure to me to have to-day to address the House and the country on a subject such as this; but the hour is a solemn one, and I am bound to make my views.

We are opposing conscription for different reasons which deserve consideration:

1. Because our traditions, our constitution, our status as a colony are opposed to it;

2. Because we have already sent overseas to help the Allies a sufficient number of men considering our population and our financial means;

3. Because the mandate which we received from the people in 1911 does not enable as to enact such a measure, especially without beforehand consulting the people;

4. Because we are not as fairly dealt with as we should be by the English speaking majority in this country, and because a feeling has been created by the Liberal party in 1896, and by ourselves in 1911, in opposition to the levying of troops of any kind. I may add that this measure is contrary to our traditions, because we have a responsible Government in this country. Our representative public men, whenever we were called upon to legislate on questions of war, a militia bill, or amendments thereto, have always expressed the view that Canada could not send her troops outside the country, except, and exclusively, for the purpose of its own defence. I remember distinctly that, in 1885, in connection with the Nile expedition, the British government applied to Sir John A. Macdonald, then premier of Canada, for troops to help her in that war, and what was his answer? He said: we are ready to send volunteers, on the condition you will pay all the expenses. True, Sir John A. Macdonald did not profess the imperialistic views which are current to-day. He was as broad-minded a statesman as our present politicians, but never did he think of enacting conscription. It was left to this school born of the imperialistic, religious and political fanaticism, to make a display of the principles which have been boomed in this country after the demise of that great statesman, to drive us into the vortex of militarism, to promise every aid possible to England, as Laurier did in 1897 and subsequently at public meetings in England, thus paving the way for the Transvaal expedition, and later on enacting the militia act of 1904, a stepping stone to this measure of compulsion.

I have just mentioned the Militia Act of 1904. I will humbly submit that we do not need a new compulsory measure to enable us to raise all the troops which we wish to send overseas. Section 69 of that Act clearly says:

> The Governor in Council may place the Militia, or any part thereof, on active service, anywhere in Canada, and beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

On this point I am at one with the hon. ex-minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), and the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) and many others. The Act of 1904 provides for the sending of troops outside of Canada, and who among the hon. members of the Opposition at that time occupying seats in this House, voiced a protest. The hon. member from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) was here, and I believe also Mr. Henri Bourassa the member for Labelle. Sir Frederick Borden might well have taken another view. Mr. Henri Bourasa writes:

> Half a century after confederation, the Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, accepts the principle: When England is at war, Canada is also at war. His conclusion is that Canada must assume "all the responsibilities of a nation," and, agreeing with his colleague, Mr. Fielding, fastens upon the Parliament of the colony the creation of a fleet, "Canadian in time of peace but Imperial in time of war," in order to support England in all her conflicts "just or injust."
>
> The Canadian ministers at the time concluded with the Imperial authorities an agreement which places, in time of war, the naval forces of Canada at the disposal of a Government whose policy and action completely escape the control and the votes of the Canadian people. Their successors, the Conservative ministers, strike more directly and more decisively at the

principles laid down half a century ago: they had adopted by this House a Bill granting a contribution to the Imperial navy, over which the Canadian Government exert no authority whatever. Later on, when this war broke out, the two parties joined hands in destroying at their very foundation the principles unanimously accepted in 1851, in 1854 and 1862, as the only principles in agreement with the British constitution and the relationship in vogue between the mother country and the colonies. They assert the obligation of Canada to take part in a war absolutely foreign to us; they raise a greater army than Wellington had at Waterloo; they put the whole burden of that army upon Canada, and yet they give to the Imperial authorities its absolute command and use.

We carried on the electoral campaign of 1911 with the slogan that we should not take any part in the wars of England, and up to that time we were right. We did not foresee at that time the present conflict in which we are fighting more for ourselves than for England or France, notwithstanding all claims to the contrary. We have a direct interest, and even if we had not sent any troops overseas, if England suffered defeat, the Germans would not give us credit for our good will. Our Dominion would be the first victim of their brutalities, and the people understood it so well, that from the Atlantic to the Pacific, very few protests were sounded against the sending of volunteers.

However, can we ask England to be grateful for all that we are doing? Can we expect to be reimbursed of the millions of dollars we are spending for troops and munitions, in any other way that mere thanks from the high politicians and their newspapers? Judging from the experience of the past, we may unhesitatingly answer: no.

We will not even be consulted when the treaty of peace will be made at the end of this terrible war in which we are taking part, and the platonic thanks which we will receive then will be the only compensation we will get for the extraordinary imperialistic wave which is rolling just now over the country, and which brought Sir Robert Borden, without consulting the great bulk of its friends, to involve us in the present war, and finally to force upon us this extraordinary conscription bill which means the destruction of our autonomy and the complete overthrow of our political ideas of the past.

I contend that we have enlisted a sufficient number of men by the voluntary system, and that it would at least be well to continue in the same ways. We have enlisted over 400,000 men, and considering our population of not much over 7,000,000, it is a fine achievement. We are told that the French Canadians have not contributed their quota. It is a well known fact that French Canadians, all born in Canada, have enlisted by hundreds and by thousands in the English regiments in the West, at the very opening of the war. Under our own eyes here, in Ottawa, French Canadians from Hull and the surrounding counties have been enlisted in Ontario battalions. Notwithstanding any ill-feeling entertained towards them, they were sought as recruits, on account of their splendid qualities.

If French Canadians are so guilty, so indifferent and so cowardly, how is it that we cannot get from the department of Militia the exact information we have been seeking for two years past as to the number of French Canadians enlisted to date, and also the number of American citizens and foreigners which have come from England by hundreds, for the very purpose of enlisting in the Canadian forces right at the beginning of the war, because our pay to the soldiers was higher than that in England? That is well known to the officials of Quebec harbour and also to the citizens of that city.

But we have only to read the mournful daily lists of casualties since the beginning of the war, to see that thousands of soldiers have given the address of their next of kin in the British Islands. Let us deduct these men from those born in this country and the proportion of our detractors' friends will be considerably reduced. Let us also look over the figures of the census of 1911, and we will see that in each of the western and Ontario provinces, hundreds of thousands of immigrants have enthusiastically enlisted in the first months of the war, glad as they were, not only to show their loyalty to motherland, but also to find a good opportunity to return to their country, there being no longer any work for them in Canada on account of the cessation of railway construction. Many of them were without work in the streets of our cities, in Edmonton and all over the West. I remember that during the winter of 1914, western papers announced that five thousand men were without work in the streets of Edmonton only. In order to find the number of citizens born in this country, in each of the provinces of Canada, and the number of the foreign born, let us open the census of 1911, which gives the following figures: in the four western provinces, out of a total population of 1,715,189, we find that 870,051, more than half, are born in English countries or elsewhere. Is it not reasonable and logical that those foreigners, most of them

without any ties in Canada should have been the first to enlist for the reasons previously stated.

Ontario boasts of having sent 176,000 men. Here again, let us refer to the census of 1911, and what do we find? That Ontario had at that time—it is probably much higher now, six years later—703,127 men over twenty-one years of age from a total population of 2,423,274 (pages 457 and 458, vol. 2), whereas Quebec, with a population of 2,003,232 inhabitants, had only 476,666 men over the age of twenty-one a difference of 226,461 or 50 per cent in the total male population of the two provinces. If the same proportion is established for the male population between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one, 15,000 more men are to be added to the male population of Ontario, and that would give that province a male population of at least 241,000 over that of Quebec. If Ontario, according to the reports brought down, has enlisted, to date, 176,000 men, that is not in due proportion to her surplus male population over Quebec. Besides, it is not to my knowledge that a single man from Ontario has enlisted in a Quebec regiment, whereas it has been quite different with us, as I have already explained. And again, what are the conditions in Ontario? In 1911, that province had a foreign born population of 407,829, whereas the foreign born population of Quebec was 146,533. Then, as stated by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) on the 20th June, (see Hansard, page 2617) the province of Quebec has given 44,000 men. My impression is that this last figure may be accepted as giving a fairly accurate idea of the number of French Canadians that have enlisted. It is quite ridiculous to speak of 7,000 or even 15,000 when we had 2,000 men in the first expeditionary force alone, and when we know that at least 2,000 French Canadians from the three counties of Rimouski, Bonaventure and Gaspé have enlisted. Moreover Quebec is essentially an agricultural country and our large lumber industry is carried on exclusively by male labourers, whereas in a great number of the industries of Ontario woman labour can replace man labour, so here again, the situation is quite different in the two provinces.

To establish the soundness of such statements, we have not only the census to rely upon. As we all know, the French families of Quebec are much larger, and, even with an equal total population, we could yet have fewer men subject to military service. This difference of 241,000 or 50 per cent in the male population between Ontario and Quebec, in 1911, and a difference of only 25 per cent in the total population, proves beyond the possibility of a doubt the correctness of our calculations. In the face of the above figures that cannot be disputed, I maintain that those who for the last two years have made themselves the slanderers of the province of Quebec are engaging in an unpatriotic campaign, are fomenting disunion and hate between the two great races of this country and are performing a work well calculated to cool the ardour of the most enthusiastic among us.

It is painful for any man to have to disprove unjust accusations. But what must be painful for the individual is much more so in the case of a whole race.

As long as the attacks and the slanders were confined to that dirty sheet called The Orange Sentinel and the members of the section, we were content with despising our traducers. But during the last few years, the most violent attacks emanating from the inveterate enemies of our creed and our race have been re-echoed by important newspapers in the English provinces. If I had not a clear conscience, I would not utter a single word in defence, but knowing that the French Canadians are wrongly accused, I feel that I cannot stand it any longer. During these critical times, while the French Canadians are being submitted to unremitting abuse, I may well face our accusers and ask them, in the words of Cicero "How long will you try our patience?" How long will you gratuitously impugn our loyalty? I say gratuitously, because no correct figures are available at the department of Militia.

The English Canadians would never have accepted peaceably the moral wrongs we have been subjected to, during those two years, by the fanaties who are heaping their slanders upon our heads. Finding themselves short of new arguments and having failed to arouse our resentment, they have invented sham insults to the soldiers from the west, on their way through the province of Quebec. That new charge has been shown, after investigation to be absolutely foundationless and the result would have been the same on all the other points, if impartial investigations had been conducted.

By the way I must say a few words about that investigation, and my remarks will be based on the report of the English commis-

sioners that cannot be suspected of having glossed over the facts.

Thursday, May 31, 1917.

Sessional Papers No. 172.

FINDING.

The Court of Inquiry appointed by the Adjutant General by orders dated the 1st of May, 1917, for the purpose of collecting and recording evidence in connection with the allegations contained in several newspapers that troop-trains had been stoned passing through Rivière du Loup, P.Q., and other places, and for the purpose of collecting and recording any other evidence which, in the opinion of the members of the court, in any way relates to or has a bearing on this matter,

Report as Follows:

1. The Court assembled at the city of Quebec on May 9, 1917, and took the evidence of one witness, and then proceeded to Rivière du Loup where twenty-three witnesses were examined; after which the court adjourned to sit at St. John, N.B., to take the evidence of members of the 217th Battalion, and finally concluded its sitting at Mont Joli.

2. The Court could not get any direct evidence that there was stone-throwing at troop-trains by the citizens of Rivère du Loup, but the Court believes that there is some foundation for the rumours circulated amongst the citizens themselves that on one occasion in October, 1916, a few stones were thrown at one train. The circumstances were as follows:—

One Sunday evening towards the beginning of October, a train with two cars attached filled with the men from the 132nd Battalion stopped at Rivière du Loup. Some of the men detrained and began asking young men why they were not in khaki, and, not receiving a satisfactory reply, used insulting language, and several were assaulted by the soldiers without provocation. This aroused considerable indignation and a group of youths formed apparently with the intention of throwing stones by way of retaliation. The station constable, noticing this, dispersed them, and, although there is no direct evidence, it would appear that at least some of them threw stones from a point beyond the station as the train was pulling out.

3. There is nothing in the evidence to show that there was any organized intention to do this before the arrival of the train and the incident above referred to.

4. Referring to the accusation in one of the newspapers that the 204th Battalion had been stoned, the Court obtained the evidence of the train crew of both sections of the train which conveyed the battalion through Rivière du Loup. None of these witnesses either saw or heard of any such occurrence and the citizens and the railway officials at Rivière du Loup had never even heard of it.

5. The Court could obtain no evidence with reference to the alleged stoning of the 176th Battalion.

6. Dealing with the case of the 217th Battalion, referred to the Court by special message from the Adjutant General, the Court assembled at St. John, N.B., where that battalion was stationed, and examined twelve members of the battalion. From this evidence it was shown that at least four missles, and not more than six, were thrown at the first and second coaches of the second section of the train as it was leaving the station at Mont Joli. The circumstances were as follows:—

About five o'clock on the evening of April 6, 1917, the second section of the train conveying the 217th Battalion stopped at Mont Joli and remained there for about an hour. During that period some soldiers belonging to the Canadian Army Medical Corps, the Canadian Army Service Corps and the 217th Battalion offered the same insults to the citizens as in the case of the trouble at Rivière du Loup, and this was resented by a small number of young men, mostly between the ages of sixteen and twenty, who answered back in the same vein. To avoid any possible trouble, the Mayor of Mont Joli, who was present, cleared all citizens from the station, while the soldiers were ordered to remain inside the train. As the train was leaving, a few stones and cinders were thrown at the car—three of which came through the windows. These were evidently thrown by some of the young fellows who had previously been on the platform and who had hidden behind some freight cars lying about 150 yards beyond the station platform.

7. In addition to these facts, admitted by the soldiers themselves, the citizens gave additional evidence that the soldiers had thrown potatoes and other articles of food, and snow, ice and cinders at the citizens without any provocation whatever. In fact a complaint was made to that effect that very same day by a citizen of Mont Joli to the Adjutant General by wire.

8. From all the evidence which the Court could obtain there is nothing to show either hostility or unfriendliness on the part of the citizens of Rivière du Loup or Mont Joli towards the soldiers.

9. Any stone-throwing at troop-trains there may have been were the acts of a few individuals angered at the moment by the treatment they had received from the soldiers while passing through.

10. Owing to the strong feeling of the majority of the soldiers that the province of Quebec has not, as yet, done her full share of sending troops over, they express their opinions to the citizens in strong terms whenever occasion offers, and this has had a deterrent effect on the volunteer service in these localities.

11. The Court is of the opinion that all necessary steps should be taken to prevent similar occurrences in the future.

(Sgd.) E. S. Wigleth, Col.
J. Ostell, Lt.-Col.
Gregor Barcley, Major.

Dated at Ottawa, this 18th day of May, 1917.

Thursday, May 31, 1917.

Sessional Papers No. 173.

FINDING.

The Court of Inquiry appointed by the Adjutant General by Orders dated the 1st May, 1917, for the purpose of collecting and recording evidence in connection with the allegations contained in several newspapers accusing the citizens of Quebec of maltreating, or allowing to be maltreated, soldiers returning from the war and passing through or sojourning in Quebec, and for the purpose of collecting and recording any other evidence which, in the

opinion of the members of the Court, in any way relates to or has a bearing on the matter, reports as follows:—

1. The Court assembled in Quebec on Monday, May 27, 1917, and took the evidence of twenty-two witnesses under oath, and then adjourned to Toronto to take the evidence of witnesses whose names had been furnished by the newspapers in which the reports were published.

2. The evidence taken was received from the Mayor, Chief of Civil Police, Provost-Marshal, the Provincial Police, the Harbour Police, the City Detectives, the Officer Commanding and the Sergeant-Major of the Discharge Depot, the Civil Magistrates, the Revenue Department, the Military Staff of M.D. No. 5, the Great War Veterans' Association, the Khaki Club, the Patriotic Fund, the Convalescent Home, a Minister of the Methodist Church, and several returned soldiers and citizens, in addition to which the Court visited the College Street Hospital in Toronto and made inquiries at the Base Hospital, Toronto, for the purpose of obtaining all evidence that could possibly have any bearing on the subject under investigation.

3. From the evidence it appears clear to the Court that there is no hostility or ill-feelng on the part of any class of citizens in Quebec towards returned soldiers or any other soldiers, nor does there appear to have been any maltreatment of returned soldiers by any class of citizens, nor has any such treatment been permitted.

4. The evidence discloses that some soldiers have obtained liquor without any restriction, some of which appears to have been of a very inferior quality, and, being under its influence, they have caused some minor disturbances, the blame for which cannot be placed under the citizens of Quebec.

5. Whenever any misconduct on the part of the soldiers has come to the notice of the civil authorities, the offenders in all cases appear to have been handed over to the military authorities to deal with—the greatest harmony existing between the civil and military authorities.

6. The evidence discloses that latterly there has grown up an indifference on the part of French Canadian citizens towards soldiers in general, largely due, in the belief of the Court, to the continual accusations that the French Canadians are disloyal and hostile to any participation in the war.

7. Owing to this indifference and to the belief firmly fixed in the minds of the great majority of soldiers that the province of Quebec has not done her duty in the war, minor incidents, which would otherwise have passed unnoticed, have been grossly exaggerated and given rise to the accusations published.

The Court is of the opinion:—

1. That there is no foundation whatever for the articles published in certain newspapers submitted to and investigated by this Court.

2. That all newspapers should be prohibited from publishing articles of this nature.

3. That the sale of liquor to soldiers in the city of Quebec should be absolutely prohibited.

E. S. Wigleth, Col., President.

J. Ostell, Gregor Barcley, Major. } Members.

Signed at Ottawa, this 18th day of May, 1917.

[Mr. Boulay.]

This investigation was held in Quebec on the complaint of some officers commanding the troop passing through the province of Quebec, and especially my county of Rimouski.

Certain allegations were made by the member for Dufferin (Mr. Best), who seemed to be glad to make these charges against the citizens of Quebec. I wish that he were here to listen to a denial of those charges, not only on my own part, but on the part of the commissioners who were chosen to make the investigation. I expected that, on the receipt of the report of the commissioners, the member for Dufferin would at least get up and say that he had been deceived and that the report which he had given to the House and to the country was entirely false and unfounded. He did not do this, however, and it is my duty to-night as the representative of one of the counties against which this accusation was directed, to tell the hon. gentleman that he should have retracted what he said on that occasion. The facts may have been misrepresented to him, but having made the charges he should have accepted the verdict of the Commission and have made a statement to the House to that effect.

Now, leaving out of consideration the facts which have been established by the above figures beyond all possibility of disproof, and admitting for the sake of argument that the province of Quebec did not give to the cause the number of soldiers that was expected of her, I say that the situation in which we are placed in this country by the will of the majority, the numberless persecutions we are made to suffer, against our language, our schools and our religion, would fully justify our standing aloof in the present war, if we had no other motives to fall in line but the gratitude we owe the majority in this country. If we look back to the past and delve into history, we easily understand why the French Canadian cannot throw all his efforts in this struggle with the same spirit and courage that animate his persecutors. Were we not spurred on by the alliance of England, France and Belgium, leagued together for the defence of violated rights and desecrated treaties, no French Canadian, when he sees his race the constant prey of detractors in this country, would be justified in ever pulling a trigger. I am in duty bound to tell this House and the country the truth, the whole truth.

While admitting that the French Canadians of the province of Quebec have

not answered the call to arms in very large numbers, one must take into account the various reasons which have helped to withhold them. If we go back to the origins of the French and English nations, we find between them a deep-rooted rivalry from the very first centuries of the Middle Ages; during all that time, until the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, British armies have constantly waged war on French territory. And while those two countries were battling in Europe on land and sea, a like struggle was being waged in America, especially in Canada. Immediately after the foundation of Quebec in 1608, the Iroquois Indians, whom the New England settlers supplied with arms, massacred our missionaries and the French pioneers of Canada and Acadia. And there is still subsisting the painful emotion caused by the barbarous expulsion of the Acadians in 1755, the wiping out of an entire peaceful people, an act for which its authors are branded in history with a mark of infamy.

Before the English conquest in 1760, the arms of the two nations in Canada were continually pitted against each other; there was between the two races an incessant enmity. After the conquest, the struggle passed from the battlefield to the economic and social arena. Ever unabashed, the English laid hold of everything within their reach; they monopolized trade. Attempts were made to Anglicize the French left in the country and to instil into their minds tenets contrary to their faith. At different periods their language was the object of legislative attacks, until the numberless persecutions became intolerable and resulted in the disastrous troubles of 1837-38. The conquerors had apparently forgotten the events of 1775, 1812 and 1814, when the French Canadians saved Canada for England. All the sacrifices of our fathers were counted for nought, and before being allowed to breathe the air of liberty they had to take up arms.

In 1867, the old Canadian provinces got together and secured the enactment of the British North America Act. Confederation, at the time of its passing, was by a large number believed to be a blessing, but now one wonders if it is not the most disastrous compact the province of Quebec ever entered into. I say disastrous, because the Fathers of Confederation who represented the province of Quebec were led into traps from which we cannot extricate ourselves. Thus while our friends from Ontario saw to it that the Act should read in express terms that in the province of Quebec the English language will enjoy equal rights with French, the same privilege was denied the French language in Ontario. The Quebec legislators would say at the time: "We must trust the English majority and expect generous treatment at their hands; we have their word, what more is needed."

Such were the arguments used to secure from the inhabitants of Quebec their acceptance of the most perfidious and nefarious compact that could be devised, and which has proved the source of all the language and racial troubles that exist to-day between the French Canadians and the province of Ontario. Without any guarantee being required, we have been surrendered, and without guarantees we are left to-day, left at the tender mercies of a fanaticism which radiates from the University of Toronto and spreads to the legislature and the press. Our rights in Manitoba had been guaranteed, but the English majority, German-like, tore up its treaties and repudiated its signature.

Since 1867, in all the provinces of the Dominion, the English element is attempting to get the upper hand, and denying our rights. The province of Quebec deeply resents those injustices. Take the Civil Service; it is practically controlled by the English-speaking people. They get the best situations. I could prove my statement by quoting from the list I have here before me the nationality of the higher officials of the service. The figures are from last year's public accounts. There are:

French Canadians..	27
English-speaking..	152

Our population entitles us to 50 of those positions instead of 27. Those conditions—I would not like my hon. friends on the other side to be deceived by the figures just quoted—existed in 1911, when we came into power; the grievance is one of long standing; things even went from bad to worse under the Liberal rule. In 1896, when we were defeated, there were four French-speaking deputy ministers in various departments, while in 1911 only one was left. Things have improved since, for to-day there are three French-speaking deputy ministers.

The same discrimination is to be found in the various classes of the public service. One can go into many of the offices without being able to get any one who understands French, and a French Canadian who succeeds to an English official has to perform the same duties for a smaller remuneration. That is the case with the harbourmaster of

Quebec, the captain of the Princess, a boat of the Fisheries Department, etc. If a French Canadian seeks an appointment all sorts of qualifications are required of him that are not required of an English Canadian, or an English-born applicant. Oftentimes when an investigation is to be carried out in the province of Quebec, English-speaking judges or commissioners are appointed, who cannot speak French. Even in the management of the Intercolonial we have to submit to the most crying discrimination. Last year I quoted figures that bear out my statement. All our applications are thrown out. The reply is always sure to come: " No vacancy," or " Too late." On part of the Matapedia branch English travellers were allowed on certain trains, while a Frenchman was refused the same privilege.

But what is the use of attempting a complete enumeration of all our grievances? The list is too long. They are well known to all the French population of the Dominion; they have existed and continue to exist from generation to generation. People who have, as I have, the privilege of belonging to a family whose ancestors settled on Canadian soil at the beginning of the 17th century, ten generations back, know of all those facts.

My object in going into those few details is to have the House and the country understand more clearly the feelings of the French Canadians at the time war was declared. Tell me, Mr. Speaker, what has been done from the very start of the conflict to incite and induce French Canadians to do their bit. The Quebec members have never been consulted either on the appointment of recruiting officers or regimental officers or on war purchases. No horses were bought in my constituency, and of all the millions of dollars spent since the war began, not a cent was spent in the counties around the Gulf. Yet must I say to the credit of my constituents of Rimouski and Matane that all those insults have been brushed aside and we have nobly done our duty. Scores and scores of brave young soldiers from my constituency have fallen on the battlefields of Flanders and France and our quota of recruits amounts to over eight hundred men. The same credit is due the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé; their children generously answered the call. More than forty soldiers enlisted in my own parish of Sayabec. Three of my nephews are at the front, one of whom has only lately made the glorious sacrifice of his life at Vimy. From the start, our compatriots enlisted in large numbers in English regiments, where they had to submit to ill-treatment and abuse. As soon as French Canadian regiments got across, they were dismembered. Why not have allowed them to keep their identity and their officers? Necessities of war? Then why not have warned them? Was it right to enlist them under false pretenses? Why should they all be placed in the infantry and not be allowed to enlist in the artillery?

Those men were led to believe that they were going to the front with officers of their own race, with men they knew and whom they looked up to as to their fathers and protectors. Why, once in England, were they made to undergo tortures that recall the barbarous practices of mediaeval centuries? If I understand the information of a returned soldier, an intelligent man, who was wounded in action, soldiers are compelled for the slightest offence to run for ten hours within a fixed course, with a load of seventy-five pounds, and being allowed only five minutes rest every twenty minutes. Sometimes they are made to keep their arms stretched out for hours at a time. Those atrocities are reported and are not such as to help enlistment. I am told from the same source that such gross injustices without proper motive are committed that there have been soldiers who shot at their officers. Those reports circulated among a people accustomed to breathe the pure air of American freedom are no inducement for the slackers to join the ranks.

Who can wonder now, after all those insults and with such poor methods of securing recruits, that the French Canadians are not very anxious to accept the sacrifice, when they know beforehand that their merit and their gallantry on the battlefield will not be recognized, and that in many cases they will not even be allowed to wear the stripes of their rank.

I heard the hon. member for Rouville state that a Protestant clergyman by the name of Williams had been appointed head of recruiting in the province of Quebec. Where could be found a more odious and systematic persecution of a race proud of its past, conscious of its dignity and jealous of its destinies?

It must also be taken into account that 75 to 80 per cent of our population consists of farmers, and that to clear and break new land requires more hands than are required by the English farmers of the

western prairies or of the more favoured portions of Canada.

It must besides be considered that in almost all the English provinces the teaching of French in our own schools is discouraged where not completely proscribed, as in Manitoba and Ontario, although these provinces have been fertilized by the blood of French missionaries and settlers, so almost everywhere in the Dominion we have manifest injustices to complain of. Our schools are a standing grievance that rankles deep. When one thinks of the situation in which we are placed in every sphere of life, in the Civil Service, as regards our educational and even religious aspirations; when the methods of recruiting and the treatment meted out to us since the beginning of the war are taken into account, then one cannot blame my compatriots if, under those conditions, they hesitate before making the supreme sacrifice. I for one cannot find it in my heart to censure them, although I have never ceased preaching to them that they must do their duty, enlist in numbers, obliterate the past, ignore the present, turn their eyes away from the vexations to which they are subjected by a certain section of the people of the Dominion, and think only of Great Britain and of the true Britishers, who live across from France, and one of whom told me one day anent the persecutions we have to endure from those of his race in Canada: "Never mind them, they know not what they do. . . . .The true Britisher is on your side." When Belgium is devastated, laid waste, bleeding, because she would keep her pledge; when France's every soldier is proving himself a hero; when Canada's own welfare depends on the issue, and because Canada's first line of trenches, Canada's frontiers are now in Flanders, our gallant Canadian youth must not hesitate to make every sacrifice. We must prove our loyalty to the British Crown so long as the hour of our independence has not struck. France! Belgium! England! Long live they!

I have shown, I think, with figures that the province of Quebec has furnished as many Canadian-born soldiers as the other provinces, and that even if we have stood somewhat aloof, our conduct is fully justified by the attitude towards us of a certain bigoted and prejudiced section of the people, by the inefficient methods of recruiting resorted to by the Department of Militia from the start, and by the constant abuse to which we are subjected.

I say further: Stop these villainous attacks, call off your persecution of our language and our schools, especially in Manitoba and Ontario, and thousands of my compatriots will readily take up arms and jump into the trenches.

This rancour against the French of Canada is one of long standing. In 1846, when a Militia Bill was under consideration, Sir E. P. Taché addressed himself to his English countrymen in the following words, which I find in Mr. Henri Bourassa's book entitled: "What We Owe England":

> Only be fair to the French Canadians, and you will see that their gallant battalions will be the first to rush to the frontier and make of their bodies a rampart against any invasion. The habit has grown too far of calumniating those brave people; too frequently they are described as ungovernable malcontents; the press too often accuses them of disloyalty and sedition, claiming for the other race the exclusive practice of the opposite virtues. To those detractors I say: You are deceived; we appeal to the mother country; treat us as brothers and not as bastards and rest assured that we shall never forget our oath of allegiance to the day when the last shot shall be fired by a French Canadian in the defence of Great Britain.

In the third place, I claim that the mandate we received from the electorate in 1911 does not empower us to vote for the present Bill. Everywhere I spoke I pledged myself to oppose any appropriation to build a navy, or to hand over millions in aid of the British navy, and I have faithfully kept that pledge. Twice already I have stated in this House that the obligations we are imposing on Canada in this war are out of all proportion to our resources and our revenue, and I stand by that statement. The policy adopted in 1911 to oppose strenuously the proposals of the new Prime Minister should still actuate us in considering the Conscription Bill. Notwithstanding the statements to the contrary of our party leaders, I still hold to the opinion that voluntary enlistment, in the future as in the past, is the best mode of recruiting in Canada. We are told that men are needed to reinforce the units now at the front, but surely the entry of the United States into the war will bring to our armies a sufficient number of men to compensate to a large extent the help we might give at the expense of our agriculture and our industries, and at the risk of starving the Allies by reducing the production of our fields. National interest is averse to all other but voluntary enlistment. I may even vote against the amendment of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, because in a way it is a mitigated scheme of conscription in so far that should the referendum carry my right hon. friend

is pledged to compulsory service. In fact, it would be sure to carry, because it would rally a solid vote from the soldiers as well as their relatives and friends, as was pointed out by the hon. member from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), and that vote would be of itself sufficient to carry the referendum by an immense majority. I have received numerous petitions from the electors of my county, asking me to vote against any form of compulsory service, whether introduced by Sir Robert Borden or Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I have come to the conclusion that I should comply with the wishes of my electors. And in any case, what faith can we place in Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his party when we read the declarations made by him in the House of Commons at various times since the 12th of December, 1912? Does he not favour placing at the disposal of Great Britain all our resources, both in men and money, and for the further information of the hon. members, I shall quote what he stated in this House on December 12, 1912:

> This is the Australian policy; this ought to be the Canadian policy. I insist once more upon what is stated in the memorandum: There is no emergency, there is no immediate danger, there is no prospective danger. If there were an emergency, if England were in danger—no, I will not use that expression; I will not say if England were in danger, but simply if England were on trial with one or two or more of the great powers of Europe, my right hon. friend might come and ask, not $35,000,000, but twice, three times, four times $35,000,000. We would put at the disposal of England all the resources of Canada; there would not be a single dissentient voice. Oh, ye Tory jingoes, is that the amount of the sacrifice you are prepared to make? You are ready to furnish admirals, rear-admirals, commodores, captains, officers of all grades, plumes, feathers and gold lace; but you leave it to England to supply the bone and sinews on board those ships. You say that these ships shall bear Canadian names. That will be the only thing Canadian about them. You hire somebody to do your work; in other words, you are ready to do anything except the fighting.

And farther on:

> Is that the true policy? It is a hybrid policy, it is a cross between jingoism and nationalism. Unless I mistake the spirit of the Canadian people, if they are true to their ideals, if they are true to their own blood, no matter to what province they belong, they will not be satisfied with this hybrid policy, but they will insist that their contribution shall be a contribution of money and of men as well, as was provided in our resolution of 1909.
>
> Mr. Speaker, it is not money that England wants at this moment. England never was wealthier than she is at the present time; her coffers are overflowing. What she wants are the hearts, the brains and the brawn of her subjects all over the world.

After such statements can we believe that the right hon. leader of the Opposition is disposed to refuse his support to every scheme of compulsory service? Can we put stock in his amendment when he is well aware that a referendum might result in a majority in favour of conscription? As I am against all form of conscription, I have decided to vote against the Laurier amendment and the main motion and vote for the Barrette amendment, which would mean the death of the Bill.

Mr. M. MARTIN (St. Mary's, Montreal) (Translation): Will my hon. friend allow me to put a question?

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN (Translation): You stated just now that the referendum would likely carry. On what do you base your opinion?

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): I have stated my reasons. If you take the soldiers' votes, 400,000 of them, together with that of their relatives and friends, say 400,000 more, you have a total of 800,000, while in 1911 the total vote polled was only 1,300,000. Supposing that the number of electors has increased very little since 1911, then deduct 800,000 from 1,300,000 and we clearly would be a minority.

Mr. MARTIN (Translation): The soldiers overseas, from all reports, are more strongly against conscription than those in this country.

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): I do not believe it.

How can we manage to obtain immigrants from Europe, who come to America to enjoy liberty and freedom? After putting this Act on our statute-books, how can we hold out to them that in Canada they will be free from European militarism?

We are told that unless we send reinforcements we must withdraw our troops from the front. My reply is similar to what other hon. members have already said: If we cannot maintain four divisions, then let us have only three and if it is impossible to keep three to full strength, let us have only two, provided we stay within the bounds of our means and resources.

The other day I listened to the strong plea of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) in favour of an appeal to the people by way of a referendum, and I was taken aback at some of his statements. I was wondering whether I was listening to the same member for Rouville, to the same Postmaster General of the Laurier Cabinet, who in 1911, addressing a public meeting at St. Hyacinthe, denounced Bourassa?

Is he really the same Liberal leader who in the campaign of 1911 went from parish to parish decrying nationalism? Is he really that same Grit orator who since 1911 has constantly inveigled not only against Henri Bourassa but against all the Nationalists, because, forsooth, the latter, and it is their only crime, had advised Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberals to submit a referendum to the people at the time of the general elections in order to feel the pulse of the people on the question of a Canadian navy and that of free trade with the United States—

Mr. MARTIN (Translation): And of boring holes in the British flag—

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): What sudden happening is responsible for this sudden turning around of the hon. member for Rouville? Did the Liberal chieftain hold council with Mr. Bourassa and bargain for the support of the Nationalists by adopting their tenets and coming before the House to acknowledge that they were mistaken in 1911 and to repudiate all they said against Nationalism? Have they accepted all the policies we advocated then and are still ready to endorse on the same question, in order to take by storm the seats of the mighty?

Mr. DELISLE (Portneuf) (Translation): So you acknowledge having been elected as a Nationalist?

Mr. BOULAY (Translation): Certainly. Why then this alliance, this face about? The hon. member for Rouville alone can explain the enigma. If Mr. Bourassa and those who followed him in 1911 were traitors in defending their principles, what are we to believe of the hon. member for Rouville and all those who share his views on conscription? To me, their conversion appears somewhat strange and I view it with a certain amount of suspicion.

I will conclude my remarks with a few words in English. There are but few of our English-speaking friends in their places at this time, but I desire that these should understand a summary of what I have already said in French. Besides, it will show that we have the two languages in the province of Quebec including the county of Rimouski. In the early days of August, 1914, when Germany had declared war on France and Belgium, we French Canadians lived hours that were lengthened by great anxiety. The eyes of all our people were turned towards England, and we expected from moment to moment the despatch which would make known that she had decided to take her place by the side of France and Belgium. I must remind my French-speaking fellow-countrymen that we should have been the first to charge England with cowardice and treason if she had hesitated for one single day to give the assistance which those countries needed. We expected that England would enter the fight to save her honour, to show her reverence for treaties solemnly entered upon, to crush barbarism, and to defend her trade and her colonies. Every man learned in these matters, every public man, every man of sense, knew what would be the consequence for Canada should England enter the fight. Do not let anybody believe that the French Canadians are indifferent to this war, or are disregardful of the mother country, for they realize that in this time of trial she has done only what they wished her to do and is fulfilling their desires in carrying on the fight. In this life and death struggle Britain has always had our full sympathies. In the early days of the war a large number of French Canadians enlisted, and if the current of that enlistment has grown less since those early days, it is due to the fact with which I have already dealt in my remarks in French, and also to the fact that a large number of local leaders among the Liberals in the back parishes have done their best to stop it altogether. I blame in this connection also some persons of high standing in public life who have done exactly the contrary of what they should have done, and have created a condition of mind among the public of which, in the future, they may be the first to complain.

Let me quote as an example the case of my own village. I did what I could to encourage our young men to enlist, and I must say to the honour of my parish priest that from the very start of the war he acted in a manner befitting a minister of religion and a true and loyal citizen of the country. He used every means to encourage our boys to go to the front. And what was the result? Over forty men of our village have enlisted. Some of them have fallen gloriously on the field of battle, and many are wounded. What has been done in my village could have been done in a great many others, and I am confident that the same results would have followed.

Mr. MARTIN: With the permission of the hon. gentleman, I would ask if he has any sons?

Mr. BOULAY: I have no boys that could enlist. But I have just stated to the House that I have three nephews who could leave, and they have left.

Mr. MARTIN: But your sons?

Mr. BOULAY: My sons are married men and they have proper regard for the obligations which they have taken upon themselves.

In considering this whole question, we cannot lose sight of the facts of history. If England has been compelled to enter this frightful war in 1914, we cannot avoid believing that she is largely responsible for it, and that to-day she pays the penalty of the tenderness she showed for Germany in 1870. I remember well those mournful days in the history of France, when the roar of the enemy's guns resounded over her fair fields, and the papers brought us daily reports of the successive defeats of our old mother country. Our hearts were full of sorrow, for we were sharers in the misfortune of France. When France, torn and bleeding, signed the treaty which extorted from her Alsace-Lorraine and an indemnity of five billions of dollars, we French Canadians swore eternal hate of Germany; we anticipated the day when revenge would be taken; and meantime we held England largely responsible for the crushing of her brave neighbour. Now that England understands the situation, she realizes that she then committed the greatest political and commercial error of her national life in allowing the only nation to be crushed which could make a rampart for the protection of her trade. Now, she devotes all her energy to the defence of France and Belgium, and we applaud her efforts, and are ready, as we have been from the start, to uphold her in this fight in every way that is in our power. Every intelligent French Canadian admits that we must take part in this war; he knows that in doing so we are defending our homes, our wives, and our children. But the man of French blood does not like constraint; he does not like to be forced to do his duty, nor does he like, more than any other man, to be insulted because of his creed and because of his ideas of freedom.

Since the foundation of Quebec we have been exposed to vexations from our fellow-citizens of English speech. While we are discussing this Bill in this House German methods are used in Ottawa and in Toronto to restrict the liberty of French Canadians. While we are discussing what would be the best means of liberating the people of old Europe from slavery, the president of the French School Commission of Ottawa is in jail or is exposed to be put in jail. Five Christian Brothers, teachers in our schools, are tried in Toronto, charged with the awful crime of teaching French to little French boys. And Genest—what is his crime? Why he has paid the French school teachers. And all this while the blood of old France and of England is shed on the battlefield in a noble effort to crush German barbarism. In 1874 began for good the persecution against our schools in New Brunswick. In 1890, in Manitoba, and almost everywhere in the Dominion outside the province of Quebec our countrymen were suffering more or less from injustice. Nothing is more painful, nothing makes me feel more heartbroken, than to receive a letter from a French Canadian who writes in English because, as he explains, he has had no French education.

Fanaticism is the plague of our country; and such persecutions as those to which I have referred are the work of its supporters. They say that this is done in order to show us how to be good citizens. They are most anxious about the education of our children, and they want to teach them by force only the one language, when we want to teach them two. They do these things, they tell us, because also they are afraid of French domination over the whole of Canada. When have we intended or shown any desire for domination? How do we use our English-speaking citizens in the province of Quebec? I call on them to declare before this country how they are treated. Every French Canadian has a heartfelt respect for his neighbour, and no one need fear any compulsion from him, nor any effort dictated by ambition to impose our will or our creed upon others. What do we ask? What do we need? Liberty under just laws; the same liberty to practise our religion that we are willing to grant all others to practise theirs; liberty to teach our own language to our children. We know our own interests, and we do not expect the Orange Sentinel and its supporters, nor do we expect the Irish Catholics, to look after those interests. We know that if we wish to live and do business in this country our children must learn the English language. And from Gaspé to Ottawa, or Timiskaming, we are teaching our children English as we have opportunity. We need nobody to show us the advisability of this course, as we need nobody to exercise coercion upon us.

To bring peace in this Canada of ours is very simple; leave us alone and give us justice. Is this asking too much?

As to the situation immediately under discussion in this House, I suggest the following as a remedy: Give the voluntary system of enlistment another trial. Ask all members of Parliament, all public men, all clergymen in the province of Quebec, to use their personal influence with those of their compatriots with whom they come in contact. Guarantee to all who enlist that the unity of the battalions formed on this side shall be maintained in the field until their annihilation. Let the people of Ontario stop their campaign against our faith, and our traditions. But above all, and first of all, erase from the statutes of all provinces in the Dominion all provisions forbidding the teaching of French. If a new campaign of voluntary enlistment is entered upon, with the proper men to carry it out, I am sure that the French blood that flows in our veins, the same blood that flows in the veins of the heroic Frenchmen overseas, will cause our people to do their duty to the utmost limit.

But, on the contrary, if you undertake to exercise compulsion, the result will disappoint your expectations. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) has given a pretty good idea of the attitude and state of mind of the people of the province of Quebec and the situation which will result if an attempt is made to enforce conscription upon them. I hope I have made the situation clear enough to be understood by every man in this country, even the least far-seeing. There is time yet to avert that situation. Later on it may be too late and the link of Confederation may be severed in this struggle for life. The announcement that our schools shall be free everywhere in Canada would be greeted with delight and from the highest to the lowest amongst the French Canadian people the appreciation would be so great that thousands of men would offer their lives willingly and would be happy to die for the liberty of the world and of Canada

Mr. PAUL ARTHUR SEGUIN (L'Assomption): Mr. Speaker, the question which we are now debating is beyond a doubt the most serious of all that has ever been introduced in the Parliament of Canada. I would, therefore, like to discuss it on its actual merits and, to such an end, I wish to lay aside all personal interest, all party interest as well as all false sentimentality. At the risk of shocking a certain number of my friends on the other side and, who knows, some of my fellow-member on this side of the House, I contend that, in order to handle this delicate and ticklish question, to see it, in a word, in its proper light, I am obliged to carefully cut out certain high sounding words which have indeed a fine effect in phraseology, but which, also, are apt to falsify logic, such as "patriotism", "Empire", "flag", "civilization", "freedom of the people", and what not?

Before entering into the main subject, I may well be allowed, I imagine, to make a digression and express my astonishment at a thing which would seem incredible, were we not passing through an epoch wherein the most incredible facts are still the most current ones in our daily life. And that incredible, astounding fact, is the promise which the hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) has made to the Imperial authorities of an army of five hundred thousand men, whereby we may be compelled to enlist from 50,000 to 100,000 more Canadians to be sent over to the battlefields of the old world.

We have then reached that point, in the democratic country which is, or better, which was ours, on this land of all sound liberties, upon this vast area of soil where both political parties have always made it a duty to act only through the popular will, we have then reached that point, do I say, where we are at the mercy of a Government leader who dares to make promises, without previously consulting either his ministers or the members of the House, and for less this good people who pay, indeed more than ever before, since they are giving their money and their blood, but have no more, alas! the privilege of governing.

I have just said "without consulting his ministers" and I do not believe I am wrong, since, during his memorable recruiting campaign, the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) has never missed an opportunity to prophesy, as pythoness-like as possible, that we never would have military conscription in this country, and that, within fifteen days, at the most, before the hon. Prime Minister's return; and I do not believe I am wrong, for the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) always answered with his most sunshiny, his most know-it-all and his most negative smile to every one who would put to him the troublesome question: "When is conscription coming?" Besides, the noble attitude taken by the latter, in giving up his seat in the Cabinet, proves that he had not been consulted. As to the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny), I will say nothing, because everybody knows that he has retained

Dorchester only by the strength of his arguments against compulsory service.

And to think that there are still some foolish people—among whom I am obliged to class myself—who are still capable of a certain astonishment!

I will now come to the main question and plainly state, from the very start,—what, I am sure, will surprise no one—that I am squarely opposed to any form of military conscription, be it called "selective" or any other name, except that only conscription which would have for its object the actual defence of the Canadian soil against invaders.

The reasons for my opposition are various, and I owe it to myself as well as to my constituents to make a review of them.

In the first place, we do not have, any of us, the required mandate to vote conscription. It is a very fine thing to be most zealous and to work for the Empire's safety, but yet must we have a mandate to do it. There is no use concealing the facts, let us frankly ask one another the question: Whom do we represent here? There is no other possible answer than this one: We represent nobody. Our mandate has expired almost a year ago, and if we are here, it is not by the will of the people; it is not our electors who maintain us here, since we are here by the will of a power that has nothing in common with our people but the sole colonial tie which binds us to Great Britain. If, therefore, our mandate is defunct, since we are sitting here without representing anybody, by what right could we go and vote such a coercive measure as that of conscription?

Should we, without a mandate, settle matters of administration or continue attending to routine, we might escape censure. But that, without any mandate, we should pass an Act which interests the people not only in their welfare, not only in their material tranquility, but which concerns the very lives of their sons, I contend that it would be taking the most arbitrary, the most unjust and the most iniquitous step possible. More than that, even were we sitting here by the popular will, even if our mandate were not expired and had we full power to legislate upon matters of public order, I contend that it would still be unjust, arbitrary and iniquitous to pass a law imposing military conscription, without previously consulting our constituents on such a question.

But another question arises: Has it ever been recorded in the world's history that compulsory military service had been enforced on the inhabitants of a colony, except for the defence of its territory? I do not think so. Is not the gaping chasm which lies between colonist and citizen quite apparent to all? Is it then so long ago that, in the mother country they referred to colonists with undisguised contempt? How, I ask you, could the order be given to colonists: You shall leave your country, you will abandon your families without any protection, your land at the mercy of any foe that may come, and you will cross the sea to come and defend the mother country. I repeat it, it is sheer madness.

More than 420,000 of these colonials have already enlisted to fight for the mother country. This is not the proper time to look into the motives which induced them to enlist. We know that they have gone overseas but we do not know how many will ever come back. I would like to see inscribed in golden letters the names of those heroes in the annals of this country. But I fear very much that this wish will never come true. Colonials are often called upon to build empires, but very seldom do their names get into the pages of history.

So, 420,000 young men have enlisted. That does not include the Frenchmen, the Belgians, the Russians, the Italians who answered the call of their mother country and left our shores at the beginning of the war to join the colours. Those reservists must have numbered at least 15,000 or 20,000, so that between 430,000 and 440,000 people from this country, of all nationalities, have answered the call.

Our mixed population does not comprise exclusively French Canadians and English Canadians; all the races are represented here, foes and friends alike. Germans, Austrians, Turks and Bulgarians are to be found in great number among our population. We have also many representatives of the neutral countries: Sweden, Norway, Holland, Spain, etc. We have besides our native Indians reserves, as well as those made up of foreign immigrants. If we deduct from our total population the representatives of all these foreign nationalities that cannot be forced to join the colours, I maintain that in proportion to our population, we have put forth a greater effort than the mother country.

It is not only with man power that we can help win the war. I am inclined to think that the Government, from the start, have overlooked that great truth. I will not speak of the irretrievable omission, but confine my remarks to the blunders that it is not too late to undo if the Government

will only set themselves earnestly to the task.

We are told that more men are wanted in Europe. Why then do you not use compulsion in regard to the Frenchmen, the Belgians, the Italians and the Russians, as well as the Englishmen, that have taken refuge in this country? Why do you not oblige them to join their respective regiments? I mean, of course, those of military age. We have not to concern ourselves with their physical fitness or the state of their health. In their country they could at least replace those who are forced to do duty behind the lines.

Among the slackers I have mentioned the Englishmen, the British-born. I am doing it, mark, without the least ill-will, but is it fair to keep here, in the Civil Service or in our large corporations so many young Englishmen that the Colonial Office have sent to this country? Is it just to leave them undisturbed when we are sending, under compulsion, our own fellow-citizens to fight for the safety of the Empire? Let the Government make up a list of all those slackers in all the departments and you will be astonished to see what fine regiments could be raised in that way.

Has the Government done all in their power to help win the war? Why then, even at this very late date, are Germans, and Germans and still more Germans to be found in all the departments of the Civil Service? There are Germans in the Department of Agriculture, even amongst the chief clerks. There are Germans at the Observatory, in the Department of Militia, in the Department of Mines, everywhere.

For the last three years the public have been wondering at this state of affairs and to all our questions the Government have been satisfied with making the same answer: "These Germans are good Germans." Good Germans, indeed, for they never miss an opportunity to help their country. If I am asked for the proof, I find it in a report "Products and By-Products of Coal" which has been brought to my notice by the directors of a well known institution of learning, in my country. This report has been prepared by Mr. Stansfield, with a wish, I suppose, to please his chief, Mr. Eugene Haanel, one of those good Germans, who is the head of the Mining Division in the report deals with the dye industry and here are some of the things that are to be found in that report:

> In confirmation of the above statement that it is at present impraticable to found a coal-tar dye industry in Canada, the following paragraphs are quoted from an interview with Dr. Bernhard C. Hesse, of New York.

In other words, as a proof of our inferiority and our shortcoming in the industrial field, the author of the report offers the opinion of a German. That seems to me to be the limit, especially when it is known that the interview mentioned in the report is dated September 14, 1914, that is to say, during the war, and that the report itself has been printed in 1915.

In this most disinterested opinion, one may read very edifying sentences, such as the following; for instance:

> Germany's supremacy in this field has been for more than 30 years a standing challenge not only to the chemists and capitalists of the United States, but to the chemists and capitalists of all the rest of the world as well.
>
> The truth seems to be that the whole of this industry cannot be successfully transplanted, and attempts to transplant part only have not resulted in any selft-contained and independent industry anywhere, but in an industry the real roots of which are still in German soil.

How delicate a matter, is it not, to boom the country of "Kultur" in one of the Canadian Government departments! It is harmless, will I be told, and nothing can result of it; well, I for one, find in these lines an insult to the Anglo-Saxon race as well as to the French race, in pretending that they are inferior to the German race in any line of industry. But it is good Germans who write it, and you cannot touch it, for during the last three years that war is being waged, this Government keeps them with a most paternal solicitude in the fat jobs they enjoy to the detriment of the real Canadians, who could fill such positions with as much ability and, in any case, with a keener sense of proportion.

Do you want another example? I will surprise no one when I state that the secretary of the Minister of Marine is a German. Why is it necessary that a German should fill this important office? I don't know. A naturalized German, it is true; but it must be admitted that, at the outbreak of war, it was a most wise thing for the Germans to be naturalized, and it might be added that naturalization, just like a minister's promise, does not amount to much. Now, if I am well informed, the said secretary had a near relation of his, a German like himself and, like him also, probably naturalized at the beginning of the war. This German enlisted in the Canadian army; he was made a sergeant and he took part in the battle of Courcelette. He was neither wounded nor killed he only disappeared and some time later he was reported prisoner in Germany. In a letter he wrote to one of his old comrades,

he complained of the Teuton's barbarity that condemned him to occupy his leisure time in a shell factory. The farce is evident; if that man had not been a spy, he would not, being a German, have escaped the firing squad where the Germans have always sent any of their own they found fighting against them. But nothing of this must be reported to our Government who have such overweening regard for the Civil Service officials of German origin.

Let us return to this conscription question. I have said that Canada has done her share. I have said that considering, on the one hand, our numbers as a people and, on the other hand, the number of those who enlisted, it may be said that we have made a greater effort than the British people. I do not say that we should stop recruiting, but I do say that our past record is a guarantee for the future. I submit that a compulsory service Bill will not result in a marked increase in the number of enlisted soldiers and that it will be a menace to peace at home. I contend that just now, the best means of bringing about final victory is the organisation of our economic resources. The day is not distant when we shall be asked to contribute, not soldiers but food. What is our Government doing to provide for the years of dearth that are forthcoming? Do they indeed beleive that the 400,000 or 500,000 men who have gone have not caused an awful gap in every branch of the trade as well as of commerce. Labour has become so scarce in the country places that our farmers are unable to cultivate all their lands; they are already anxiously asking themselves how they will be able to take in their crops. Have our Government done anything to prevent the alarming increase in the cost of living? The speculators are keeping on their work at their heart's content; those who govern won't listen and they look in other directions. One thing only concerns them: to send more men to the mother country. The only fixed idea of our Prime Minister is the fulfilment of the promise which the overseas military authorities have wrung from him; it is his nightmare, his obsession: one hundred thousand men!... one hundred thousand men!... He must find them at any price. The trusts are about to starve our people; no matter—one hundred thousand men!—If the Government does not attend to it immediately, we will have this winter, in spite of the controller, a dreadful dearth of fuel; no matter, one hundred thousand men! Agriculture and the national trades

are short of hands; no matter, one hundred thousand men! It is useless to try and argue, so long as those hundred thousand men have not come out of Jupiter's thigh. We should not forget that Canada's population is so much the sparser that the country covers an immense territory. But the friends of conscription see men everywhere; they don't see anything else; they forget that the men are indispensable to the good working of our economic machinery in every one of its wheels.

It may be that the moving picture theatres in the large centres, that the pool rooms and the shows are filled with idle youths. Do you think conscription will reach these boys? Seventy-five per cent of these cigarette smokers are not fit to pass the medical test and half of the rest are rich men's sons whom protection will keep away from the rosters.

There is a question which it is my duty to touch upon here. I do it with a certain hesitation, for it is an exceedingly delicate one. It is that of the province of Quebec and of her present situation as regards the other provinces. The French Canadians have been upbraided for their indifference in the present conflict and for their reluctance to answer the call of the mother-country. Were we to believe certain fanatical sheets of the English provinces, and also some members of this House, the province of Quebec, and especially the French Canadians, remained absolutely deaf to that call. Exaggerations were resorted to, in order to make abuses easier. Other English papers and also other English speaking members, more honest, more loyal and more broad-minded, have replied to these calumniators and that is sufficient. If I refer to it here, it is only to try and show that the French Canadians' situation at the present hour is an exceptional one. Shall I be rightly understood when I say that the instinct of preservation, the strongest sentiment that exists, is leading the French Canadians in spite of themselves? There are English Canadians—and legions of them—who are English before being Canadians and who, unsuspectingly, are ready to sacrifice the interests, even the future, of the colony to those of their mother country. I do not wish to blame them, for their blood is up, and blood will tell. But neither can they blame my fellow-people for being Canadians before being British, and even for being French Canadians before being only Canadians. In this case also, blood must tell.

Yes, without suspecting it, the racial instinct is at work among us French Can-

adians. Instinctively, we feel that it would be dangerous for us to weaken ourselves beyond measure, because we know that for the struggle to come, we can rely only on our own forces. Foreign immigration benefits only the English element in this country: Irishmen, Swedes, Scotchmen, Americans, Germans, Norwegians, Finlanders, Austrians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Turks or Doukhobors, all, in a hundred years hence, will have dissolved themselves in the English element, having its character, its language, its manners and its ideal. No one, except a few Frenchmen or Belgians, will have joined the French Canadian race. We must, I repeat it, depend only on our own resources. Now, instinct does not reason in face of a danger. The French Canadian is attached to his land, to his soil, to his old province; persuade him, if you can, to go and get killed for the salvation of the Empire, he will go; but do not attempt to send him there by force; he will cling to his green maples, and you will find that his arms are too robust for you to break their grip. For the French Canadian does not see things in the same light as the English Canadian does; and the great pity of it all is that the English Canadian cannot or will not understand that there are always different ways of considering a question. Will you say that we lack patriotism? Let any foe, whoever he may be, invade the old soil so dear to every Canadian and then you may judge our patriotism. The facts of our past history would be renewed. And if ever Canada were to suffer an invasion, the foe would soon see more Salaberrys arise. But it is useless, absolutely useless to attempt to impose conscription upon a people that does not want it, because it has its own reasons for not wanting it.

If there be so much loyalty in the other provinces, if those provinces are so eager to go and win glory upon the European fields of battle, why don't they impose conscription upon themselves? There is nothing to prevent them from doing so. Must Quebec be at the fore, for others to jump in? My opinion, I will state it frankly, is that, at the bottom, the sister provinces are very glad to witness the opposition made by the province of Quebec and which may perhaps turn to their own benefit. Have a referendum upon this conscription question, and of the nine provinces, there will be nine to vote against it. This referendum is a necessity; it is for the people to decide this question. Is it because a negative answer is feared that the imposition of conscription is wanted? It really would be unfortunate, if this fact was lost sight of, that it is not all to pass this Act, but that its most important phase would be the carrying out of its provisions. It would also be its most difficult feature. If the people do not want conscription—and you could only know that by consulting them—will the mere fact that you have passed that law make them change their minds and bring them bound hands and feet at your disposal? And if this measure becomes law, and you attempt to enforce it; if, when it has become a law, you should try and impose it and the people should refuse, what will you do? Have you ever considered, you, the friends of conscription, what may be the outcome of it all?

You want to pass this law because the time is short, do you say; that is why you refuse to ask the people their opinion and that, deliberately, you propose to do a monstrous act? Is not that a false pretence? If, instead of shifting as they have been doing, the Government had honestly understood their duty and had submitted the question to the people, they would already know where they stand. The people are and must remain the masters of their destinies; the Government forget that the people are the masters and that we, the members, are only their servants. Under present circumstances, the Government seem to intend making of the people a herd of slaves.

I have refrained from discussing the merits of this Bill; much could be said on that subject; but it would only be a waste of time and useless trouble, for, even if it were perfect and a model act in its kind, I would still feel obliged to vote against such a bill, believing that the people, and the people alone, I repeat it, have the right of deciding so momentous question.

I could not conclude without saying a word of praise and of admiration toward the Liberal party's revered leader. In refusing, as he has done, to associate with the ministers for the passing of a compulsory enlisting Act, he has set an example of that true democracy that does respect the rights and the obligations of the citizens. He has avoided the snare laid for him. He has devoted his life to the building up of the Canadian country; his efforts have always had for their object to make of Canada a united nation in the Empire. To-day, through the Government's action, Canada reverts once more to the status of a mere crown colony, crouching under the imperialist rod. He who had dreamed of a Canada greater, stronger and prouder, will not bear the responsibility for such a downfall before history. More than ever before, I am happy to follow in the footsteps of a worthy leader and I shall vote with plea-

sure for the amendment of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, who wants the people to be consulted before the tax of blood is imposed upon them.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE (Montreal, St. James): Mr. Speaker, having followed very attentively the different phases of the debate on this important question, and having devoted the best study and reflection possible to me to the issue which the present Bill establishes, I have come to the conclusion that my first impressions were right, and that my determination to oppose conscription, under any form, was well founded. I have the honour of representing a very large and important section of the city of Montreal; thousands of my electors have conveyed to me, in different ways and at different times, both individually and collectively, their desire that I should voice their views and opinions by opposing any form of coalition government, any further extension of Parliament, and any project of conscription. And I may say, in passing, that the hon. member who represents another very important section of the city of Montreal has himself admitted that from his own division he has received many and many petitions against conscription. Therefore, there is no doubt that I have truly grasped the views of my constituents and represent their opinions when I say I am against conscription. Such being the unanimous will of my electors, and such being my own inclination, I will trespass but briefly on the indulgence of the House, while I set forth some of the many reasons which urge me to adopt the stand I have taken on this occasion.

I need not at this moment refer any further to the coalition question, because that seems now to be a dead issue. As to the prolongation of the parliamentary term beyond the period already accorded, I will reserve for the appearance of such a proposal all argument in opposition to it. However, I cannot refrain from making one statement, which applies to the general trend of the present Government's policy and which concerns the idea of extension of Parliamentary terms. Eighty years ago, in Upper and Lower Canada, our fathers fought against the Family Compact and the bureaucracy of that day, and succeeded in securing for their sons the boon of popular representation thirty years later, in 1867. It has flourished and borne fruit for fifty years; and I object to celebrate the half-century of our Confederation by either the uprooting of that tree, or the splitting of it into fragments by driving in the wedge, under blows of an Imperialistic hammer, that is calculated to deprive our children of its protection, its shade and its fruits.

The immediate question under discussion is that of conscription; and on that I desire to register my emphatic opposition to any such scheme. I do so all the more heartily, because I am deeply convinced that it is a menace to the constitutional liberties that we have been taught to expect and that we have ever enjoyed under the protection of the British flag. I do so because, in my mind, it is an insult to the manhood and patriotism of Canadians. I do so because it is the outcome of hysterical sentiments created by the overstrain upon the nerves of public men by the conditions of unrest in the world to-day. I do so on account of the manner in which it has been sprung upon a people long led to believe that no such scheme was in contemplation. I do so, above all, on account of the autocratic spirit that underlies its conception, its presentation and its prosecution.

Bear with me a moment while I attempt to explain: There are two great and antagonistic principles animating the contending Powers in this terrible war. On the side of the Central Powers, Germany and her allies, we find the standard of autocracy raised and the doctrine of brute force and Kaiserism preached with fire, sword and shell. On the side of Great Britain, France and her allies, we see the standard of democratic freedom lifted aloft and the sublime doctrine of popular liberty and constitutional rights advocated in accents of thunder. It is for the triumph of that democracy over the monster of autocracy that Canada has joined in this struggle, and that she has freely, loyally, unshackled and uncoerced, sent forth to the conflict far more than a fair proportion of her manhood. The methods adopted by the Government of to-day to attempt to implement the unreflecting promise of an over-excited Prime Minister, are in exact accordance with the autocratic spirit against which the Allies are fighting, and for the destruction of which this very measure is supposed to have been conceived and introduced. The refusal of the Government, which has long out-lived its constitutional existence, to allow the people of Canada to have a voice in the issue or a word in the deciding of the fate of their dearest and most precious assets, is purely and simply the illustration in this land of the Kaiserism of Europe, and the putting into harsh practice here of the methods that have raised the indignation and the

battle spirit of the civilized world. Elected in times of peace, with a mandate to administer the affairs of a country in a state of tranquility, the Government, having reached the end of its term, makes use of the war excuse to cling to power and to avoid a verdict from those who gave its members their original mandate.

As far as carrying on the affairs of Canada, with a view to performing a fair and rational duty in this struggle is concerned, the Opposition has never declined to lend every possible assistance to the Government; but, when it comes to a radical change in national conditions, and to the introduction of methods savouring strongly of coercion and compulsion, it is the inalienable right of the people of this Dominion—the people whose lives and blood are given to the cause, and whose money and sacrifices foot the terrible debt of the nation—to be consulted and to have a voice in this sudden dislocation of their destiny. Had the Government consulted the people first, we would know what they had to say regarding this measure; but to promise that conscription would never be resorted to, to then hurl it unexpectedly at the head of the nation, to do so in a most autocratic and Prussian-like manner, and then, to tell us, if not in words at least in actions, that all the magnificent voluntary achievements of Canada must be wiped off the page of our war-history, and that we are to be presented to the world as a nation of cowards, whose participation in the struggle had to be forced by the lash of conscription; to do all this is unspeakably unjust to Canada and can have but two results: that of keeping a dead Government in apparent and deceptive life for a brief time longer, and of placing the stigma of poltroonery on the character of the Canadian people for all time to come. The Government to-day represents the spirit of German autocracy; the Opposition represents the democratic and liberty loving spirit if the Allies. Listening to the advocates of conscription, one would be glad to believe that the entire fate of the Allied nations in this war depended upon Canada, and the fifty or one hundred thousand men that she could add to her contingents already at the front or on their way there. Is it conceivable to any rational mind that Great Britain entered upon this war with the expectation of having to rely upon distant and thinly populated Canada to ensure her success? Does any one imagine for a moment that the fate of the millions in arms on the vast expanses of the battle grounds of Europe can be affected more or less by the addition of another 100,000 from Canada? The plain fact is that our additional contingent would not be more than a drop of water in the bucket, as far as the ultimate result of the war is concerned. And it is more so on account of the two-fold fact that the fresh contingent would be necessarily undisciplined and unprepared men, and that, being recruited by main force, it would naturally consist of real slackers. Slackers are men who can go, but will not go of their own free will, but who are none the less cowards when forced into uniform. After the magnificent showing made by Canada, after the four hundred thousand of heroic and voluntarily enlisted brave fellows, we are going to send a division of cowards and slackers to represent this country in the belligerent camps of the Continent. Is not that a disheartening proposal—one of the most unpatriotic ever conceived by a Government?

I have heard and read the speeches of some of those prominent, and I trust sincere, Liberals who spoke on this question, and who announced their determination to vote against the amendment presented by the leader of the Opposition. In particular, did I note the remarkable and extraordinary speech of the hon. member for South Renfrew—one of the leading Ontario members of the Opposition party. In all that speech, as well as in the others I refer to, there was not the shadow of a shade of reason for their opposition to the amendment, while they each and all advanced every legitimate reason why they should not vote as they have announced. The attitude of these gentlemen on this issue has but confirmed more and more my views that our leader was right, as he has always been right and as subsequent circumstances have invariably proven him to be right. The amendment calls for a pronouncement from the people of Canada upon this the most vital question since that of Confederation, and either a referendum or a general election can alone clear the atmosphere and make it possible for any Government to proceed in a constitutional manner and with the sanction of the people of Canada.

I will not be a party to robbing the immense electorate of this Dominion of the right to say who shall administer the affairs of the country, and in what manner the Government is expected to fulfill its mandate. I am against conscription. I demand elections. The spirit of imperialistic autocracy that introduced this measure is the

same that dictated the coercion laws of England against Ireland, and of Russia against Poland. England and Russia both fight against that same spirit to-day; our fathers fought against it in '37, and Canada is not to be set back eighty years in her advancement along the highway of liberty, and of representation by the people and for the people.

The fault for all lack of recruiting in Ontario, in Quebec, and elsewhere in Canada has been sufficiently and amply laid at the door of the Government by the various speakers who addressed the House, be they for or against conscription, on this side. I need not go over that overwhelming proof of the Government's mismanagement, and its effort to hide its own failures by casting the blame on the people of Canada, and making the world believe that compulsory measures were necessary with our population. But I will strongly insist on the Government's lack of policy in not giving the proper inducements to recruits.

The story is a sad one. No man who has gone to the front has had any assurance that if he were killed, or wounded, his own family at home would be provided for by the country in whose service he sacrificed either his life or his future; no system of pensions, no adequate remuneration, no guarantee that the members of the soldier's family would not be pauperized and left on the charity of the public.

Throughout Canada there are tens of thousands to-day who have not met with even the paltry fair treatment that was expected of the Canadian Government by the men who went freely to the front. What we need more than conscription is some practical and effective method of safeguarding the families of the men who have enlisted. In the trenches to-day there are numbers whose hearts are sore, thinking of the misery they have left behind them for those who depended on them for comfort and livelihood. This has been one huge deception from beginning to end.

I cannot but emphasize the statement that errors have been committed, and are still being committed, in recruiting. I will read a letter to this effect written to the editor of the Citizen, Ottawa, under the heading of "National Service all Round", and signed " Equal Rights."

I concur absolutely in what he says in the letter, which reads as follows:—

National Service All Round.

Editor, Citizen.—Of course, if Conscription of manhood is necessary, it should be accompanied by conscription of wealth.

[Mr. L. A. Lapointe.]

It is comforting for men above military age to talk of sending their younger compatriots to fulfil their duty in the trenches, but do they think that the younger ones alone have a duty to perform? Do they think that the sacrifices should be borne by one class only of men?

On one side, a certain class of the community is asked to renounce all that they have earned by diligent and hard work, and to go to the trenches, where they may have to lay down their lives on the altar of the country.

On the other hand, those who are no more deserving, no more hard working, but who happen to be a few days above the age limit, or who are under some maybe small physical disabilities, will remain very comfortably in their homes, keeping their positions, getting big salaries, and making no sacrifice whatever, just as if they were not the least concerned in the preservation of the country.

Let me mention a few cases that will illustrate the situation. They are not special cases; thousands of them will happen.

A young man, 28 years of age, has by his hard work, assiduity, and good behaviour risen to the position of accountant in a bank or commercial institution, where he gets a salary of $1,500 to $2,000 per year. Satisfied that his future is good, he has got married and is the father of one or two babies. He has taken life insurance to protect his wife and children in case of a sudden or premature death. His future looks bright, his home cheerful, and the world smiles on him. The call comes for his class; he knows that war is a terrible thing and that he must answer, and he goes. What is the result for him? Disaster, absolute and irreparable. He forfeits his position. The paltry $20 or $30 a month that the Government hands to his wife, added to his princely pay of $1.10 a day, are just sufficient to prevent his family from dying of hunger. The home has to be closed, the insurance policy dropped, and if the worst happens and his life is taken, his wife and children, for whom he had created a bright future, are condemned to misery and drudgery all their lives.

The same applies to all other cases of successful young clerks, promising business men, skillful apprentices, steadfast labourers and workers. And at the same time that they put on khaki, their companions, not called by the war, will step into their positions, enjoy all the advantages, get the pay, and sacrifice nothing. Whilst those who donned khaki will be shedding their blood, the manufacturers, the rich, the millionaires will be heaping up new millions. Whilst the wives and children of the soldiers will be mourning them and working at starvation wages for a living, the

wives and children of those who have not gone will be displaying expensive dresses, riding in luxurious limousines, holding dogs on their knees, the food for which the soldiers' children would probably not be able to get.

Conscription of manhood means for some sacrifice of all, for the others sacrifice of nothing. What should be done, for sacrifice there must be? If the services of men on the farm, in the munition factories, in the offices, which are rated as indispensable, are worth $4, $5 or $10 a day, is it not just that the services of men who are indispensable in the trenches should be paid as much? The advantage would still be with the home work, for it entails no danger.

Surely a country which is willing to pay high wages to its mechanics, its business men, etc., should not bargain to pay less than equal wages to those who are giving their blood in its defence!

Of course, all those whose purse would be touched by such a measure will raise their hands to heaven and say that it is impossible, that it would ruin the country. It shows their sincerity, when they talk of sacrificing the last dollar. Their motto is: make the others sacrifice their last drop of blood, and their last dollar. I wonder if the Government would ever attain its object should this Bill be put into force. I doubt it very much. I presume that the Bill will unfortunately get its second reading and then I will have an opportunity of discussing its clauses in Committee of the Whole. I reserve to myself the right at that stage to express my views on the different clauses of this Bill; but I cannot let this occasion pass without giving it a proper title. Instead of calling it a Bill of Conscription, I would rather call it a Bill of Exemptions, Exceptions and Patronage. I have got only to put before the House section 11 as an example. It is as follows:

11. (1) At any time before a date to be fixed in the proclamation mentioned in section four, an application may be made, by or in respect of any man in the class or subclass called out by such proclamation to a local tribunal established in the province in which such man ordinarily resides, for a certificate of exemption on any of the following grounds.

Remember this is before the Bill is in force at all. Follow now closely the exemptions, and tell me if there is any rational expectation of securing recruitment by means of this unique, useless and vexatious enactment? Subsection (a) provides:

(a) That it is expedient in the national interest that the man should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he is habitually engaged

Practically every man in Canada would come within this exemption.

(b) That it is expedient in the national interest that the man should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he wishes to be engaged and for which he has special qualifications.

Still worse: it is made optional to work at what suits him best.

(c) That it is expedient in the national interest that, instead of being employed in military service, he should continue to be educated or trained for any work for which he is then being educated or trained.

Every student and apprentice in Canada could take advantake of this paragraph.

(d) That serious hardship would ensue, if the man were placed on active service, owing to his exceptional financial or business obligations or domestic position;

Where is the man whose financial or domestic relations and conditions might not be invoked as an exemption?

(e) Ill health or infirmity;

This is simply a question of getting a certificate from a doctor. If a man was sick in the morning he could get a certificate from the doctor and be exempted by the tribunal.

(f) That he conscientiously objects to the undertaking of combatant service and is prohibited from so doing by the tenets and articles of faith, in effect at the date of the passing of this Act, of any organized religious denomination existing and well recognized in Canada at such date, and to which he in good faith belongs.

And if any of the grounds of such application be established, a certificate of exemption shall be granted to such man.

The faith of almost every Christian claims "Thou shalt not kill." My hon. friend the member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) has a strong plea here for his anti-hanging theories.

I go further. When we take these exemptions as a whole, the judges may, in their discretion go so far as to keep at home men who would have liked to go voluntarily, and I know that some would take advantage of all these general exemptions. I am told that already some members of this House have written to certain of their electors telling them that they should bring their sons to their farms.

As you see, Mr. Speaker, the Bill does not stipulate in clear and precise terms the exemptions, but formulates a general exemption after the creating of the different

tribunals for registering, appeals, etc., all the people exercising their discretion in virtue of clause 11. I contend that this clause would render the Bill futile and useless, because there will be so much discretion exercised in virtue of it and other clauses that conscripts will be very few.

Why should the Government create such perturbation and general disturbance in this country by introducing such a Bill, at such a time, for the levy of a few thousand men, when, according to the Government's admission, there are still 126,000 soldiers and officers of all ranks in England who have not yet crossed over to France, and when everybody can see scores of others in khaki parading the streets of our cities, who have perhaps been enlisted for years but have never been instructed to go overseas? In the face of so much duplicity, deception and maladministration I cannot but register with my whole heart and soul a vote against this impracticable, anti-Canadian and unpatriotic measure—against all forms of conscription, of tyranny, autocracy—against all attempts to reduce to ashes the liberties of the Canadian people and the constitutional autonomy of Canada.

It is needless for me to repeat what has been clear to this House ever since this debate began, that my province and my people are the objects of unjust and unpatriotic attack. Were I to raise my voice in their defence, it might be claimed that I am speaking for those to whom I belong and in whom I have a special interest. I prefer to hear the voice of one not of my race, not of my province, not of Canada; I prefer to leave the floor, so to speak, to one whose place in the ranks of British authorship must command respect, and whose patriotism has won for him a high station amongst the men of thought, of culture and of weight in the British Empire. Instead of my own feeble voice, I will ask you to listen to the powerful and influential expression of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle:

The French Canadians.

I do want to take my hat off once again to the French Canadian. He came of a small people. At the time of the British occupation, I doubt if there were more than a hundred thousand of them, and yet the mark they have left by their bravery and activity upon this continent is an ineffacable one. You pass right through the territory of the United States, down the valleys of the Illinois and of the Mississippi, and everywhere you come across French names: Marquette, Joliet, St. Louis, Mobile, New Orleans. How come these here? It was the French Canadian who, when the English colonies were still clinging to the edge of the ocean, pushed round from the north into the heart of the land. French Canadians first traversed the great American rivers and sighted the American Rockies. Keep farther north and still their footsteps are always marked deep in the soil before you. Cross the whole vast plain of Central Canada, and reach the mountains. What is that called, you ask? That is Mount Miette. And that? That is Tête Jaune. And that lake? It is Lake Brulé. They were more than scouts in front of an army. They were so far ahead that the army will take a century yet before it reaches their outposts. Brave, enduring, light-hearted, romantic, they were and are a fascinating race. The ideals of the British and of the French stock may not be the same, but while the future of the country must surely be upon British lines, the French will leave their mark deeply upon it. Five hundred years hence their blood will be looked upon as the aristocratic and distinctive blood of Canada, and even as the Englishman is proud of his Norman ancestors, so the most British Canadian will proudly trace back his pedigree to the point where some ancestor had married with a Taschereau or a De Lotbiniére. It seems to me that the British cannot be too delicate in their dealings with such a people. They are not a subject people, but partners in empire and should always be treated so.

[Mr. L. A. Lapointe.]

In taking my seat I may say that I have always respected the opinions of others. I trust that my opinions will be respected, because I speak sincerely, but I have no respect for fanaticism. I have no prejudices and never had any regarding race or creed.

On motion of Mr. Neely, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. Thursday.

Thursday, June 28, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

WAR LOAN BONDS.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. What is the number of bond issues of the war loan, and the amount of each?
2. What rate of interest does each bear?
3. What price did each issue sell at?
4. What was the actual amount received by the Government from each sale?
5. What amount has been paid to brokers or others for selling the bonds?
6. What was the amount, if any, of other expenses in connection with the sales of said bonds?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1, 2 and 3. Three bond issues as follows: 5 per cent 1915-25 war loan, $100,000,000, issue price 97½; 5 per cent 1916-31 war loan,

$100,000,000, issue price 97½; 5 per cent 1917-37 war loan, $150,000,000, issue price 96.

4. 1915-25 war loan, $97,003,600.27; 1916-31 war loan, $97,789,580.17; 1917-37 war loan, $139,882,508.04—to date; returns not yet completed.

5. Brokers. Recognized bond and stock brokers were allowed a commission on allotments made on applications bearing their stamp, as follows:

1915-25 and 1916-31 loans, one-quarter of one per cent; 1917-37 loan, three-eighths of one per cent.

Banks. Arrangements were made with the banks for a commission as under: 1915-25 war loan, one-quarter of one per cent; 1916-31 war loan, one-half of one per cent; 1917-37 war loan, nine-twentieths of one per cent.

For the above commission the banks agreed to receive on behalf of the Government at all their branches subscriptions and payments therefor, deliver provisional receipts, interim certificates and bonds and keep the necessary accounts in connection therewith; to cash at all their branches throughout Canada the coupons of the issues free of exchange; to use their best endeavours through their several offices throughout Canada to obtain public subscriptions to the loans. The banks also agreed to make, if required, cash subscriptions of $50,000,000 to the 1916-31 issue and of $60,000,000 to the 1917-37 issue.

6. Clerical assistance and office contingencies: 1915-25 war loan, $14,130.36; 1916-31 war loan, $26,998.24; 1917-37 war loan, $19,748.38 to 31st May, 1917.

Advertising: 1915-25 war loan, $36,023.16; 1916-31 war loan, $50,626.67—to 31st May, 1917; 1917-37 war loan, $23,367.89—to 31st May, 1917.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MORNING SITTINGS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I gave notice that I shall move to-morrow that the House sit in the forenoon, on and after Tuesday, 3rd July.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I hope my hon. friend will consider the advisability of deferring the consideration of the question of morning sittings until the debate on the Military Service Bill is concluded. If he thinks the debate has been unduly prolonged, or that there has been obstruction, I would not object, but no such condition is alleged to exist. I think it would be well to conclude the debate before we consider the question of morning sittings.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should be glad to consider the suggestion, but I do not see the reasons on which my right hon. friend's proposal is based. I do not wish to restrict the debate upon this Bill. The proposal I am making is giving greater opportunity for hon. members to be heard without unduly prolonging the debate. This is the usual course to pursue. The debate at this stage of the season is likely to occupy a great deal of time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would not say that. It is the most important question we have had before us during the session. When it is disposed of, I shall be happy to facilitate the business before the House, as far as possible. But, in the meantime, we are all very busy, and we cannot see the end of the session at the present time. I would impress upon my right hon. friend the desirability of permitting latitude upon this debate, and we will try to facilitate matters when the debate is concluded.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Can my right hon. friend tell me when the debate on the second reading is likely to be concluded?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think I shall be able to inform the right hon. leader to-morrow.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is a circumstance that might influence my judgment very much. The motion may stand.

REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION.

LAKE OF THE WOODS WATER LEVEL.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Some time ago my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition made an inquiry with regard to the report of the International Joint Commission fixing the level of the waters of the Lake of the Woods. The report had really been made at the time I gave my answer, although it had not come to my personal attention. I have made inquiries, and I find that it is being printed, and that the printing will occupy some considerable time as the report is voluminous. For that reason, I thought it desirable to obtain a short abstract, in order that the House might be informed as to the commission's recommendation. The memorandum of the report, which I obtained from the Secretary of the Canadian Section of the International Joint Commission, reads as follows:

Lake of the Woods Report.

The Final Report of the International Joint Commission in the matter of the Lake of the

Woods Reference was filed here and in Washington on June 12. In answer to the questions submitted by the Governments of Canada and the United States, the Commission recommends the maintenance of an ordinary maximum stage of 1061.25 (sea level datum) on the Lake of the Woods, with an extreme range from 1056 to 1062.50. The former level would only be reached in years of excessive drought, and the latter in years of excessive precipitation. The level recommended the Commission believes to be in the best interests of all concerned on both sides of the international boundary. It recognizes the water-power interests, particularly those on the Winnipeg river supplying light and power to the city of Winnipeg, as the dominant interests in the Lake of the Woods region, and the level recommended is one that will be of very great benefit to those interests. At the same time the interests of navigation, lumbering, fisheries and agriculture have been effectively safeguarded. The Commission's Report sets forth the means by which the proposed level is to be maintained. The outflow capacity of the Lake of the Woods is to be increased at a cost of about $175,000. Compensation is recommended to interests at the outlets of the lake and on the Winnipeg river, amounting to $25,000 and $30,000 respectively; to the owners of lands that will be flooded, on the United States side, $164,000, and in Canada, $81,000; and for protection along the water-front of Warroad and other towns, $115,000. The project involves the utilization of Rainy lake and other lakes tributary to the Lake of the Woods as immense reservoirs for the storage of water. It is recommended that the general direction of the proposed system of regulation be vested in the Commission; and that the actual control of the dams and regulating works at Kettle Falls, Koochiching Falls and Kenora, be put in the hands of an International Board of Engineers, with one reservation however. The dams at Kenora being in Canadian territory, the Commission recommends the creation also of a Domestic Board, to be appointed by the Governments of Canada and Ontario. This Board would control all the works at the outlets of the Lake of the Woods so long as the level of the lake remained between 1056 and 1061. When it should fall below the former or rise above the latter figure, the International Board would assume control. The Commission bases its recommendation on the fact that as long as the level of the lake remains between 1056 and 1061, Canadian interests only will be affected; while above and below those levels, international interests will be affected, and the International Board should therefore control the situation.

As soon as the report is printed it will be laid on the Table and made available to members of the House.

INQUIRY INTO LOSS OF ALCOHOL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. STEELE: I wish to make an inquiry of the Minister of Militia, based upon the following item appearing in the London Free Press of yesterday:

A board of officers, composed as under, will assemble on Wednesday next, the 27th instant, at 10.30 a.m., for the purpose of inquiring into and reporting upon the loss of alcohol on charge to the medical stores, M. D. No. 1.

I wish to inquire—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I think the hon. member had better place this question on the Order Paper. It is not of such importance as to require the attention of the House on the Orders of the Day.

PRIVILEGE.

Mr. HERMENEGILDE BOULAY (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege. I noticed in the "Citizen", of the 28th instant, an item which reads as follows:—

Mr. Boulay resented the manner in which French-Canadians had been treated, and referred to the reports of the affair at Rivière du Loup which had been referred to in the House by Dr. Edwards. As to this, Mr. Boulay read the report of the investigation into the affair, but complained that in spite of this report Dr. Edwards had not had the courtesy to withdraw his statements.

In justice to the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) I may say that I did not refer to him in my speech. The only hon. gentleman I mentioned was the member for Dufferin (Mr. Best).

LABOUR STRIKE IN WESTERN MINES.

MESSAGE FROM DIRECTOR OF COAL MINING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS: (Minister of Labour): I have a message from the Director of Coal Mining which I wish to read to the House. Mr. Armstrong reached Calgary only on Monday of this week; yesterday he sent me the following message:

Calgary, Alta., June 27, 1917.

Hon. T. W. Crothers,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Directions issued to-day have been accepted and endorsed by Policy Committee and are being distributed, beginning to-night, to various camps, and I confidently expect that men will go back to work by next Tuesday. Operators have answered by stating they will loyally comply and will be glad to render any assistance in their power towards the production and supply of coal and coke from district eighteen. Some specific cases require particular treatment, which I will deal with later. Propose remaining here until mines are working. Will then proceed to Ottawa.

W. H. Armstrong.

Mr. OLIVER: May I repeat a question that I have already put to the minister several times: Does district 18 include the mines in and adjacent to the Jasper Pass?

Mr. CROTHERS: I am not very familiar with the geography of that part of the country, but I have another letter which I might read to my hon. friend. It was written on the 22nd of this month, by the manager of the Canadian Coal Sales Company of Winnipeg, and is as follows:

We beg to inform you that if you receive any inquiries for coal, you can obtain at present one thousand tons and over per day from the Edmonton district, and east and west thereof.

The mines in that district will appreciate to be supplied with orders as they are only working half the time, due to the scarcity of orders. We admit that the fact of mines in southern Alberta being closed down prevents the coal dealers in southern Alberta and Saskatchewan from getting their supplies from this district as in the past, but nothing prevents them from getting all the coal they require from the Tofield, Edmonton, Wabamun and Estevan coal fields, which are only working half the time at present and were closed down during the months of March, April and May for lack of orders.

We beg to state that the complaints about coal shortage in the West are done by people who are not acquainted with the facts or by people who will not give themselves the trouble to look around and get their supply elsewhere.

Our company alone can easily ship daily from the above coal fields five hundred tons over their present shipments. We admit that the above coals are not as good as the southern Alberta ones, but they give very good satisfaction at the Edmonton Power Plant, Saskatchewan Power plant, etc.

Our experience for the last ten years has been that the mines in western Canada had to close from April to August for the lack of market. As winter comes there is generally a scramble for coal and the mines are not capable of mining it quick enough. Would it not be possible to have the Government suggest to the various town councils to see that their respective local coal dealers get their yearly coal supplies during the months of April, May, June and July, when the railways are idle, and also the mines.

There are at present enough coal mines in Alberta and Saskatchewan, when in operation, to take care of more than the demand of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and even supply Ontario if the freight rates were not so excessive.

Hoping the above may be of use, and holding ourselves entirely at your disposal to supply the requirements of any party requiring coal.

The member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has found fault about conditions there. If the substance of this letter is true, there is no lack of coal in Edmonton and vicinity.

Mr. OLIVER: The mines my hon. friend has been reading about are the domestic coal mines in the vicinity of Edmonton. There never was any report of trouble in these mines. It was reported, however, that the steam coal mines—the Jasper Park Collieries, the Brulé Lake Collieries, the Mountain Park Collieries and Pacific Pass Collieries—were shut down in sympathy with the strike in the south. I should be gratified if my hon. friend would find out whether the strike in those particular mines still continues and whether or not those mines are included in District 18.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think that the mines my hon. friend mentions are included in District 18. But mines northerly from District 18 have generally followed conditions in the mines in District 18; when there is a strike in District 18, there is a strike in the mines further north, and when the men in District 18 return to work, the men in the mines further north return to work also under similar conditions. I have no doubt that when the mines in District 18 open next week, the mines in the districts further north will open also.

Mr. OLIVER: In the steam coal mines that I have mentioned, the men did not take part in the original strike in the southern Alberta mines. It is only within the last two weeks that they went on strike, supposedly in sympathy with the southern Alberta mines. The mines in District 18 are under the direction of the director appointed by the Government, but the mines that I have mentioned are not, according to a statement of the minister, under that control.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not think they are.

Mr. OLIVER: Therefore, the question whether the men in those mines in northern Alberta have gone back to work or not, is a separate question from the one concerning the mines in District 18.

Mr. CROTHERS: The men in the mines in northern Alberta always follow the course taken by the men in the mines in District 18.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We could, of course, take into consideration the advisability of extending the jurisdiction of the director appointed so as to include the mines to which the hon. member for Edmonton alludes, if the men should not go back to work as the Minister of Labour expects they will.

Mr. OLIVER: Quite so, but I do not wish to be understood as urging the extension of the jurisdiction of the directors. I am anxious, first of all, to know what the action of the mine operators is.

PRIVILEGE—SIR SAM HUGHES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: I find in Hansard of June 26, the statement made by the hon.

junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), that on one occasion while I was Minister of Militia, I directed:

—that under no circumstances should this young man—

Referring to a certain young man.

—who was desirous of fighting for his King and country, be permitted to enlist

The facts are, as outlined the other day in this House, that this young man, who was, at the time, not desirous of fighting for King and country, went over to the front as a newspaper correspondent, and he wrote back, as the public will well remember, a series of the most slanderous, malicious and false articles that ever came from the pen of any one professing to be a journalist. I thought at that time that this young man was a member of one of the battalions; I learned afterwards that he was not. Later on, after he had returned to Canada, a request came before me to make this young man an officer. Being under the impression that he had previously been in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, I issued an order that under no consideration should he be promoted or taken on to the strength again, if, being a soldier, he had written those articles, unless he made reparation, as he afterwards did. As soon as I learned that this young man had seen the error of his ways and was desirous of enlisting, I took him on the force, and I believe, although I forget the details of the matter, he became an officer.

I find this further statement concerning myself from the hon. junior member for Halifax, which, from first to last, is absolutely without one particle of foundation in fact:—

The other day he thrust my name into his speech because I have refused his personal solicitations to debate here his personal grievances against the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White).

If my recollection serves me aright, the hon. member stuck his own nose into the debate the other night, so that his statement is wrong. I have no personal grievance against the Minister of Finance, nor against any other member of this House. The facts concerning a conversation I had with the hon junior member for Halifax are these. I was talking with some hon. gentlemen, and as the hon. junior member for Halifax came up to us, some one remarked that the financial critic of the Opposition was coming. Speaking jocularly, I said that I did not endorse the situation that there was such a thing as a financial critic of the Opposition; at least, that we had not had any evidence of it; that I thought any school boy could have done about as well the the hon. gentleman had done. That was the sum and substance of the conversation. After the repudiation of a conversation which I had over a year ago with the hon. member, I would never be found holding another conversation with him, except in the presence of witnesses.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Consideration of the motion of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and the amendment thereto, and the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barrette, resumed from Tuesday, June 27.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, I am sure no question before this House has given individual members more opportunity for serious consideration of their duty to themselves, their constituents and their country, than has the Bill that is now before the House. Theory is all very well in its way, but we in Canada are face to face with certain actual conditions which must be met, and it is in view of those actual conditions that each of us for himself must come to a conclusion, according to the light of his individual conscience, as to the best way to meet them. I have no patience with the man or woman in this country who says that this is not Canada's war, and that, therefore, a limit should be put to the amount of effort that Canada shall put forth in the prosecution of the war. If this is not Canada's war, then this Parliament had no right in August, 1914, to take the stand it did in voting money and supplies in order to send an expeditionary force to France and Flanders to take its position side by side with the armies of our Allies there. On the other hand, if we were right then in entering into the war at all, we can be right now only by putting forth every effort in man-power and in the material resources of this country in order to ensure that this war shall be brought to a successful conclusion. This House and this country do not need to be told what objects are sought and desired by our enemies, the Central Powers of Europe. We know that Germany's object in this war is not merely the acquisition of a certain small territory, or territories,

on the continent of Europe, but that she seeks domination of the free nations of the world; and as we rank ourselves as one of those free nations, we cannot escape the conclusion that Canada has as much right to use every resource in her power to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion as has any other power engaged in it.

The preparedness of our enemies to carry out the object which they had in mind is evidenced by the fact that after almost three years of continuous and bitter warfare, we—and by " we " I mean practically all the free nations of the world—still find ourselves face to face with a determined and stubborn enemy. Though we have had more or less success in different spheres of operations, I am not optimistic enough to think that we have by any means reached the point where we can expect the unconditional surrender of the central powers. Confronted as we are by this formidable foe, and with the end of the struggle not yet in sight, I fail absolutely to understand the attitude of any citizen of this country who can stand up and say before the people of this country and our Allies that Canada has done enough. If we had not sufficient reason for entering the war in August 1914, the German conduct of the war from that date to the present time, their barbarities on land and sea, their throwing aside of every moral consideration and of every principle of international law in dealing with neutral lives and neutral shipping, would furnish us with a sufficient reason why to-day, as a self-respecting free nation we could not keep our forces out of the field.

We have, Sir, the great example of the republic to the South, which kept out of the war as long as she could. But there came a time when even those of pro-German sympathies in the States must in their heart of hearts have come to the conclusion that if the United States was to maintain her national self-respect she could no longer keep out of the war. Had we not entered the war in August 1914 we should have found ourselves in the same position as the United States of America.

Citizenship in a free country like Canada carries with it obligations and responsibilities, and in my judgment the man who says that this Parliament has not the right to pass a measure such as is now before the House does not properly appreciate the responsibility that goes with the privilege of being a citizen of a free and democratic country. The very foundation of organized society, in my judgment, is that we are banded together for one common purpose, and the primary purpose for which we are banded together is the protection of the lives and property of the individual subjects of the state. As a free citizen of this country if I am injured in person or property at home or abroad I have the right to call upon the state to which I owe my allegiance to give me redress, not as a favour, but as a right. If that be true, the converse is also true—that when the state is in jeopardy from enemies within or without she has the right to place her hand on the shoulders of every one of her citizens and bid them come forward for the defence of home and country. Sir, in that very principle, which is the foundation of organized society, I find the authority for the passing of such a measure by this Parliament, or by the legislature of any democratic country under circumstances similar to those which now exist. No man in this House has greater respect and admiration for my right hon. leader than I, but I must say that the same process of reasoning that leads me to vote for the Bill also constrains me to vote against the motion of my right hon. leader. If it is the duty of the state to protect the individual, and the duty of the individual to protect the state in time of stress or danger, then I say it is not a proper thing to ask the people of this country to say by means of a referendum whether individual citizens shall come forward and do their duty or not. I maintain that the obligation rests upon them to come forward whether they be willing or not, and I think—and I say this with all respect for the opinions of others—that this House would be divesting itself of its due and proper responsibility if we were to consent to deal with this question in the way proposed by my right hon. leader.

If the principle of compulsory service is right and proper to-day, it was equally right and proper two years ago, when a special session of this Parliament was summoned shortly after the outbreak of war. But for some reason or other this Government and this Parliament then decided not to adopt this logical and businesslike method of dealing with the situation; they would rather depend upon the spontaneous patriotism of the citizens of this country.

Following that course, there grew up in the minds of the people, men of military age and others, the conviction and belief that Canada had adopted a course in this matter which was to be permanent, and that no other course would be adopted no matter

what eventualities the war might bring forth. Whether the people were right in coming to that conclusion or not, I am not prepared to say; but we must admit that a great many people did come to that conclusion. We are bound to make some mistakes, I admit; that cannot be avoided. We did not enter upon this war in a businesslike way; events have proved that; but we did intend to do our best. If we made our mistake, at least others are benefiting by that mistake. And I say to this House and the country: Hats off to the great republic to the south, that, while slow to enter into this conflict, now that it has entered upon it, has entered upon it as a business proposition. The object of that business proposition is the putting down of German domination in Europe and the establishing of free democracies throughout the world. But they have had the benefit of the mistakes that we have made.

Having adopted a certain course contrary to the principle which is now invoked in this Bill for securing further aid for our army, it is a question to be seriously considered whether we should not seek some other way than the way proposed by this Bill. A measure of this sort must have behind it the national sentiment of the people in order to be successful; and, Sir, in my judgment, there was the great initial error that we made when we entered upon this war. We called our men to the colours; we provided for their transport and did it in a remarkably short space of time; but there was one thing which we neglected to do, and we are suffering to-day as a consequence of that neglect—we neglected to mobilize the national sentiment of this country. Perhaps that was partly due to our failure to properly appreciate the seriousness and the magnitude of the task that lay before us, but I think this Government missed the opportunity of a century perhaps, when at the outset of this struggle, they were not the first to initiate those steps tending to co-operation between all the varied bodies of sentiment in this country that have been necessary in other parts of the Empire before a conscription measure could be placed upon the statute book. They have conscription in Great Britain and in New Zealand, and it may yet come in Australia. What is the history of conscription in Great Britain? To read the history of conscription, you must first read the history of government in Great Britain. That history tells of a change from a party government to a coalition government, then to another coalition, until you have to-day practically a military dictatorship. But, if you have a military dictatorship in Great Britain, it is a dictatorship which represents in itself every section and every sentiment of the people of that country. The reason that compulsory service was accepted in Great Britain as readily, as freely and happily as it has been, lies in that very fact, and also in the fact that before the Government of Great Britain undertook to conscript the man-power of the country, it put its hands on the wealth and conscripted that for the benefit of the nation. Our little sister, New Zealand, very early in the war found what she had to do in order to put compulsory service into effect.

I say again that I see very serious trouble ahead of us in respect to the enforcement of this measure, unless, before the measure becomes operative—not before it becomes law but before it becomes operative—something is done to mobilize the national sentiment and to secure national unity. There are those who say that it is too late for any such proposals. I absolutely fail to see why it is too late for something in the line I have suggested to be carried out. It is true that my right hon. friend and leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) objects to this measure becoming operative at the present time and being made operative by the present Government. Then, in my judgment, there is an alternative course. That alternative course is that, this Parliament having passed this Bill, as there is every prospect it will do, again the leaders of the two great parties should get together and see if some method cannot be evolved by which we shall secure the maximum amount of assistance for our boys at the front and at the same time preserve that national unity which was sought by the Fathers of Confederation when they brought the original provinces of Canada together. It can be done, and, in my judgment, it should be done. It should be done even now. Shall we plunge this country into strife, shall we destroy the foundations of Confederation, shall we create schism, if by any method that can be suggested by the patriotism and the zeal for the common good that must inspire the leaders of public thought in this country, the leaders of the two great political parties these results can be avoided? If a way can be found by united patriotism to lead us out from this unfortunate position that may spell national disaster, and yet at the same time obtain the results we all seek to obtain, namely, the mobilization of Canada's efforts, of Canada's resources in men and of material wealth for

the prosecution of the war, surely it is worth while making the attempt.

I fail to see any other course open to the people of this country. We are to-day approaching the fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of confederation—we might say the Golden Wedding day of the provinces of this great Dominion. And, Sir, since the laying of the foundation stone of this confederation men have toiled and struggled in this country, building stone upon stone, until to-day we have this great commonwealth stretching from ocean to ocean, a future empire on this North American continent. Among the names that will be written in history as those of men who have performed great and noble work in building up this country, there will stand prominent the name of my honoured leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). And, Sir, it grieves me, as a native-born Canadian, to see anything occur, in this time of crisis and strife, that is likely to endanger that which it has taken fifty years to build up. If our confederation is now disrupted, it will take a century to place us again in the position in which we were prior to the outbreak of this horrible war. The maintenance and upbuilding of our confederation is, I am sure, the aim and object of every one of us on both sides of the House. Whether we support or do not support this Bill, we have one common object, the winning of the war. Does any one tell me that, while my right hon. leader is opposed to the application of this measure at the present time, he is not imbued with as earnest a desire to win this war as any other man in this House? The man who tells me that, I brand, Sir, as a partisan, and not as a friend of this country. The man who, on either side of this House or in this country, to-day attempts by his words to set one section of this Dominion of Canada, against another, consciously or unconsciously, is just as much an enemy of the empire and of the country as if he were facing our soldiers in the trenches over in Flanders. The situation is altogether too serious for party bickering and party strife in this country; and if that can be avoided, if there is yet a possibility, and I think there is, of the mobilization of national sentiment and national effort in this country for the winning of the war, without the bringing on of party struggle and party strife, history will write it against this Parliament and against this Government and against the leaders of both sides of this House as a crime if they do not first exhaust every effort of statesmanship, of diplomacy, of resource and of deliberation in the effort to work out a solution that will mean a continuance of those friendly feelings that have existed between the various portions of Canada, and that will, at the same time, mean our vigorous prosecution of this war. That is the ideal I hold. I am not here to support an abstract principle so much as to speak for this ideal, which must be dear to every one of us to-day, or we cannot class ourselves as true patriots. I am not suggesting anything further than the broad lines on which I consider an arrangement and an understanding may be arrived at, even at this late date. Within a very few days this country will be celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of its confederation, and there could be no more opportune time for every member of this House, every 4 p.m. member of this Government, for the leader of the Government and for my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition, for every one of us, as we go to the altar of patriotism, dropping by our side party bickering, party strife, every selfish consideration,—I say there could be no more opportune time for each and every one of us to dedicate ourselves to the cause of our country and to the successful prosecution of this war, which means not only the freedom of Europe but the freedom of North America and of Canada.

With those thoughts in mind and with that desire strong in my heart, I am free to say that, while I am voting for the principle of this Bill—that is what is involved in voting for the second reading—and while I am constrained to vote against the amendment proposed by my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), my one strong and consuming desire in offering my thoughts to this House and to this country is that even now, with this Bill under consideration, there may yet be found a way which will not only redound to the unity and to the credit of Canada, but will bring to our boys in the trenches that help and that succour which we all recognize they need, and which we are all determined they shall have.

Mr. J. L. CHABOT (Ottawa): Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable, I might say unfortunate, that at this present time, when Canada and the Motherland and the British Empire are passing through the most critical period of their national lives, dissensions tinged with provincialism should

have occurred, and that scenes painfully unpatriotic in their purpose should have been enacted in certain sections of the country, and that in this great crisis, in even the very smallest degree, a feeling of bitterness should develop in this House. This is a time when the representatives of the people, the members of this House, should be prepared to lay aside all political feelings and all national differences, with a view of preserving harmony and presenting a united front, not only to Canada but to the whole world.

If this condition of affairs does not exist here, the fault does not lie with the right hon. Prime Minister, (Sir Robert Borden) nor with the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House. In view of the momentous issue confronting Canada at this present moment, I feel it my duty to support a measure whose main purpose is to bring this war to a speedy, and I fervently pray, a successful determination; to win the war, to maintain the prestige and power of the Union Jack, and what it stands for; to protect our freedom, and to save the very national life of Canada.

I do not intend discussing the details of the Bill presented for our consideration. The matter has been gone into so thoroughly and so fully that I fear that any lengthy explanation or extended elaboration on my part along those lines would be superfluous. The selective Military Bill brought down by the Prime Minister of this country appeals to me as an intelligent and practical modification of the Canadian Militia Act established and promulgated at the time of Confederation and subsequently re-affirmed and re-endorsed, with a few alterations, in 1904. There is no doubt in my mind that when this Bill becomes law its provisions will be carefully and very judicially carried into effect, and I consider it my duty to give this Bill my undivided support for many reasons, but mainly because its chief aim is to sustain the gallantry of the men who have been fighting for our homes and our country, because it is intended to relieve the men who for months have endured untold hardship and privation in the trenches. It is intended to fill the gaps in the ranks of divisions, which ranks have been very materially thinned in the last few months, and it is intended to avenge the loss of Canada's best and purest blood, which has been shed freely upon the fields of France and Flanders, and surely it has not been shed in vain.

Furthermore, the passage of this Bill will assist in bringing this terrible conflict to a definite, and I trust, decisive issue. A referendum such as proposed in amendment by the right hon. leader of the Opposition is in my opinion opposed to the idea and is contrary to the spirit of responsible and representative government.

We, in this House, are the representatives of the people of Canada. This Parliament is composed of men of integrity, men of ability, experience and initiative, men possessing a more thorough knowledge of the existing conditions, men who are more competent judges of the present situation than the general public. We are the custodians of the honour and national life of this country, and, therefore, we should be the arbiters in any matter vitally concerning its constitution and welfare. Besides, a referendum would not be a fair test of public opinion, because in different sections of this country sentimentality and prejudice might, and would outweigh the sense of duty of the people. Again, 300,000 of our soldiers are at the front, and would find it difficult to cast their ballots, while the thousands of slackers in this country would be in a position to use their influence and exercise their franchise to the fullest extent.

Mr. Speaker, the right hon. leader of the Opposition, when he moved his amendment, declared, rather emphatically, that at no time since the beginning of the war had he feared any danger of invasion of Canada on the part of Germany, and he also made little of the opinion and claim that Canada's first lines of defence were in the trenches of France and Belgium. I cannot understand how a gentleman possessed of an unusually keen sense of intuition, of splendid faculty for analysis, and of a wide range of information, that a gentleman possessing such eminent accomplishments, should entertain such an opinion. It reminds me of the manner in which hon. members spoke in regard to the menace, peril, or danger which we referred to during the discussion of the Naval Bill in 1913. Notwithstanding the information which we had received in the form of a memorandum from the Admiralty, we were told at that time that the supposed danger did not exist, that our fears were imaginary, and that our contentions were illusionary. But the peril came sooner than we expected, and fell upon us with a full measure of vengeance and unmistakeable violence. Does the right hon. gentleman believe that, if this war were won by the Central Powers, Canada would not be in danger of invasion? Does he believe that if the Germans, in their first rush for Paris, had reached their objective point, Canada

would not have been in danger? Does he think that if the 200,000 Germans on their march to Calais had not been stopped at Langemark by the 32,000 Canadians, who, undergoing their baptism of fire with unfortunately disastrous results, and against overwhelming odds, by their courage and their valour held back that army of Germans for seventy-two hours, and effectually checked their advance to Calais—if the Germans had reached Calais—would not England, and Canada also, have been in danger of invasion? Does the right hon. gentleman believe that if the German fleet had defeated the British navy and the allied fleet on the sea, or had at any time broken through the British naval cordon that surrounded them—thank God Britannia still rules the waves—it would not have become a source of great danger, not only to England but to America? I need only quote what Roosevelt, the ex-president of the United States, mentioned in one of his speeches. He declared that the British navy, and the British navy alone, kept the Germans away from the shores of America. I also wish to remind the right hon. gentleman that the most potent factor in the development of the spirit of pan-Germanism, whereby Germany expected to dominate the world, control its commerce and rule its destinies, was not only begotten by greed for power and wealth, but chiefly by the ardent—I might say insane—desire of the German Government for territorial expansion and aggrandisement. For many years previous to the war the surplus population of Germany had been fast outgrowing its geographical limits, and thousands of Germans have been migrating to foreign lands; and the German government, anxious to keep them within the bounds of a greater and wider German Empire, cast a covetous eye on the British Empire, whose magnitude and vastness are such that the sun never sets on it. And if in this war the Germans were victorious, does my right hon. friend for one moment believe that the Germans would not cast a covetous eye on Canada—the most important of the overseas dominions—a country whose area is vast, whose possibilities are great and whose resources are innumerable? They certainly would, and I, therefore, have no hesitation in declaring that Canada is now safe but was not safe while the Motherland was in danger; and further that the safety of this country, since this war began, has depended to a large extent on the defence of the Motherland, and that our first lines of defence are undoubtedly in the trenches of France and Belgium.

The member for Rouville (Mr. Lemiuex) and the member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) declared with emphasis and a certain amount of pathos that this Bill was a direct and flagrant violation of pledges made by the Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet since the beginning of the war. I hope these gentlemen are sufficiently well informed and fair-minded to admit that war conditions to-day are quite different from what they were a year ago; that a process of transformation, in matters affecting the war as well as in matters affecting the ordinary affairs of the whole world, has been gradually going on from month to month, almost from week to week. Opinions expressed and promises made a year ago might not—perhaps would not—hold good to-day. Let me remind these hon. gentlemen of the present attitude of Russia; of the entrance of the United States into this terrible conflict; of the deeds of heroic France, which has been almost bled white during the last year; of the carrying out of the submarine warfare on a much larger scale and in a much more destructive manner.

The member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) the other evening strongly emphasized the assertion that the Government was moribund and irresponsible and that it did not command the confidence of the people because it had outlived its legal life. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that the life of this Parliament was extended on the strength of a resolution, passed unanimously, petitioning His Majesty and the Imperial Government to amend the British North America Act with a view of granting an extension of the life of this Parliament for another year in order to prevent a political conflict at a time when it would have been wholly undesirable and prejudicial to the best interests of Canada. For that reason, and in the light of common sense, fairness and equity, I consider that this Government is as legally constituted to-day as it was a year ago.

In reference to what I said in connection with the remarks made by the members for Rouville and Kamouraska, may I point out that during the last year the armies of the Allies have carried on a more offensive campaign; that larger quantities of ammunition have been at their disposal; that the use of more formidable weapons and more dangerous implements of war have created a demand for men, and more men; and that that was one of the reasons which led to the presentation of this Bill.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition, referring to the delinquencies in the matter of enlistment in Quebec, gave a very incomplete explanation and made a very weak defence. I am willing to agree with the right hon. gentleman and others who have spoken on the subject that conditions in Quebec are somewhat different from what they are in other provinces; that Quebec is almost essentially an agricultural province; that its men marry at an early age and assume domestic responsibilities and obligations which married men in other provinces do not assume. I am willing to agree with hon. gentlemen in respect of many other reasons which have been put forth in justification of conditions in Quebec. But if recruiting in Quebec has not come up to expectations, it is because the people of that province have not received the encouragement or the enlightenment to which they were entitled. I do not mean from officials of the Government; I mean from men who are their leaders; men who are their representatives in this House; men who should have been their counsellors and guides from the beginning of the war and should have done what we have accomplished in Ontario. The French Canadians are a peaceful, God-fearing and law-abiding people. They love their homes and their country; they are patriotic to the core; they are brave and courageous. I need only mention the battle of Courcelette as a striking example and a convincing proof of the valour, the dash and the bravery of the French Canadian troops at the front. But the people of that province are more sentimental and more impressionable than their English-speaking fellow-citizens; consequently, they are more easily influenced. Unfortunately, since the outbreak of this war they have allowed themselves to be misguided and ill-advised by a certain few in Quebec whose teachings, actions and writings since the beginning of the war have proved them to be false to their Canadian citizenship and to their standing as British subjects—and they should have been treated accordingly. I am a French Canadian, representing a constituency in Ontario. I love my mother tongue as dearly as any French Canadian in this House or in the country. I feel proud of the language of my ancestors, the history of whose country is as glorious as it is wonderful. I am particularly proud of the record of France since the beginning of the war, because of the valour, the courage and the chivalry of her soldiers, the spirit of self-sacrifice, the self-denial, the patriotism, the devotedness and the initiative of her people, and the wonderful military feats and accomplishments of her armies, have enlisted the admiration of the whole world. But I declare that I am first and foremost a Canadian; I am proud to be a British subject.

During the past few weeks I have received many threatening letters, describing the various methods of death intended for me should I vote for conscription, conveying choice epithets galore, and qualifying me as a traitor and coward if I should support the Compulsion Bill. All I have to say as to this is that I have no fear. If doing my duty as I understand it; if telling this House how dearly I love Canada, how reverently I honour the flag, how sincerely I respect and esteem my compatriots in Quebec, and how deeply I admire the British Empire, France and the Allies, or if expressing the sentiments of my true and sincere loyalty—if that be cowardice, then I say that I am not ashamed to be branded as a coward.

The French Canadians of Ontario have answered the call of duty in a fairly satisfactory way. My compatriots in Ottawa, the city which I have the honour of representing in this House, as well as in the neighbouring and military districts, have contributed their fair quota of men to the Canadian militia service, 1,587 having enlisted from this military district. The casualty lists show that these men have been doing and are doing their duty faithfully and well, while the honour roll published from day to day sadly attests to the fact that many have made the supreme sacrifice, and, I have no doubt, have faced danger as fearlessly and have met death as courageously and ungrudgingly as any other class of Canadian soldiers at the front.

The union of the two great races in Canada was sealed in blood in 1776, when shoulder to shoulder the English and French defended Quebec against an invading army. What the English soldiers did for Canada and the Empire at Lundy's Lane and Queenston Heights, a handful of French soldiers under de Salaberry at Chateauguay accomplished in 1812, and since that date the English and French of this country have grown up into a common brotherhood, the brotherhood of the Canadian people. They have been living in peace; they have had their differences, they may have had their quarrels, but under the Union Jack the French Canadians of Quebec and the rest of Canada enjoy liberty and protection, religious, national and political. They

speak their own language; they make their own laws; they exercise their franchise as they see fit, and they worship at the altars where their forefathers knelt. They value their Canadian citizenship as highly as does any other class of Canadians in this country.

I firmly believe that when the purport and tenor of this Bill are fully and properly explained to the people of Quebec, they will be willing to do their share and to discharge their national duty as faithfully as any other class of citizens of this country. I say this, notwithstanding the dire threat delivered in stentorian tones and with dramatic effect by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. L. J. Gauthier) a few nights ago. While the French Canadians have and enjoy rights, they must realize, as I realize, that they have obligations to fulfil. Our Canadian soldiers on the battle-fields of France and Belgium, fighting for the flag, for the Empire, for liberty and for our own country, have, by their valour, their courage, and particularly their adaptability and resourcefulness, covered themselves with glory. The Canadian physicians, surgeons and nurses have, at the front and in the hospitals, done themselves proud in the eyes of the whole world because of their devotion to duty, their spirit of self-sacrifice, their unselfishness and their all round good work.

If I be permitted to digress, I would like to say that the Canadian physicians and surgeons on the field, as well as in the hospitals, ably assisted by the nurses, who, since the war began, have rendered invaluable aid in various spheres, have performed their multifold duties and arduous labours in a manner which has elicited the admiration of the British and the Allies alike, have won the approval of all well-thinking people, and have earned the profound gratitude of thousands of sick and wounded soldiers who have come under their care; and the administration and organization of our hospitals both in France and in England are, to my mind, satisfactory and excellent. Shortcomings and mistakes may have been made, but we must admit that the undertaking has been immense, intricate and far reaching. I wish to state most emphatically, from what I know of the conditions existing in those institutions, that the man who stated that the Canadian Medical Service had failed to an almost criminal degree, erred in judgment and observation; drew wrong conclusions and was animated by a feeling of unreasonable animus and failed in the discharge of his duty.

Canada has made many sacrifices since this war has commenced; the people have endeavoured to honourably discharge their duty for the cause of humanity and civilization, and if this terrific contest is protracted, we, in conjunction with the Allies, should be prepared to spend our last dollar and to expend the last ounce of mental energy and physical strength which we possess. We should be prepared to put forth our strongest endeavours to reasonably increase our man-power at the front, with a view to bringing the Germans to their knees and crushing militarism and Prussian autocracy, thereby ensuring to the whole world a permanent and lasting peace.

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 battle-fields 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.

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. 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 tonight.

The Canadian Government guarantees the boys a minimum wage of $50 a month and board, it pays two-thirds of 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.

[Mr. McCoig.]

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 in 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.

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, favouring 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. 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. 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 question 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 on 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.

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 honourable body may pass such an Act to go into operation within three months of the voting thereon.

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

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 will 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 true 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.

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.

I would point out to the House that under the voluntary 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.

Mr. EUGENE PAQUET (L'Islet): Mr. Speaker, the hon. George P. Graham, Sir Wilfrid Laurier's first lieutenant, approves Sir Robert Borden's policy of compulsory military service and he contends that every Liberal member is perfectly free to act, to speak and to vote as his conscience dictates. He seems to believe that freedom of speech does not exist in the Liberal-Conservative party.

I have been sitting here in the House of Commons for the past thirteen years and I have parted with Sir Robert Borden on several momentous occasions. I may assert that no one appreciates more than the Prime Minister of Canada the frankness shown by the members of this deliberative body in expressing their opinion.

The hon. Mr. Graham states that the fundamental principle of the Liberal doctrine is based upon the respect for individual liberty. How can the hon. member invoke that principle when journalists, imbued indeed with the Liberal idea, keep on proclaiming that the French Canadians now occupying a seat in Sir Robert Borden's cabinet should be considered as traitors to their race and to their province?

I am impelled by that respect for individual liberty in expressing my belief that the French Canadian ministers, approving as they do a bill which I intend to fight as vigourously as possible, do so because they are satisfied that, by resisting the popular impulse, at the very risk of thereby ending their political life, they may be of service to their fellow-man.

I might be allowed to apply to the present situation a reflection which was made in this House by a most distinguished French Canadian: If French Canadians, Conservative or Liberal, continue to be represented henceforth in the Dominion cabinet, they may owe that privilege to the Ministers who are in it to-day.

I respect the motives which urge the Prime Minister to introduce a bill, inspired, as he says, by a deep sense of our duty. But I feel obliged to oppose this measure, because I believe that Canada's participation in this war should be voluntary. I demand that the people be consulted, in order to ensure the preservation of our national unity: the good work accomplished by the Fathers of the Confederation.

I have always contended that Canada should defend her territory and her liberties. From the very beginning of the war, our native country and our liberty have been threatened. Canada was thereby threatened with a change of institutions and the imposition of the Prussian yoke. Germany could not find a more fertile land to feed her immense population, to expand her trade and to extend her barbarous domination.

It has often been said that Canada was the British crown's brightest jewel. Should that crown become decayed or broken, what would become of the jewel? The archbishop of Montreal has declared; "We are a colony of England and therefore, should England be defeated, Germany's first prey would be Canada. Now, we do not want to be Germans. That is why we must do all we can, since Canada's destiny is linked with success of the British arms."

On November 8, 1914, Mr. Henri Bourassa wrote: "Canada, an Anglo-French nation, bound to England and to France by a thousand ties, ethical, special, intellectual and economic, has a vital interest in the maintenance of France and of England, of their prestige, of their power, of their world-wide action. It is therefore her national duty to contribute, in the full measure of her forces and by her own particular means of action, to the triumph and above all to the maintenance of France and England's combined efforts."

On May 18, 1917, Sir Robert Borden exclaimed: "There are other places besides the soil of a country itself where the battle for its liberties and its institutions can be fought, and I venture to think that, if this war should end in defeat, Canada, in all the years to come, would be under the shadow of German military domination."

These words go to show that the Canadian nation, directly interested in this war, could not remain unconcerned by the European conflict: "Horrible unbridling of a nation of prey whose passions let loose find, in the brutal realism of war, their national course."

"This war," has declared Mr. Asquith, then Premier of the United Kingdom, "is a national war. We shall keep on to the end, until entire reparation has been made to Belgium, until France has recovered her lost provinces and security, until Europe has been delivered from the incubus of armaments, and the world from the monstrosity of Prussian militarism."

So are we fighting with Great Britain to repel the invader and for the triumph of those democratic ideas so well analyzed in this House by Mr. Balfour. It is as much Canada's war as it is England's war. It is yours, Mr. Speaker, it is mine. It is the war of every Canadian and of every British subject.

At the opening of hostilities, the leaders of the nation have declared that Canada's participation in the war was absolutely voluntary. "Free participation, free enlistment." Such were the words that rang forth throughout the country. The Canadian people has given a solemn assent to these feelings. Indeed, at the call to the colours, 400,000 sons of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, have willingly responded and have joined the allied troops to defend the country and defeat Prussian militarism. They know that our security at the present time rests with the British fleet. Our brethren, leaving Canada to drive back the German hordes, knew that England had not willed the war, but had risen in a body to refuse to accept the infamous proposal of William II who was violating Belgium's neutrality in defiance of the treaties signed by his grandsire. At the first call to the colours, the most authoritative voices in the clergy of various denominations, in the Canadian press, in the political associations of the country united themselves in the defence of the Allies' cause against a foe who believes only in might, cynically laughs at his own atrocities, tramples upon the most sacred agreements, ruthlessly kills children, women and old men, and transgresses the laws of humanity, the law of nations and the re-

spect of pledged troth. Odious doctrines have perverted the moral intellect of the Germanic race. Allow me to quote the following words which William II addressed one day to recruits in Potsdam:

"Recruits! before God's consecrated servant and in front of this altar, you have sworn me fidelity. You are still too young to well understand the full meaning of that word. You have sworn to be faithful to me, that is to say that, becoming my soldiers, you have given yourselves over to me, soul and body. You have now but one foe; my foe. It is possible that in these days of socialist plots, I may order you to fire upon your kinsmen, your fathers and mothers—God spare you that!—but know ye well that, even then, it is my orders you shall have to obey without grumbling. God and I have heard your oath of fealty to your war chief. . ."

The German Kaiser claims the empire of the very souls of his soldiers. He is cruel enough to tell them that he has the right to order them the shooting of their fathers or their mothers and that, if needs be, they must execute his orders without grumbling. In the face of such monstrous language that cries to Heaven for vengeance and in the face of the German army's most tyrannical deeds, the Canadian people have voluntarily made, both in men and in cash, sacrifices unparalleled in our history in order to expedite the Allies victory. Voluntarily, the rich and the poor have subscribed to the Patriotic Fund and to the works for the war, in order to aid our valiant defenders' families, our motherland's mariners and the sufferers both in Belgium and in France. Canada's military effort has called forth the Allied nations admiration. On the battle fields of Festubert, of St. Eloi, of Courcelette and of Vimy, the Canadians had accomplished feats the glory of which shall never die. The people have responded to the call by revealing treasures of energy, of devotion and of charity. In the face of these sacrifices, the Government should not lay aside the volunteering system and offer violence to the feelings of a large portion of the population by making the service a compulsory one. Men! Men! And still more men! cry the partisans of selective conscription. Nevertheless, during the year ending May 31, 1917, the total number of men enlisted amounted to 85,306 and the total losses reached the figure of 75,492. Therefore the recruits have exceeded by almost 10,000 the number of vacancies to be filled. Among those set down on the loss columns, a large number of wounded soldiers have already returned or will return to the front. Is that what can be called the utter failure of voluntary recruiting? I am satisfied that voluntary enlistment, if well organized, would be in keeping with the military effort which is to be expected from Canada. Enlightened economists remind us that we should not lose sight of our country's youthfulness, its resources and its future. They are rightfully asking themselves whether conscription would not, after all, render England a negative service by sterilizing in the finest of her colonies all the germs of future life.

While the Canadian army is heroically struggling in order to expel the invader from Belgium and from France, we should says the economist, concern ourselves about economical organization and the evolving of a constructive policy.

Before the war, Canada needed all her men to continue the conquest of the soil. Europe is not producing as she did in the past years, because her soil is turned upside down and her able-bodied men are all at war. The farmers are entreated to give, more than ever before, all their care and attention to the tilling of the land. The authorities have even called upon foreign labour. In accelerating the desertion of husbandry by means of compulsory recruiting, we would be making a mistake that must react upon our economic life. We should not forget the assistance, especially agricultural, which our country, more than any other one, is able to give England and the allied nations. Exports from Canada and from the United States, needed to supply the Allies' needs, should be immensely larger than under normal conditions. In such an emergency is it wise to throw into the War furnace 100,000 more young Canadians?

And should the war last somewhat longer, will not the leaders of the Government, taking their inspiration from the principle of compulsory military service laid down in their new legislation, demand still more victims?

Ever since January 17, 1916, I have gone by the word of our political leaders and asserted that compulsory service would not be imposed upon the Canadian people. When the National Service cards were being distributed, I advised my electors to submit to the wishes of the Government; I gave them the assurance that these cards had no reference to compulsory service. In public meetings, I quoted the words of Sir

Robert Borden, of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and of the honourable member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Descarries), to demonstrate that there would be no conscription, I am not therefore surprised to hear voices raised in the province of Quebec in protest against this bill.

Messrs. Viviani and Balfour have recalled the supreme sacrifices of the Canadians. With the grandest eloquence they have hailed our soldiers who are fighting, suffering and dying for the holy cause.

After these sublime sacrifices, it would be unjust to violently tear away from Canada her sons and to forcibly levy the imposition of blood.

To impose conscription under such circumstances, without consulting the people, why! wouldn't that be doing injury to the devotion, to the sacrifices and to the heroism of the Canadian people?

It is impossible for me to approve an enactment, the enforcement of which might endanger our national unity.

As the honourable Mr. Patenaude wrote to Sir Robert Borden, on June 18:

> The proposed law, I have every reason to fear, threatens to destroy this unity, and to give rise throughout the country to deep internal divisions of long duration, and even detrimental to the needs of the present moment.
>
> Indeed it is better to keep the country united in the present effort than to attempt a mightier one at the cost of national disruption.

The honourable Mr. Patenaude perfectly expressed my own opinion as to the new Military Service Act.

I believe this is a fit occasion to make a few remarks about the French Canadians' military effort during this war.

Ill-advised journalists have been, these two years, incessantly abusing the French Canadians because the latter have not contributed as many volunteers as the province of Ontario has done to the oversea service.

According to Government statistics, the number of French Canadians who have enlisted is estimated at 14,100. I am convinced, from a serious study, that the French Canadians' contribution to the general recruiting is far larger than is inferred on insufficient evidence. As an historian has rightly stated it: "The number of our compatriots in active service is not the only criterion of our loyal determination to contribute to the success of the Allies whose cause for the future of civilization, for England, for France is to us so dear and so sacred."

I sincerely trust that justice will be meted out to us. We find among our English-speaking fellow-citizens numerous defenders. They know that since the cession of Canada to England, the French Canadians have been somehow the champions of British domination upon Canadian soil.

During the darkest days of our history, the French Canadians have loyally and generously fought for the British crown. In the American war of independence, our militia men placed themselves under the British government's orders and saved Canada for England. From 1760 to 1840, the English bureaucrats, through their persecution, impelled agricultural development, paralyzed trade and commerce in the province of Quebec. Nevertheless, our fathers' loyalty remained unshaken. And when, in 1813, the United States tried to seize upon Canada, our militia, commanded by Mr. de Salaberry, drove back the foreigners. I may boldly proclaim that British institutions rest, in the province of Quebec, upon immovable foundations.

It is true that the province of Quebec has not supplied men for the war in the same ratio as the population of the other provinces. We should consider that Quebec's rural population is much larger than the urban, and that recruiting is carried on more easily in towns. Some one has written: "When it is a matter of warfare and of battles, we like to share in the glory attached to it. The fascination of arms springs from the prestige of the chiefs who set off their own valour and that of their soldiers." We have not been given French Canadian leaders; only one regiment has succeeded in getting a fair opening and in pulling through. The others that followed on have lost their identity in England and in France. All that counts in the present organization has been a staff almost exclusively English. How many French Canadians are there in the superior ranks? The very few compatriots who cut a nominal figure in high ranks have been so intimidated and circumvented, that they are unwittingly and helplessly so, rather a cause of discouragement.

Colonel Blondin has sounded the right note when recruiting in the province of Quebec. If the hon. Minister of Militia had organized, at the very outset of the war, a well directed campaign, the results would have been different. Since the conquest, the authorities have not encouraged the militarist idea among the French Canadians. In a general way, my compatriots seem to have been systematically ignored in the Militia Department. How could our people show any enthusiasm for enlisting when both editors and legislators consign the French Canadians of Ontario to the same

standing as the Germans as far as education is concerned? Why should our people rush to the recruiting booths, when English-speaking Canadians want the fusion of races, ostracize our language and try to disposses us of our holdings? One of us has said: "What we have we hold." Such is my compatriots! rallying-cry to resist the organized attacks against our faith, our traditions and our language. The struggle which the French Canadians of Ontario and of Manitoba have to keep up for the maintenance of their language and the preservation of their schools has largely contributed to impede recruiting.

For a few months past, I have been expecting an official truce, but those who are hostile to our tongue will not disarm and are even now trying to send to jail the defenders of our language in the city of Ottawa. So strange an aggression has revived a regrettable feud. Therefore, those who persist in refusing to give our race its due; those who abuse us since 1914; those who keep on persecuting our compatriots in the capital of Canada, destroy enlisting in the province of Quebec. If this unfortunate question of the bilingual schools were settled in a fair way, the French Canadians' participation would be more effective.

Several liberal speakers have stated that the Nationalist campaign of 1910 and of 1911 had paralysed enlisting in the province of Quebec. They seem to have forgotten some most important facts of our history. As a matter of fact, in 1885, General Laurie and Colonel Williams proposed the levy of two regiments to aid the Empire and asked the Canadian Government to pay part of the expense. Sir John A. Macdonald, consulted by Lord Landsdowne, wrote that Canada ought not contribute to the wars of the Empire.

Let us recall the Liberal policy of 1896. One could read in L'Electeur: "Why fight for England?" In 1896, the Liberal party in the province of Quebec opposed any participation of Canada in the wars of the Empire. Le Canada, organ of the Liberal party, in 1907, opposed all contribution on the part of Canada to the defence of England. It approved any Canadian policy of abstention. In 1910, in the course of the debates upon the Naval Act, and during the electoral campaign of 1911, several Liberals in the province of Quebec were bent on lessening the Government's schemes and reduced them to a simple maritime policy. Some spoke of the creation of a navy which Canada might lend to England, others, of the creation of an exclusively Canadian fleet to be controlled by us and by us alone. And even some others again found in this navy the best instrument to conquer our independence.

The Liberals of the province of Quebec, although supporting the Naval Act proposition, seemed opposed to Canada's participating in the wars of the Empire.

The Liberal party has always, previous to March 29, 1909, advocated the doctrine which the Nationalists defended in 1910 and in 1911. To prove this I might refer to the reports of the various imperial conferences. They show that the Liberal party has deeply engraved in the heart of the French Canadians the principle of Canada's non-participation in the wars of the Empire.

In the judgment of the vast majority of the French Canadians, this traditional principle is inscribed in the Constitution. The supreme reason of their opposition to enlistment and to compulsory service consists, as it seems to me, in their sincere attachment to Canada which is their only country.

The French Canadian mentality is to-day entangled by obstacles which might be removed through a consultation of the people. Indeed, my compatriots have the sense of order and discipline and they would submit to the verdict rendered by the majority. Therefore I ask the Prime Minister, as did the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), and other members of this House, to make, previous to putting this bill into force, a last and sincere appeal to the patriotism of our Canadian youths, to go voluntarily to the assistance of their brethren at the front. I do ask this in order to try and settle a situation full of difficulties and internecine struggles. Otherwise you are deepening a chasm between the two great races who form the Canadian nation and between classes that should respect and love one another. What would be the usefulness of the new law, if our country is rushed into an unwholesome agitation?

The adoption of this measure under such circumstances would be more hurtful than useful to the Allies' cause. Just think, Mr. Speaker, of the touchiness of the races and of the working classes. This irritability must be taken into account. It may be suddenly stirred up, powerful and threatening. Are the various classes of our society and the Canadians of all races condemned to inflict upon one another the most painful injuries by the enforcement of an Act the results of which are doubtful?

The referendum offers itself with a sort of serene majesty to act as a moderator. Let us accept it in the interest of national

unity. We are writing to-day one of the most important pages in our history. Should the government, in justice toward the people they represent, forcibly enlist the Canadians for oversea service, after the nation has already voluntarily made such immense sacrifices in this war.

I ask for an appeal to the people, so as to dispense with doing violence to the feelings of a large portion of the Canadian people.

I ask for a consultation of the people, in order to maintain union among the various races and not to endanger the work of the fathers of Confederation.

If we establish a comparison between the number of our people and the extent of our country, between our financial resources and the obligations we have taken upon ourselves, we come to this conclusion that the share Canada has already assumed voluntarily in the great war can compare with that of any other country, if it does not exceed it.

In the opinion of our ministers, these noble efforts are not sufficient. They should at least regulate their new position by consulting the people. I do not believe my mandate authorizes me to modify in so serious a manner our country's traditions. In this war of universal democracy against military despotism; in this war of liberty against tyranny, this Government should accept the very democratic principle of popular consultation. As a journalist has expressed it: "The voice of the people should lose nothing of its efficacy and of its eloquence in a democratic country which has already made such a splendid struggle against tyranny and political absolutism."

In Australia, Mr. Hughes, the prime minister, has not seen fit to have the Australian congress decree conscription for outside service, without asking the electors' opinion by means of a plebiscite. The majority has rejected compulsory service. Since then, Mr. Hughes has had a general election and he has been kept in power. If Mr. Hughes believes conscription necessary, he will again submit the question to the electors, through a plebiciste. I ask the Canadian government the same favour.

The people who will pay the imposition of blood have given me no mandate to deprive them of their liberty. Therefore I pray the Government to consult the people by means of a plebiscite. Is not the right of consultation one of the British subject's most universally recognized privileges. Parliament should not impose upon the people an important modification of its social and

constitutional administration before having obtained the nation's consent.

We are, it is true, in extraordinary conditions, but do the members elected in 1911 represent public opinion when voting upon a measure which so deeply affects our national existence?

The present Parliament is sitting only by virtue of an act of its own creation, since its normal term has expired eight months ago.

Should this Parliament, elected when the question of war in no way existed, involve the country into a new policy which raises the strongest protest in several parts of the country? I do not believe I have the right to bind the population of Canada without inviting it to express its opinion. My constituents strongly protest against the compulsory military service. If the majority of the Canadian electors declare in favour of selective conscription, the French Canadians shall do their duty and respect the law.

The protests which are voiced against conscription from every part of the country should induce the Government to call for a plebiscite.

I have performed my duty by urging a referendum which cannot effect a change of government. If we are plunged in the whirlpool of militarism, I shall not be responsible for the violating of the Canadian people's rights.

Will the referendum be approved by the majority of the House? Many expected it a few days ago, but we now see Sir Wilfrid Laurier's lieutenants, in the English speaking provinces, approve of conscription and condemn the referendum. In my opinion, should we have general elections and the Liberals obtain the control of the administration, the majority of the Liberal members would impose compulsory service.

According to the debates of this House, the Conservative party and some distinguished members of the Liberal party shall be responsible for the adoption of this measure.

If this bill is adopted by both Houses and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor General, I shall appeal to my compatriots to show due respect of the law, in order to restore union and harmony among the different classes and the different races.

The French Canadians, having all in their hearts the greatness of their country, will surely rally under the flag of the Bonne Entente. My compatriots are the most interested in the triumph of the Allies. We need the prestige of France to set off the splendour of our national development.

As Lieut.-Col. L. G. Desjardins has written it, in his splendid work: "England, Canada and the great war." We may say and think whatever we please, but we cannot help it; France, grand, powerful, respected, shall always be one of the mainstays of our future. We therefore have the best reasons to wish for her success, jointly with her powerful Allies, and to desire that the cordial union which binds her to the British Empire be perpetuated, thus procuring us all the advantages we have good reason to anticipate therefrom.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ALPHONSE VERVILLE (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to treat this question from a standpoint different from that of any hon. gentleman who has participated in this debate. I shall discuss it, not from the standpoint of nationality, or of province, but simply from that of organized labour. I, as other members of this House, who have so far addressed Parliament and the country, understand my full responsibility, and whatever I may say, at the outset I will state that I assume all the responsibility. I do not pretend to say that the discussion will be pleasing, perhaps, to a certain class of society, but it may be pleasing to others. But when a member rises in this House, it is for a purpose, and that purpose is to express his opinion as he sees fit, provided he keeps within the rules of order.

The great departure from our economic system, which the Government proposes to make in the enactment of the measure under discussion forces every one to consider the economic and national effects, as well as the general results, of such a radical change. This change may have for effect a general disruption of our economic power. Far be it from me to attempt to discuss this important subject from the constitutional point of view, but nothing prevents one from discussing its economical aspect.

The question of the day is, have we exhausted our man-power? According to the Prime Minister, we have not; according to others, we have; so then, it is a question of judgment based on figures at our command. As far as I can judge, we had exhausted this power before we reached the figure of 400,000 soldiers for overseas service. Amongst the different classes which compose our nation, two are specially called upon to state their attitude toward the world's battle now raging in Europe and the part which each has taken and proposes to take in the future. These classes are the wealthy and the poorer classes. In many quarters they would be called the exploiters and the exploited.

So far, the former class has controlled everything even in the sanctuary of Parliament; the autocracy of capital is becoming more and more a menace to the well-being of our Dominion. They have succeeded without great efforts in creating a large number of millionaires who are tumbling over one another in the rush for titles. They have succeeded in having these titles spread over the head of many undeserving men, and in that respect we are ridiculed by our neighbours as well as by our own sound-thinking people. Is it because a large number of our man power have willingly and voluntarily embraced military life, and a large number have gone to the soil of France, have fought and died to prevent Prussian military system being established in Canada?—Is it because many have never seen the field of hostilities yet and perhaps never will?— Is it because many are receiving good appointments and enjoying fat salaries without doing much good to the country?—Is it for these reasons that so many in this class have been knighted? It is perhaps fair to expose before the public the part that each of them has and is now playing in this great struggle, so as to establish for each their responsibility, and to show which of them has been the greatest factor, as well as the amount of patriotism shown in each case.

To any observer of human nature, there are times in life when occasion presents itself to appreciate the real value of sacrifice, and it must not be measured by words, but by deeds, with allowance made for the position in which each of us is placed and for the real motives that have influenced his decision. The former class I will admit, have cleverly set in operation the machinery at their command—nearly all the newspapers of the land, reviews of all kinds, literature, pamphlets of all sorts, have been in circulation to stimulate patriotism among the people. They have appealed to the generosity of every one to assist those who suffer through the war. In many quarters this has appeared as philanthropy, and has really been philanthropy, perhaps, in a few cases. They have organized large plants and institutions to manufacture implements of war material.

they have tried to revolutionize our system of transportation. They have opened industries which had never seen the light in our country before. They have recommended the increase in food production. They have recommended thrift to all classes of society. They have accumulated a large capital so as to finance the operations of the country.

The latter class also have done their share. They have furnished voluntarily seventy-five per cent of the 411,000 men already enlisted—that is, over 318,000 of our forces. They have set and kept in operation all the industries of the land. They have been, and are still, keeping in operation our whole system of transportation. They have produced the necessaries of life. They have increased production in many cases to a maximum. Through their labour they have been the means of increasing the wealth of many. They have been and are still the brain power of the machine. To sum up, they have and are still the economic power of the land.

With these few reasons set forth before this Parliament, it is proper to analyse, which of these two classes has been more useful, has done more to win the war, and has shown more patriotism. If we consider the motives of the former classes in their philanthropic, as well as in their patriotic action, we must believe that selfishness has been the determining factor with many.

Let us put the question: Is it patriotism to manufacture implements of war at scandalous profits, after being well provided, by guarantees from the Government—that is, from the people's money? Is it patriotism to secure contracts of millions of dollars at exorbitant figures, taking advantage of the needs of our soldiers in the trenches? Was it patriotism to organize a staff of middlemen so as to rob right and left the treasury of our country as well as that of the Allies? Is it patriotism to speculate in the most vital part of the soldier's existence, that is on foodstuffs? Was it patriotism to charge scandalous prices for land on which our soldiers were to be trained? Was it patriotism to charge on money loaned to the country percentages that made us the laughing stock of our neighbour? Was it patriotism to grant contracts to firms in the United States instead of to firms in Canada? Was it patriotism to prevent industries being nationalized for the better prosecution of the war? Was it patriotism to compel workingmen to contribute so many days' wages to the Red Cross or Patriotic Funds, while it was known that many could not make both ends meet, and publish in large headlines the fact that such an amount has been subscribed by such a firm?

Was it patriotism to reduce the wages of working men so as to make larger profits, regardless of fat prices received on contracts? Was it patriotism that induced them to force many employees to enlist, while many parasites were left in cafés, ballrooms, cricket and golf grounds? Was it patriotism that induced them to prevent the rank and file from buying foodstuffs at reasonable prices? And so on, all along the line. These make up but a very small percentage of the reasons for the patriotism of the wealthy classes. They are, perhaps, these so-called fathers of society who are demanding the enactment of this measure, knowing full well that they have the means to evade the law. They are playing their strongest trump card against a referendum because they are accustomed to command and to lead rather than to be controlled. This class of our population are in need of nothing. Food and the other necessities of life, regardless of price, are plentiful, so far as they are concerned. They have the power to command the powers that be to enact legislation from which they will derive large profits. If I were to take the figures of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), showing the amounts paid by way of taxation on profits, they would be convincing enough without giving any more. He has spread them on Hansard, and it does not take a great mathematician to figure them out. I submit that this very faction is somewhat responsible for the present legislation. The word "exemption" is equivalent to the word "protection." I am tempted to say that some pray that the present struggle may last some time yet, so that they may make scandalous profits. What has been done since the beginning of the war to get back to the treasury of the country some of this conscience money by the inauguration of a system of taxation which would not exist if these people had not been permitted to make such profits? And, of course, if that system of taxation had not existed, the expenses of collection would have been saved.

I admit that war can only be won, not by sentiment, but by practical common sense. I do not believe in the displays of sentiment that we witness, day in and day out, in this House. Those who are not displaying so much sentiment may be just as loyal as others. What is winning the war in Europe? The word " socialism " has been used more than once in this House; it has scared many

people in different parts of the country. When I look at what is happening in Great Britain, in France, in Italy, and in all the Allied countries, I see that it is the principle of socialism which is now winning the war. When Britain took possession of the railways, mines and industries she applied the principle of socialism with a view to winning the war. I ask the present Government what they have done in that respect? If they have been afraid to take action because of the word " socialism." I hope that they will apply another name to it, and take steps to do what has been done in the Old Country.

I believe that I can speak for a great majority of the wage-earners of Canada. I know their sentiments and their feeling; if any take issue with me they make up a small minority. I have had the experience of struggling for life; it is something not easy to forget. In the name of those for whom I speak I take issue w th the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), as well as with the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), when they say that labour is in favour of conscription. I say that labour is against any kind of compulsion. The other day the member for Red Deer stated that organized labour adopts the principle of conscription because it compels persons to join the different trades unions. No one can show me in the constitution or rules of organized labour anywhere anything which indicates that organized labour compels anybody to work with them if he does not want to do so. The principles adopted by organized labour are based on freedom. If a member of a labour union does not want to work with those who do not belong to the union it is his right to refrain.

The same applies to the opposite case: if a man who does not belong to the association does not want to work with members of it, he does not have to do so. We do not prevent the employer from employing whoever he likes; at the same time we maintain, and rightly so, that he cannot compel us to work with those men if we do not want to do so. This is the principle which has been adopted in every strike in the country if there are any exceptions, they are very few. Those who say, therefore, that the principle of compulsion is embodied in the constitution or rules and regulations of trade unions, are making a great mistake. I shall later, in a very few words, expose the fallacy of that argument.

Compulsion is the very evil that labour has been fighting against for more than half a century, in time of peace as well as in time of war. Labour men are free and independent; free and independent they want to remain. I do not want the country to believe that organized labour is afraid of war. They have had to engage many times in the struggle between capital and labour; besides, when you consider the number of men belonging to labour organizations who are now at the front, you realize the truth of my contention. I understood the Minister of Labour, when he was giving some figures the other day, to say that organized labour at the front did not amount to so very much, after all, because there were only about—

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. VERVILLE: I understood it that way; I accept my hon. friend's correction. Remember if there were 30,000 men at the front who belonged to labour organizations, 90 per cent of those men would have families. If you figure the number of citizens throughout the country that these men represent, you will find that they have done more than their share. I say, therefore, that they are not afraid of war.

Labour men do not forget the blood shed by their forefathers in order to obtain the advantages of a system of free association. What they got was never secured through the good-will of other classes. Every foot of ground obtained by them has cost as many lives as the present war, although in different form.

And still they are willing to join the colours, but they want to have a voice in the administration and in the enactment of the legislation by which they will have to abide. They have been trained in a school which teaches that the referendum is the most democratic platform upon which all can stand. They also have been taught that they are the producers of the wealth of the world, and that man-power is superior to all other power in the land. Is it possible to believe that with their economic education they would accept compulsion without a referendum?

The Prime Minister, in his address when moving the second reading of this Bill, expressed what I would consider a threat from the soldiers who will return after the war is over. I have too much respect for my fellow man who has gone to fight the battle of civilization not to resent an insult—I use the word unwillingly, for I know the extreme politeness of my right hon. friend. Nevertheless, he insinuated

that the soldiers who will return will have lost all their dignity, their spirit of fraternity, their manhood to the extent of being a menace to the public security. Never will I believe that. Never will I permit any one to attack them in their dignity as workingmen without entering the strongest protest. My fellow-workingmen have known each other too long; too many are closely related and connected with one another to believe that. Did my right hon. friend think when he made those remarks that they might have a double meaning? Has he thought that the soldiers of industry are as essential as the soldiers at the front? He has, for he has said so. The soldiers of industry have made up their mind to produce everything necessary to provide for their fellow men—the best of implements and the best of food. They believe that it is not man-power which is needed at the present time, but supplies of all sorts. They know that the difficulty of transportation is a big factor; they also know that the United States are endeavouring to solve this problem, and from information at their disposal they are convinced that for Canada it is not man-power but food that is needed on the field of battle. Let me give a quotation here in support of my argument that it is man-power that is badly needed in this country. I do not want to go over the material which my hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. McCoig) brought forward this afternoon, to show the different advertisements appearing in the United States for men to come to work in this country. As he has stated, they are required to go on the farms. I have a small newspaper, La Justice de Biddeford, published in the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the state of Maine?

Mr. VERVILLE: Yes. In the first column there is a small item calling attention to an advertisement in another column. I will read it first in French, and then I will try to translate it into English if I can. The article is as follows:

Nous attirons l'attention des ouvriers textiles sur l'annonce de la Dominion Textile Co., que l'on trouvera dans une autre colonne. Cette compagnie opre de bonne calaires pour ceux qui désireraient aller travailler à Magog, P.Q.

This is the translation:

We call the attention of textile workers to the advertisement of the Dominion Textile Company that will be found in another column. This company offers good wages for those desirous of going to work at Magog, P.Q.

This is the advertisement:

ON DEMANDE.

Des employés de latures de coton.

Nous avons des positions pour les employés de filatures de coton d'expérience dens quelques-une de nos Douze Fiatures. On n'acceptera que des familles d'origine canadienne. Des arrangements seront faits pour le transport des familles et de l'emploi sera donné à tous les membres de la famille de plus de 14 ans.

Bonnes conditions de travail et bon salaire aux personnes d'expérience.

Echelle de salaires, 55 hrs. par semaine.

Chambre de Cardage—

Frame tenders .....$11 à $15, par semaine

Chambre de filage—

Frame tenders .....$ 9 à $11 par semaine.

Fileurs sur Mule-Jenny.$15 à $17 par semaine.

Tisserands ....$11 à $15 par semaine.

Salaires proportionnels dans les autres départements.

Renseignements dtaillés sur les conditions de vie, les loyers, etc., seront donnés sur tout village désigné. Ecrive en français ou en anglais ou adressez-vous en personne au

BUREAU DE PLACEMENT,

Dominioon Textile Company, Limited,

112 Rue St-James, Montréal, P.Q.

Filatures à St-Henri, P.Q., Chutes Montmorency, Qué.; Hochelaga, Qué.; Magog, Qué.; Côte St-Paul, Québec; Kingston, Ont.

For the benefit of hon. members who do not understand French, I will translate this advertisement as best I can, although, of course, it will be translated in better form later on:

Employees in cotton factories wanted. We have positions for employees with experience in cotton factories in some of our dozen factories. We will only accept families of Canadian origin. Arrangements will be made for the transportation of families, and employment will be given to all the members of a family over fourteen years of age. Good conditions of work and a good salary to persons of experience.

Scale of wages, 55 hours per week.

Frame tenders,

Detailed information as to the condition of life, lodging, etc., will be given in each village designated. Write in French or in English, or address yourself in person to Bureau de Placement, Dominion Textile Company, Ltd., 112 Rue St. James, Montreal, P.Q. The factories are at St. Henri, P.Q.; Montmorency Falls, P.Q.; Hochelaga, Que.; Magog, Que.; Cote St. Paul, Que.; Kingston, Ont.

Every one knows that Biddleford is quite a factory centre. I am not speaking now of the farming industry. I am speaking simply of textile industries. I have given this advertisement in this American paper to show that there is a scarcity of labour at the present time, and I believe that I am not far wrong when I say that 400,000 is the maximum man-power that we can reasonably send to the front.

It has been stated in this House that man-power should be called upon before accumulated wealth. The arguments, how

ever in support of that statement do not appear to be reasonable. Without any compulsion we have succeeded in calling to the colours over 400,000 men, or about one-fifth of our man-power between the ages of 20 and 45 years, and before we endeavour to proceed any further by compulsion, we should extract from the accumulated wealth at least the same percentage. Why has not the Government taken such action before presenting the present Bill? They would then have had some excuse, but not a dollar except under the unfair system of taxation which now prevails, has been taken.

Was I right when I said that the power of organized capital had a great deal to do in the administration of public affairs? But, though their power may be great, it is as nothing compared with the power of the creator of wealth. This power if put into operation would lead to the entire disruption of our present system. Organized labour has notified the Government and the country in that respect. When they say that they will use all the means at their disposal to oppose compulsion I want this Parliament and the country to know that means a general strike. And what would a strike mean under present conditions? It would mean a calamity. Would any one assume responsibility for that? If responsibility there be it rests upon those who prevent the masses from pronouncing themselves on the present measure. They alone who prevent the people from expressing themselves on this measure will be charged with disloyalty by the soldiers at the front. On them will fall all the responsibility—responsibility, perhaps, for the greatest disruption of our productive power.

The Government must not believe that organized labour does not appreciate the Government's full responsibility in this matter. I want this Parliament to understand that, even if the whole of organized labour were to be exempted, their determination would not be altered one iota; it is a question of principle, and it involves too many years of sacrifice for them to be indifferent. The Government has no right to plunge this country into the dark days of a general strike.

The Government must be big enough to understand the errors they have already committed. They must understand that organized labour has been ignored ever since the war began, and that organized labour certainly was not consulted on the present measure.

The Minister of Labour the other night read from a newspaper which I take myself. I can tell him that if organized labour in the United States had furnished the same number of men in proportion to population as we have in Canada, every one of them over there would be against compulsion to-day. During the latter part of March I happened to be in the United States, visiting Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis, Cleveland and Buffalo. President Wilson's Bill was not presented to Congress until the 2nd day of April. When I was in Chicago I spoke to three of the heads of organized labour, and learned that President Wilson had had a conference with them ten days before the Bill was introduced. The President took them into his confidence and asked what support he might expect, and as a result a large committee was formed. If the United States Government could do that, why could not this Government consult organized labour before this measure was introduced? Why have this Government not consulted organized labour at any time during the last three years. They say: Oh, it is too late now; we have to get the men. During the last ten days the whole cry in this House has been: We want more men. Apparently it does not matter who is going to make the munitions and produce the food so long as men are got for the front. In the United States, before the Bill was presented to Congress, organized labour in the United States stipulated that not a dollar of profit beyond what was reasonable should be allowed to the large business concerns of the United States Many business firms in that country offered to manufacture goods at cost price. What a different condition of affairs we see in Canada. If anybody in this country made such an offer as that, we should erect a handsome monument to him in one of the biggest squares in Ottawa. I cannot divulge the confidential information that was entrusted to me, but I am at liberty to say that the President of the United States would not move until he had organized labour behind him. In the United States, through the co-operation of organized labour, men are moved to where they can do the most necessary work. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that is one of the objects of this Bill. I claim that the Government are greatly to blame for not taking organized labour into their confidence. It may not be too late even yet.

I may be told that organized labour represents only a small proportion of the wage-earners of this country, but we must not forget the number of their dependents and those who are in sympathy with them. It

is needless for me to give the figures because they are well known to all. But, taking the figures which the Minister of Labour gave, 65,000—

Mr. CROTHERS: I did not give that figure at any time. What I said was that the membership of organized labour in Canada amounted to 160,000, and of that number 30,000 had gone to the front. Taking organized labour as one-fifth of the total wage-earners of Canada, I said that if those who were not members of organized labour enlisted in the same proportion as those who were, 150,000 wage-earners would be fighting at the front.

Mr. VERVILLE: Surely my hon. friend, being Minister of Labour, must know the figures. He knows very well that a certain portion of organized labour is affiliated with the Trades Congress and that another portion is not. As I was saying, the number of dependents and those in sympathy with organized labour is very large, and the only way to find out their opinion is by means of a referendum.

If, at the beginning of the war, the Government had taken organized labour into its confidence, as has been done in other countries, the present position would be brighter. It is perhaps not yet too late, for I honestly believe that if a referendum were taken and the principle of the present measure was endorsed by any majority of the people, organized labour would, as usual, submit loyally to the decision——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. VERVILLE: —and do all in their power to see it carried out. It may be that we would have a contrary result, and then, were organized labour called upon to do their part under the voluntary system, they would answer to the call so long as the productive powers of the country were not paralyzed.

My hon. friend from Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) the other day told us that there are at least 12,000 Canadians in Great Britain at the present time whose presence is absolutely unnecessary. We have been told that each one of the soldiers costs the country about $1,000 a year. Taking the figures quoted by the hon. gentleman, 12,000 —and doubtless his figures are conservative—as each of these men would cost $1,000 a year, or $2.75 per day, it costs us $32,000 per day to keep 12,000 men on the other side of the ocean who are absolutely useless, as has been stated here. This is equal to an expenditure of $960,000 per month. This country is spending $960,000 per month, for what? To keep 12,000 men on the other side who are absolutely useless, and who probably could be of great use in this country. I should probably be safe in saying that $1,000,000 a month would not be an exaggeration, but I am taking my hon. friend's figures. That is, we are spending $1,000,000 per month for nothing at all. Is this because we want to say that we have so many hundred thousand men on British soil? Is it because we want to say that we have 120,000 or more men on the soil of Britain, who I suppose have never set foot on the soil of France? Is it for that reason? If it is, I would advise the Department of Militia to call all of those men back to Canada as quickly as possible and put them on farms or in industries where they could be productively employed, and then, Sir, we could ask for voluntary enlistment and the labourmen of this country could not say: how is it possible to maintain production when we are short of hands in every part of the country? I said that I would not be guilty of advocating a general strike; I would not be guilty of that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. VERVILLE: Perhaps nobody knows better than I do what that means, and I only wish that the present Government would understand it as well as I do and realize the danger that lies in a general strike. I do not want to go into details, because they are horrors, not only for the members of this House, but for the country and for the Allies, and would be a possible menace to the successful carrying on of the war. But we must bear in mind that if you are going to force that class of men by compulsion without their being consulted, whoever is responsible for that will have to answer not only to the country but to many other countries on the other side, and my hope is that this will not come to pass. I conclude by borrowing the utterance of a great statesman, one who has been quoted as an authority in many cases, the immortal Abraham Lincoln. The language of Abraham Lincoln, the great president of the United States, has been quoted in this House more than once; I have quoted it myself. This great statesman did not very often make mistakes, and he is regarded here and everywhere as having been a grand old man. In a speech delivered by him at Hartford, Connecticut, in 1860, referring to the New England shoemakers' strike, he said:

Thank God we have a system of labour where there can be a strike. Whatever the pressure, there is a point where the workingman may stop.

Now, Sir, if a man like Abraham Lincoln would make such a statement as that before thousands of people, not only the strikers but the people of the city of Hartford, do not those words apply absolutely to this country at the present time? With him I will say: Thank God, labour has a weapon that it can use intelligently, and no power on earth can contest that right. My last appeal to the Government, to the Parliament and to the country, is, for the love of unity, for the love of the constitution under which we are governed, for the love of those soldiers now at the front, and of those they have left behind, and for the love of humanity, let us have a referendum.

Mr. W. G. WEICHEL (Waterloo, North): Mr. Speaker, I do not see how any one can rise on this occasion without feeling that the responsibility of a representative in the Canadian House of Commons to-day is very serious and very grave. Many striking sentiments have been expressed during the course of this debate, and the one thing that stands out very clearly and distinctly is the honesty of purpose which has characterized the debate from the very beginning. I feel that right conclusions regarding great national and vital questions as they concern our country at the present time can be reached only by conscientiously and honestly striving to understand existing conditions as they appeal to us to-day. To me the situation is serious. If any man will look at the map of Europe, he will see that the responsibilities of Great Britain and her Allies in this great struggle are very grave, and that the obstacles to be overcome before this war is won are still great. A business man to-day does not know where he is for twenty-four hours at a stretch, because conditions are upside down. The Russian situation, although it has cleared somewhat during the last week or two, still looks ominous to most of us, while the submarine menace, as we all know, is just as grave to-day and just as dangerous, so far as the integrity of the Empire is concerned, as it was weeks ago. These conditions appeal to me, and therefore I am one of those members of this House of Commons who to-day feel their responsibility in a crisis such as we are passing through. And, therefore, to cut the matter short, I am going to vote in favour of the Bill. There are two proposals before the House, and we are familiar with both of them. We have heard them discussed by a good many members since the debate began. We have heard from the Prime Minister. He has been across the water. He has met the men in the old land. They, no doubt, have given him information which has caused him to come back to his native land, and to ask the Parliament of Canada to pass the Military Service Bill. The other proposal is an amendment moved by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, that a referendum be taken on this matter. Sir, it is needless and unnecessary for me to quote figures to-night, and I do not wish to occupy more time than necessary. The figures have been quoted by other speakers. All I wish to say is that, in my opinion, the Military Service Bill is a whole-hearted effort to win the war, while the referendum, on the other hand, means delay, and, as one of the speakers pointed out the other day, leads us nowhere. We have had referendums in the past, and they have only been a farce. For a few minutes, allow me to refer to some other matters, before I take up the consideration of the Bill.

I well remember those ominous and fateful days preceding the war. I was then on a trip out West, and never shall I forget the shrill voice of the newsboys on the streets of the city of Winnipeg, when, on that fateful day, they broke the news to the people of that city, in the early hours of the morning, that England had declared war on Germany. Sir, you can readily understand that war between England and Germany had a terrible meaning for me, and, like a flash, my position was revealed to me. Hon. members in this House know my ancestry. I am the only one of the 221 members in this House whose parentage is German, and I wish to take this opportunity to-night, realizing my position—and I know that the members of the House will appreciate my position—to thank every member of the House, irrespective of party, and the Government, for the many acts of kindness that have been extended to me, and to my people, since the war began. I represent a constituency, Sir, where the greater majority of the people are of German ancestry, and the war has certainly produced changes in the sentiments of the people of that riding, but I am happy to state that, although there were some differences of opinion—and these, Sir, I am sorry to say, were greatly exaggerated by the newspapers of this country—to-day there is unity of purpose on the part of the people in the riding of North Waterloo. There is only one thing that lies before

them, Mr. Speaker, and that is their duty, and they are going to do it to the very limit.

We have heard several hon. gentlemen in the House refer to the voluntary enlistment. I shall have something to say about that. The results in my riding were fair. They might have been better, but, take it as a whole, they were quite satisfactory. The rural population of my riding includes many of the class of people called the Mennonites, who are exempt from military service, as are other classes of conscientious objectors. These people came to Canada over a hundred years ago from Pennsylvania, and, travelling up the Grand river, settled in the county of Waterloo. They are God-fearing, plain living people, and I pay this tribute to them here to-night, that no finer set of people can be found in the whole Dominion of Canada than the Mennonite farmers of Waterloo. But, Sir, let it be understood by this House to-night that we could not get any volunteers from these people who are exempted from military service; and therefore our enlistments came entirely from the city of Kitchener, the town of Waterloo, the village of Elmira, and two or three smaller hamlets near by. I think I am quite safe in making the statement that we have enlisted over 1,000 men in North Waterloo. And of that number, nearly 300 were boys of German ancestry. I do not wish to apologize for my people, because I think they have done quite well. They did very well as far as the Patriotic Fund was concerned. They stand very high in the estimation of the chairman of that fund. They worked night and day to make the Belgian and Red Cross Relief Funds successful and were most ably supported by the ladies of our district. We have heard a very great deal about patriotism and loyalty in the Dominion of Canada during the past two or three years, and I wish to say that loyalty and patriotism, as I have learned to size it up, count for naught if not backed up with something more than flag-waving and loud talk.

Coming down to the Military Service Bill Mr. Speaker, I might say to you—and I am honest and conscientious in my conviction—that I was always opposed to compulsory service. I do not like the word "conscription." I am democratic in my ideas along these lines. But the situation, as it has been presented to me in this House, compels me to sidetrack any opinions I may have had in the past on this question, and to cast my vote in favour of this Bill because I believe it is in the interests of our common country. After

reading this measure, I prefer this Bill to the Militia Act. I think it is more comprehensive and more businesslike in its terms, I think selective conscription is better suited to the best interests of this country than the system of choosing men in a haphazard manner. Besides it will enable every kind of labour to be supplied.

I was surprised to hear a statement made by an hon. gentleman who, it is supposed, expects to be the next Minister of Labour—the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville). He said—and this, no doubt, will go broadcast through the country to-morrow—that if the measure passed, a general strike would be declared by the labour unions in Canada. I consider that a rash statement to make at this time. Suppose the boys in the trenches should organize a general strike and refuse to fight for us because we declined to send them help; what about our institutions then? What about all that we hold dear? Statements of that kind are absolutely out of place; the people do not want to listen to them. The people want their representatives in this House to discuss these matters in a manly way, not to spread—shall I call it sedition?—among the people, or to speak as my hon. friend spoke a few minutes ago.

The Military Service Bill appeals to me because men are not to be conscripted for a single purpose. It was a wise step on the part of the Government to provide that the general purpose of the Bill should be to fulfil every requirement necessary to the carrying on of the war. Agricultural interests are not to be deprived of farm help. The farmers have been urged to greater production. Would you to-day deprive the farmers of their help, who are doing such magnificent work in producing foodstuffs to win the war? Would you cripple an industry which is so essential to the winning of the war? Some hon. gentlemen have said that the Bill does not provide for this particular purpose, but I believe that it does. and that same is outlined and featured in the Bill.

I believe also that any amendments brought forward by any member of this House, irrespective of party, will be warmly welcomed by the Government.

What is expected of a representative who has been elected by the people to this House of Commons? I have travelled considerably throughout the country since the war began, and the conclusion I have come to is that there is a whole-hearted purpose among the people to-day, that of winning the war. As far as I am concerned, my

duty is clear, whether I win or lose at the next election. Mr. Speaker, I would rather go down to defeat ten thousand times than side-track an issue like this, which means so much to my country.

The old line of political talk is distasteful to the people of to-day. What they want is action, quick action and plenty of it. Sir, the men at the front are waiting to see what we are going to do. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Verville) said that there were many labour men in the trenches. I think that these labour men who are in the trenches do not differ in their views respecting this matter from the 200,000 or 300,000 other men who are fighting the battles of Canada in France. I believe that all our soldiers are united on this question, and that they expect the Parliament of Canada to pass this measure without delay. I take my hat off to the soldier. I know many a fine fellow who exchanged a remunerative position for the paltry little sum which he receives to-day in uniform. As a citizen of Canada I cannot help appreciating the great work that is being done to-day by the men at the front, and I am the last man to deny them the reinforcements which they so badly need. We have often seen the soldiers pass by. We bade them God-speed, sent them to the firing line—and then quietly settled back in our easy chairs and waited for news from the front. These men are to-day in France; they are working for us; they are dying for us. What are we going to do for them? That is the question that is now before this House and before this country.

I was across the international boundary line a few days ago, and I met several prominent gentlemen in New York City. I never was prouder in my life than I was when I listened to what these men had to say about Canada's part in the war. It would do your heart good, Sir, to hear what they said about what Canada did under the voluntary system. Canada's effort is one of the grandest spectacles ever presented to the world. With a population of barely 8,000,000, she organized, equipped and sent overseas a force of between 300,000 and 400,000 men. And Canada has every reason to feel proud of the achievements of her sons at the front.

We have heard a great deal about patriotism. What is it that makes a man love a country? Because it is the land that gave him birth. "The land that gave us birth" is surely pressed upon us now as something paramount to every other consideration. The man who loves his country, is her faithful standard-bearer, and tries by every means in his power to keep her high above her rivals, must be considered a true and worthy patriot. But if he is inactive and lukewarm in her cause and does not with all his might uphold her institutions and everything that will have a tendency to elevate her in the eyes of the world, he must be looked upon with distrust, if not with contempt. What is it, after all, that makes a country? Lands, forests, rivers, mines? True, there is inspiration in these things. But, Sir, a country is nothing without its men. Some time ago, in reading the works of a certain author, I came across the following paragraphs:

> The very same country whose scenery, tame or bold, charming or awful, has been the inspiration of gallant generations may, as the wheel of time turns, fall to indolent savages, listless slaves or sordid money-getters.
>
> It is the nation, not the land, which makes the patriot, and if the nation degenerates, the land becomes only a monument, not a dwelling. Let the nation rouse itself, and the country may be a palace and a temple once more.

In this war, democracy as we have it here is forced by autocracy as they have it in Germany to accept temporary conscription in order that the issue of this great struggle may once for all be settled. Why, I know hundreds, yea, thousands of men who left the Old Land to live in democratic countries in North-America. These people preferred living under British institutions and they continue to do so to-day because they are guaranteed freedom of speech and liberty of conscience, and they much prefer to live on the broad acres of Canada to passing their future existence in congested Europe.

I am voting for this Bill because I feel it is a necessary expedient during a grave crisis that has overtaken our Empire; but while I am doing that, I hope and trust that militarism will never rear its ugly head in this country. Militarism is a cold code. My ancestors knew something about it, and what I know about militarism makes me abhor it from the bottom of my heart. Its unwritten laws are as unchangeable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. Under this code the end justifies the means—any act is entirely all right because it is done to serve the end. It is against the doctrine of "live and let live," and against the individual himself be he English, French, German or any other nationality.

Voltaire, the famous Frenchman, once stated that while France ruled the land and England the sea, Germany ruled the clouds. I am fully convinced, Sir, that there are

two Germanys. Old Germany is the Germany that gave the world Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, and Goethe's Faust. It is the Germany that gave the world the Fairy Tales of Grimm, and that gave to the world Humperdinck, Schubert, Schumann, Schiller, Heine, Hauptmann, Brahms, Mozart, Liszt and Wagner. That Germany still lives to-day. It exists away down deep, gasping and groaning under the autocracy that has been imposed all over it. It is the Germany that President Wilson had in mind when he stated: "We have no quarrel with the German people." No, Mr. Speaker, we are at war with the thing that caused the symbol of Germany to change from the learned college professor to the military autocrat.

Shall we say that commerce and industry have so taken possession of the public mind that there is no further room for patriotism? Has the spirit of democracy, in its workings towards individualism of charcter, unfitted our citizens for sacrifice on behalf of the welfare of the nation as a whole? I am positive that this is not the case. The splendid response of our volunteers since the war began, the deeds of valour performed in many hard-fought fights and the whole-souled effort of the people at home are evidence enough for me that the national spirit is not decadent. What was saved for us in the past must be preserved.

Let me say a few words with regard to discrimination along race lines. If there is in this House one man who knows something about racial prejudice, that man is myself. I never knew what racial prejudice meant until August, 1914. From that time on, I have known what it is to have insult and ridicule and everything else that makes life unenviable heaped upon one. When I hear hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec speaking about racial prejudice, I came to the conclusion that the prejudice against my race must be of a different brand from that against theirs. Discrimination along the lines of religion, of birthplace, of race, of language, is un-British and absolutely wrong. We must not forget that this is a cosmopolitan country. For years, you have let the bars down and have invited hundreds and thousands of people from foreign lands to settle in the Dominion of Canada. These people came here and made a home for themselves. Speaking for my own people, I know that through thrift and industry they have succeeded nobly. But let me say to the Government that the sooner the laws of the country with regard to naturalization are amended, the better for all concerned. I know men who have lived in my riding for thirty, forty or fifty years. They have succeeded well in life, and their first and second generations to-day are growing up around them. Those men have done public duty; they have served on the school boards of our cities and towns, and some of them have been aldermen. Yet to-day many of them find themselves disfranchised. There is a saying that ignorance of the law excuses no man; but I for one and others must take upon ourselves certain responsibilities which we did not fulfil before to those people, simply because no one in this country ever expected that we should get into such a war as is raging at the present time. There are men who have lived in my riding for forty-three years who thought that by taking the oath of allegiance they became British subjects, and when the time came they could not produce their naturalization papers and they were disfranchised. Yet some of those men have boys in the trenches at the front. Therefore, I say that the sooner these matters are remedied, the better for the unity of the different races in this Dominion of Canada.

Let me now relate a story of what happened not long ago in my house. I was summoned into my library and I found an old man of over seventy years of age sitting there. He said to me: "Mr. Weichel, is it permissible for me to speak to you in German?" I said: "My dear friend, we are not fighting languages, and I will try, if possible, to follow you." He said: "Will you get my boy out of the army?" Such inquiries, no doubt, are not new to most hon. members. I said: "How long has he been in?" He said, "Eleven months." I said, "I am sorry, my dear friend, but I am afraid that you cannot expect the Government of the Dominion of Canada to clothe and equip and drill your boy for eleven months and then simply ask me to come and take him out of the army again." "Well," he said, "I would not have asked this of you but mother is very anxious, for the boy has weak lungs. He has had pneumonia once and pleurisy twice, and she thinks it would be injurious to his health to send him into the trenches." I said: "I am very sorry, but I will do what a representative can do. I will lay the matter before the Officer Commanding the District and see what he has to say about it." He got up, and a big tear rolled down his face. "I am very sorry," he said, "that I worried you to-night, but it was for mother's sake; she wanted to keep the last one." "What

do you mean by the last one, my dear friend?" I asked. He said, "I have three boys with the Canadian Mounted Rifles in France." To-day that man who has given his all—his four sons—finds himself without naturalization papers. Three of his sons are in France fighting our battles, and he is here with no vote. Many have given their sons for the cause among them many members of this House. My brother's boy is wearing the King's uniform and is to-day in the trenches in France so that patriotism does not exist only with a few races in this country.

In view of the cleavage between the races of this country at the present time, I would urge that we take mighty good care how we handle people from the moment they arrive in this country. I would compel every citizen of Canada to be Canadian and British in soul as well as in name, and let the high standard of their work be their citizenship. That is the only way in which we can become a united country. Racial bitterness has a tendency to destroy the unity of races in Canada. I am a young man, and many of you have been here for years, but I want to say that nothing hurts me more than the cleavage which exists between the two great races of this country at the present time. I wish I were a magician and could dispel all these recriminations; they certainly do no good. I feel that both sides may be to blame.

We must not forget that day by day the loyal spirit of our people grows stronger. Narrowness of thought, unreasoning strife, and violent denunciation of things that must be done to preserve the Empire, cannot resist its influence. The destiny of our Empire and of others is in the balance. Could we but be given to understand how much we must depend upon the preservation of our democratic institutions, would not a new spirit take possession of the people. Racial prejudices would not be tolerated for a moment, and these evils, so disastrous to a young nation like Canada, would go down before the march of an outraged people.

We sing "God save the King," and have sung it ever since we were children. "Send him victorious," we say. But how can he be victorious unless we send somebody to win the victory for him? For my part, I have the most implicit faith in our Empire. I have faith in the strong and loyal heart of our common country, which clings fast to liberty and sooner or later rights wrongs and uproots evils. Racial prejudice has to a certain extent dislocated matters in Canada. In my opinion, this is only a sign towards new adjustments. Out of it all will come a new people, who, after passing through this fiery ordeal cleansed and purified, will appreciate more than ever British institutions as we have them to-day. Freedom and justice for all who live in these broad lands will be guaranteed anew, and democracy will have for them a newer and a broader meaning than in the past.

Mr. WILLIAM POWER (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, the important question at present before the House is one on which I have no desire to give a silent vote, for it will live not alone in the life of the present generation, but of those to come, and whether our assistance to the present war by compulsory service will be beneficial or not is the question of the hour.

Our boys who have so earnestly volunteered to carry the honour and the flag of Canada in this great conflict have brought lustre and honour on Canada. Their prowess, whether on the fields of Langemarck, Givenchy, or later on the far-famed ridge of Vimy, have earned the respect not only of the Allied nations, but of our opponents in this great struggle. Little did the people of Quebec, or of Canada, dream, when from that old city a flotilla bearing Canada's sons heaved their anchors and hied away to England's shores to stand shoulder to shoulder with the sons of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales, that the whole world would, within a few short months, resound with their praises. But, Mr. Speaker, this was an army of men gathered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, acting together with but one impulse. Duty had called them, and there was a voluntary response, not the shackling of compulsion such as to-day is proposed to be inflicted throughout this country. Our pride in the glorious past is to be levelled to the ground, and men in free Canada are to be shackled and manacled in order that they may be forced to fight for freedom and justice.

For me, to-day, standing in this House, the self-elected representative of one of the divisions of this country, on my own shoulders and conscience alone rests the responsibility for my vote. I owe no responsibility to any elector of my division, as my mandate from them expired in October, 1916. Therefore, my responsibility on their behalf ceases, and in voting on this extraordinary measure I shall act solely and entirely for myself, and not for any elector of my division. In giving this vote, I may draw upon myself the rancour of men who

through patriotic motives favour conscription, and perhaps the plaudits of men who for just as honourable reasons are opposed to the same. I fear not the first, nor do I seek the latter. My duty is plain and apparent: never shall I by my vote force any compulsory measure upon my fellow-men without the people of this Dominion having had a fair opportunity to pronounce a verdict upon it.

I shall no doubt be reproached in my native city and perhaps by some of my own flesh and blood for not assisting the soldiers at the front by my vote on this Bill. If I considered this Bill an earnest and sincere effort on the part of the Government to assist the men at the front, would I desert those near and dear to me? I am not an egotist, but if there is any hon. gentleman in this House who has good reason to take an interest in this contest it is the humble individual who stands before you. Five of those who are nearest and dearest to me have been in the conflict since its earliest days. One of those boys was gassed on the bloody field of Langemarck, the second is lying wounded in the Crimean Hospital at Woolwich, and the three others are doing duty somewhere in Flanders. I may be reproached by them, but if I thought it was the purpose to assist the soldiers at the front by this measure, I would be the last man to oppose it. But, in my own heart and conscience I feel that there is something underlying this measure, an object which I will not dare to bring before this House because the passions and prejudices of men are running very high. The day will come when the people of this country will know the object for which this measure has been brought before the House.

I am not a lawyer, I am only an ordinary business man, and I will not attempt to go through and dissect this Bill, nor to deal with the many classes of exceptions contained therein. That is the duty of lawyers. But there are exemptions which, if the Government put this Bill through in the interests of the country and the soldiers at the front, they must consider, and I will take these up one after the other.

As we hear on the floor of this House, as we have heard from the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), so we have heard from the food controller of the Mother Country, that it is not men we want; it is food to feed our people and soldiers. The cry goes abroad: Produce, produce, produce. If such is the case, are the farmers and farmers' sons going to be conscripted by this measure? No, I say they must and will be exempted. Secondly, there are great munition factories scattered throughout the length and breadth of this land. With the promoters of the factories I have no concern. For those men who have, with the cognizance of the Government, profited out of the life-blood and honour of our soldiers at the front, I have nothing to say. But in these factories are hundreds and thousands of humble toilers who are working night and day in order that we may send munitions to our soldiers at the front. Are these men going to be conscripted? No, they will also be exempted. Thirdly, we have our great railway systems extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. On these railroads hundreds and thousands of the ablest, brightest and noblest men that any country ever produced are working day and night in order to maintain the trade and commerce of this country, to bring the grain from the great West to the seaboard and to bring munitions to the seaboard. I ask you, Mr. Speaker: Are these men going to be conscripted? No, Sir, they will be exempted. Fourth, we have hundreds and thousands of dock labourers at the seaports and lake ports of this Dominion working night and day owing to the scarcity of tonnage in order to assist our soldier boys at the front. Are they going to be conscripted? No, they too will be exempted. Fifth, from the whole world a cry goes up to the terrible menace of the German submarines which are daily and hourly doing their utmost to torpedo and sink the many vessels bringing food and supplies to our Allies and our soldiers. The cry goes up: We must replace these vessels. In the United States and Canada men are toiling night and day to put in operation the many deserted shipyards in order to build new vessels and thereby help our Allies. Can this great work be done by waving a magic wand and without the assistance of labour? Can we find men to build ships if this Bill passes? No, we must have labour, and I ask if these men are going to be conscripted? No, they are not; they must be exempt. A coal controller has been appointed by the Government of the day. Is he going to go down into the bowels of the earth and bring up these miners? In the interests of shipping, of the railways, of our own firesides, it is necessary that we shall have miners remaining in the coal mines. Are these men to be conscripted? No, they will be exempt.

Then, I ask: Whom is this Compulsory Bill going to send to the front to assist our

brave volunteers? I have heard hon. gentlemen in this House declaring there are thousands and thousands of young men to be found around the cities, towns and villages in Canada. I have heard it said by the hon. member for Parry Sound the so-called hero of Vimy Ridge who stated he said good bye to hundreds of his men at the front. Why did he leave, what for? Was it to come to this House to raise passion and prejudice against the province of Quebec, and to be acclaimed as a hero by the Minister of Inland Revenue? Are these the men whom we are going to send to the front to protect our brave volunteers? Are the men who go prowling around at night in our towns and villages, night hawks, barroom loafers, horse thieves, gamblers, men whose carcases are loaded down with liquor and who are steeped in debauchery of the most degraded kind—are these the men that this Bill is going to send to protect our noble soldier boys? No, I would sooner let my son meet a soldier's death upon the field of Flanders than that he should be protected by such men and I am not certain but that most of the fathers and mothers of our soldiers would feel the same as I do. I am ashamed of the actions of some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have chided and derided members of His Majesty's loyal Opposition and who have charged that our opposition to this measure was merely due to partisanship. There is no partisanship about me where the interests of the boys at the front are concerned. The men who say such things about the members of the Opposition know not the feelings of the good, the patriotic, mother, when the glorious news is flashed across this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific of victories at Langemarck or elsewhere, or the anguish which is mingled with her pride, when at the end of the message she reads the words: "Casualties are heavy."

Do some of these gentlemen ever realize the feelings of these patriotic mothers who, when this news is flashed across the Atlantic, lie in their beds at night waiting for the dawn when they shall read the daily press, not to see the fashion plates, not to see the social items, where Sir this or Lady that has been attending some tea party, not to read of the plaudits bestowed upon the eloquence of hon. members in this House; no, but to read the long list of casualties to see if there are included the names of those who are near and dear to them. But with even greater dread do they wait in their humble homes throughout the breadth of Canada for the tinkling of that bell which will bring to their homes that cold, dastardly telegram which emanates from the Militia Department at Ottawa: Regret your son is killed, your son is missing, probably is a prisoner; your son is wounded, lies dangerously ill at clearing station number one or number two. Then, when the poor mother seeks for further information from Ottawa, what is the response? We know nothing more. And yet these men dare to say that the members of His Majesty's loyal Opposition are disloyal to their country. Those are the men who want to send their sons and our sons to stand shoulder to shoulder with a ragged, ruffianly mob collected throughout the streets of our cities under this compulsory measure. What is the cause of this Bill being before the House? It is the cause of the fall of many a man, it is pride. It was pride on the part of the Kaiser that brought on this cruel war, and to-day, Sir, I am sorry to say from my seat in this House that it is pride on the part of the hon. Prime Minister of this Dominion (Sir Robert Borden), a man for whom I personally have the greatest respect, although I am sorry to say I have not much respect for some of his colleagues—but it was pride, I say, on the part of the hon. leader of the Government that led him to launch this Bill before the country, to declare that his party were pledged to it, and they must carry it through this House. It was then, Sir, that he offered the gloved hand of conscription to our honoured leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

He said to him: come with me into a Cabinet, let us form a coalition government; we will pass a conscriptive Act in the House and then we will go before the people and ask them to ratify it. But this is not asking them to ratify it, this is dictating to them. Had the right hon. leader of the Government given the ungloved hand of peace, friendship and conciliation to him who has devoted his life to upholding the national honour and unity of Canada, had he given the ungloved hand of friendship and conciliation to him, even at this late stage, and said to him: come with me down to my native province, come with me down to the sea, let us stand in the old historic town of Halifax shoulder to shoulder appealing to the people for recruits to assist our boys at the front; then come down with me through the towns and villages of Nova Scotia, down through New Brunswick, over to Prince Edward Island, and then on to

the old province of Quebec; bring with you from the Liberal party your leading men; they are true Canadians, Canadians who love the grand old Union Jack, that flag of which we Canadians are so proud, that flag which has brought to us liberty and justice, —bring with you true loyal Canadians, men who love Great Britain, who love the Empire, bring them to the province of Quebec, bring them to the old city of Quebec, and there united, standing upon the pedestal of that monument which overlooks the St. Lawrence—the noblest monument that is to be found in the world to-day, that monument erected to the victor and the vanquished, that monument erected to the heroic deeds of Wolfe and Montcalm, that monument whose every stone speaks peace, unity, conciliation—let us stand together around that monument, Liberals and Conservatives, Englishmen and Frenchmen, Catholics and Protestants, and rally around us the youth, the strength and the manhood of that province; then let us continue on to the metropolis of Montreal, on to the golden fields of Ontario, even on to the Pacific coast. I will venture to say, Sir, from my seat in this House, that had this been done, before the snow shall whiten Canadian ground, we should have hundreds and thousands of good and true volunteers to assist our boys at the front. But with a compulsory Act, I say the snows will come and the snows will go, and the boys will still be waiting at the front to hear the tread of those so-called men who are to be enlisted under this compulsory measure.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have detained this House so long. We are now upon the eve of celebrating the glorious festival of the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, and I trust and hope that there can be found men in this country who will yet unite the different classes and creeds throughout Canada so that we can show a united front on the fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, there are but two words, vox populi.

Mr. P. MICHAUD (Victoria, N.B.): It is not my intention to dwell at great length on this important measure. There never was such an important Bill before this House since Confederation, and although all the ground has been practically well covered, it is my duty to make a few remarks on this subject. We have noticed all through this country great agitation, and from the information we have it is only fair to say that this measure will not be accepted without much discussion. What will be the consequence if this Government undertakes to pass this Act without authority from the Canadian nation? I remember the definition of government by Washington. He said: "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence, it is force. Like fire, it is a dangerous master. Never for a moment should it be left to irresponsible action. I will add to irresponsible party."

We notice in Canada the busy rich class urging strongly upon this Government the passing of this measure of conscription, the conscription of manhood. And what has the right hon. leader of this House done to keep his friends from agitating so strongly such a drastic measure? In England and in New Zealand they could never have had conscription of manhood unless they had conscripted wealth to a large extent.

At the beginning of the war a special session was called by the present Government; members from beyond the Rockies to the Atlantic, from both parties, left their homes to attend. The whole Canadian nation was well represented at that important session. We voted on that occasion, without a word of dissent, $50,000,000, and, since that date, we have voted hundreds of millions of dollars. As the country knows, we have fully performed our duty, for all we want is to win the war. In none of the British colonies was a conscription Bill adopted without first having consulted the people, or without having taken the precaution to consult both political parties, before introducing such a measure. In this House we have the leader of the Government conducting the business of the war without, to my knowledge, having taken the trouble on any occasion, except one, to ask the members of the Opposition to co-operate with the supporters of the Government in endeavouring to find a solution of this question. The Government had all the money required to carry on the war. During the three years' struggle many millionaires have been created in Canada. People of all classes are taxed heavily under the changed tariff, and we are now in this position: not only have we loaded upon the Canadian people a burden, which has already caused some disturbance in many centres, but we are going to pass conscription on manhood, without consulting the electors of this country. The labourers who are absolutely required to work in the manufacture of munitions have asked for a referendum. The fishermen who

have to supply the fish to the country and to the Allies also desire a referendum. The farmer, who has to supply grain and meat in order to carry this war to a successful issue, has made the same request.

At the request of my constituents, I am asking this Government to trust the Canadian nation and to have a referendum on the question of conscription. But the members of the Government of this country will not trust any one but themselves. And what will be the result? We have at the head of this Government politicians who are too partisan to carry on successfully the administration of the affairs of this country. How easy it would have been for the right hon. leader of the House, from the beginning of the war, to have taken the whole Canadian nation into his confidence. On the advice of his colleagues, he lost the opportunity of making himself the leader of the nation. Had the Prime Minister called our leader to his councils at the beginning of the war, no such drastic measure would be before us at the present time. The whole country would have been protected from the action of the speculators, moneys voted for war expenditures would have been more evenly divided, the breadwinners of the country would pay a reasonable price for their daily bread, and harmony would reign amongst all classes. The labourer would be better satisfied, the farmer would be paid more for his products, because no middlemen or speculators would share the profits on the products, for both these classes would have disappeared. The cry is: "Produce more" and the speculator says, "Let me buy more, let me put more products into the cold storage, and fix a price for those products which will suit me."

I may be asked: What has this to do with the Bill before the House? The Government refused to trust the people of the country, for the reason that the Government have imposed upon the people; and consequently the party in power has every reason to be afraid of its master. I will not hesitate to take into my confidence the people who have sent me here to represent them. Why not trust those who have elected you? If you are afraid of them, that goes to show that you have not fulfilled your duties in connection with this war. Sooner or later we shall have to give an account of our conduct in this House, and I, for one, will not hesitate to tell the electors of my constituency that, on a measure such as the one before us, I have not refused to consult them.

The people of this country have lost confidence in the present Government and the supporters of the Administration have also lost confidence in the people, and that is the reason why the Government refused to submit to the people, for their approval, the greatest measure ever presented to the House.

Agricultural colleges and universities in the United States are taking part in a plan for a national mobilization of food production. It is alleged in the Review of Reviews that food production in the United States is not keeping pace with the increase of population, and also with the increased demand for food. It refers to Canada and Western Europe as being countries where the production of food is reduced, yet their own capacity in that direction is their strongest war asset. This capacity of food production is almost certain, however, to be reduced even below the level of positive need, by any system of indiscriminate enlistment from the farm, with no plan for labour replacement. There must, therefore, be enlistment for food production, as a part of any military plan of mobilization, and such enlistment must be as definite as enlistment for service at the front. The American universities and colleges are looking to the War Department to protect the food production as vigorously as it protects any other means of national defence. What have we done to assure the farmers in Canada that in future, and as long as the war lasts, the production of food will be fully looked after? Canada is the granary of the British Empire, and means to make its fields productive to the fullest extent should not be neglected. If we need more men at the front, we also need more men on farms, and the problem which the nation at large should be called upon to decide is as to whether or not more good can be done by supplying more food to the Allies or more men. We have heard members in this House say the people should be led. Yes, this is true, but not led when not one of us in this Chamber has a mandate to lead them. Explain the position of the country to your constituents. Let them know the importance of winning the war; make an appeal to their sound judgment, and you will have, in return, a reply which will convince you that they realize, as much as any of us, the importance of winning the war.

It is my most sincere conviction that they who have been bearing the burden of the high cost of living, and who have sent their sons overseas in humanity's cause, will

continue to make sacrifices without being compelled to do so under the Bill now before the House. Let us, with one mind, devote ourselves to the winning of the war. Let us be a united people, having only one purpose in view.

Two-thirds of the population of New Brunswick are English-speaking, and one-third French Acadian and French Canadian, yet in that province the people are one. There are no difficulties between the French and the English-speaking peoples, because we understand and respect one another. The majority of the people are not following the advice received a few weeks ago from somewhere in Ontario. The English-speaking Canadians in New Brunswick know that the French-speaking Canadians and Acadians are doing their full duty. Like our English-speaking friends, we have our history. To the history of Canada we have contributed many pages, which are read at the firesides of our French Canadian people, who shed tears as they read. My ancestors became British subjects about two centuries ago; to-day their descendants willingly form part of the great army of the Allies in the fight for freedom and liberty. The French Acadians and French Canadians in New Brunswick have enlisted in good numbers. What is the trouble with the highly-paid political campaign writers in Ontario who are sending to New Brunswick literature similar to that which is being used against the province of Quebec? I ask my friends on the other side of the House to stop sending that seditious literature, for we want to continue to respect one another; we want to continue to work together for the one great purpose of winning the war.

My masters in politics are the electors in the section of Canada which I represent, and the result of their decision through the medium of a referendum on this question shall be my guide in respect to such an important measure as that which is now before the House.

Mr. E. W. TOBIN (Richmond and Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, as I do not wish to give a silent vote on this important question, I ask the indulgence of the House while I state my views with regard to it.

The life of the present Parliament has now expired, and the present Government and their followers do not represent the will of the people. The introduction of conscription involves a constitutional change such as was never even dreamed of by the people of Canada when electing their representatives at Ottawa—to say nothing of the fact that the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and other members of the Government have repeatedly stated that it was not the intention to introduce conscription. The introduction of conscription by the Prime Minister is a step towards autocracy and kaiserism and away from democracy. The Canadian boys at the front are fighting against autocracy and kaiserism and for the principles of democracy.

What objection can there be to an appeal to the people, the true masters in all such cases, but particularly in this one? Are the present Government afraid of the people? And if they are afraid of the people, is it because they believe that the people will vote down conscription? If that is their belief, their sole aim in adopting conscription without a referendum is to impose upon the people something they do not want. If that is not autocracy and kaiser rule, I would like to know what it is.

One of the grounds upon which the Prime Minister proposed coalition to the leader of the Opposition was that conscription should be passed first and that the Government should go to the people afterwards. Why should they go to the people after the passing of conscription? Do you not think it would have been proper for the Prime Minister to approach the leader of the Opposition before announcing to the House and to the country that he intended to introduce conscription? But no; like all autocrats, he proposes his policy, and then says: You must do as I say, or there will be no coalition.

If the Prime Minister had had his heart in the winning of the war, should he not have united the two great parties in this country by calling upon the leader of the Opposition before he went to England, or even at the outbreak of the war? If he had done this, he would have had the co-operation of the leader of the Opposition and of the whole Liberal party since the beginning of the war. I can assure you that if that had been done, many blunders and much muddling would have been avoided. The right hon. leader of the Opposition and the Liberal party have shown, by their co-operation with the Government, by voting large credits and otherwise, that their heart is in the winning of the war. But they cannot be asked to go so far as to allow the people's money to be squandered and the public treasury to be looted. That is not in the interests of Canada or of the British

Empire; nor is it the proper way to win the war. In order to win the war you have to keep Canada strong financially, agriculturally, industrially and economically, as well as strong in arms at the front.

I believe that the Government have failed in all of these points. I believe that the financing of the Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White)), borrowing money in Canada, when he could have got it as cheap or at a cheaper rate outside of Canada, is bad from every point of view. If the policy of borrowing outside of Canada had been followed, we to-day should have $300,000,000 more money in Canada than we actually have, and we should be that much stronger economically. The taxation imposed by the Finance Minister is unfair, because it tends to kill industries and to discourage the investment of capital, instead of to tax the incomes of those who receive the profits earned by companies.

No action was taken by the present Government to assist the farmers, except very recently, when for political purposes they introduced their free wheat resolution and told the farmers that they were going to arrange for agricultural credits. In my opinion, this was done, not for the purpose of assisting in the war, but for the purpose of helping the Conservative party. It was only when they thought that a general election was imminent that they brought in the free wheat resolution.

The Government have not kept Canada strong industrially. They have taxed industries in such a way as to cripple them and to prevent capital from being invested in this country. In addition to that, they have driven thousands of dollars outside of Canada for investment in foreign countries. Speaking from an economic standpoint, I say that the Government have done nothing to control the foodstuffs. They have done nothing to control the profits that were made by munition workers. They have done nothing to save in time of war; they have gone ahead with lavish expenditures not only for war purposes, but for every purpose that would tend to assist the Conservative party.

The methods followed up to the present in the matter of voluntary enlistment have taken from agriculture and other industries—including mining, the distribution of coal, and forestry exploitation—the quality and quantity of workmen of which these vital industries have absolute need. In consequence, we have the present high cost of living. If a measure of selective conscription had been adopted at the beginning of the war and applied with intelligence, it would have been somewhat of a remedy; but at present the adoption of conscription to increase the size of an army raised by voluntary enlistment can only make matters worse.

Some weeks before the entrance of the United States into the war the Government found it so necessary to fill the wide gaps in the agricultural army that it launched an appeal to the American workmen. This appeal was published in more than 700 American papers. The Government estimated at 70,000 the number of Agricultural workers that it was necessary to bring at any price from the United States. At the moment of the declaration of war by the President, 700 Americans or thereabouts had responded to Canada's appeal. Unfortunately, the authorities at Washington have put a sharp end to this drain on American manhood, and the agricultural army of Canada has not the 60,000 recruits which the Government judges it is absolutely necessary to have to allow us to produce on Canadian soil the food for which England has so pressing a need.

Comparing the military effort of Canada with those of England and France, we have actually in Europe or in training camps in Canada, 420,000 soldiers besides those in auxiliary service. If we estimate the population of Canada at the beginning of the war at 7,000,000 people, we have enrolled six per cent of our population for the European conflict. This is equivalent to an army of 2,400,000 for France, and 2,700,000 for the United Kingdom. Now, in spite of these figures on paper, England has not yet sent to France, in the two years and ten months of the war, this number of men. If we measure our military effort by the number of population, the figures of the effectives and the cost of the armies, the comparison is most striking. Canada has spent for its army three times more per soldier than England, and four times more than France. If we take into account the difference in the wages, pensions, transports, etc., these figures are modest. We must, therefore, multiply by four the corresponding figures attributed to France, and by three those attributed to England. Therefore, the cost of the actual army to Canada is equal to what it would have cost England for an army of 8,100,000, and France for an army of 9,600,000. This is more than our two Mother Countries would put into the field if the war should last five years. Now France and England are, apart from the

United States, two of the richest nations in the world to-day, and Canada is one of the poorest.

In my opinion the Government have not done what they should have done for the encouragement of voluntary enlistment, and I would refer you to General Sir Sam Hughes' statement to this effect when he said that some months previous to his getting out of the Borden Cabinet, recruiting was not being encouraged, and if you will refer to a return laid on the table of the House, you will see that only $3,996 was spent for recruiting in Quebec, whereas in Ontario $18,544 was spent. As a matter of fact, no appeal for recruits was made throughout Quebec by the Conservative-Nationalist party. The first recruiting meeting held at St. Hyacinthe, a city of from 12,000 to 15,000 inhabitants, was held by General Lessard and the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin) only a few weeks ago. The same can be said of many parts of Quebec where on many occasions the only recruiting officers that visited the French districts were Engish-speaking officers, who did not possess a word of French; in fact, the matter is so notorious that one can come to no other conclusion than that a deliberate attempt has been made to ostracize Quebec in order to allow the Conservative party to raise the race cry once more, and appeal to the English-speaking people against the French-speaking people.

I have the honour of representing a constituency composed, in a large part, of French Canadians, and no truer or more loyal people to the British Empire live in this Dominion. They have been educated to believe that Canada is their country; they are proud of the liberties they enjoy under British rule and under the Union Jack, and they are not deserving of the attacks that have been made upon them by the Conservative party and the Conservative press.

I said a moment ago that I thought that this policy was for the purpose of creating a feeling between the English speaking and the French-speaking people of this country. Allow me to say that I believe that the Conscription Bill was introduced for another purpose, namely; that of creating an election cry that would allow the Conservative party to appeal to the passions and prejudices of the English-speaking people of this country; and, Sir, if you want proof of this, read the Military Service Bill as introduced, and you will see that it is an appeal for party purposes, and not for conscription. Because the law as it stands is not enforceable, and I do not believe it was ever intended to be enforced, but was drafted simply for the purpose of creating a division among the people of this country. In an issue of this kind the question is: Are the people to rule, or are they to be ruled by Sir Robert Borden? There should be no question of race or language, and there is no need of raising what is popularly known as the race cry. The simple issue is: Should not this question be referred, by a Parliament that has been dead and buried for a year past, to the people of Canada for their verdict? Present the facts to the people and allow them to vote " yes " or " no " to conscription. The only way the question can be made one of race or creed is by the politicians making it one, because it is a pure question of the will of the people of this country, and one that is to be decided by the people and no one else. Why cannot the people of this country, although they are not all of English origin, decide this issue in the same way as the people of Australia, who are all English-speaking, and of British descent, have done? When they were called upon to decide this issue it was not a question of race or creed, but a question simply of whether the people of Australia were to change from voluntary enlistment, which they had adopted from Great Britain itself, to conscription. That is the issue here, and not one of race or creed.

Many people who are attacking the province of Quebec forget that the French Canadians were abandoned on the shores of the St. Lawrence river over three hundred years ago, and, although subsequently their colony was ceded to England, from the days of their abandonment to the present time they have looked to this country as their only country and their only home, not only professing loyalty, but showing their loyalty on many occasions by taking up arms on behalf of their new King. They remained always loyal, always good Canadians, always good British subjects, until the Nationalists and Conservatives started preaching the doctrine that French Canadians owed nothing to Great Britain. Nationalist eloquence and Conservative gold had its effect in the teaching of this doctrine, and in 1911 twenty odd candidates were returned from Quebec, elected on the doctrine that they owed nothing to England, or to the British Empire, and when you take into consideration the fact that in the recruiting that has been carried on Quebec has been purposely neglected and isolated, and nothing has been done to undo the

harm that was done by the Nationalist-Conservative party, it is little wonder that volunteering has not been so enthusiastic in that province as in some of the others.

Before the Government propose conscription to the House it should place before the House and the country the full facts of the situation. They should let us know what is required for the production of food, for munition factories, for transportation, for the carrying on of coal operations and to keep all the great industries of this country going. They should let us know what the effect will be upon Canada itself if more men are taken out of this country, and give all the facts with regard to the requirements of men, not only at the front, but in keeping this country a strong live part of the British Empire in order that it may continue to do its proper part in this great war for democracy. Then when we have all these facts and figures we can, as sensible business men, decide as to what should be done. Let us see that there is no leaping in the dark—no more doing things first and thinking afterwards. Let us think, this time, before taking such a step as the introduction of conscription in this country. Let us think first and act afterwards, and I am convinced that no matter where these facts lead us, the people of this country will do what is best for the winning of the war. For these reasons I will vote against the Bill and support and vote for the amendment of my leader, and I will vote against the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette).

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN (Saint Mary's, Montreal): Mr. Speaker, I must prelude my remarks with thanking the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Bellemare) for giving me his turn so as to permit me to leave tomorrow to attend to my duties in the great metropolis.

For nearly nine days both sides of the House have been discussing the most important question which has risen since Confederation.

I have the honour, Mr. Speaker, of speaking on behalf of a population of 700,000 souls, which is more than several other members of this House can say.

Religious and racial questions have been mooted and insults hurled about. I may say that if there is one who has been insulted, besides the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), it is your humble servant, the mayor of Montreal, since he is a public man.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to explain and place the responsability where it belongs for what is now occurring in our province, and especially in the city of Montreal.

In 1911, when came the federal elections, there was a compact between three persons. One is now deceased, and I regret to mention here the name of Hon. Mr. Monk; the others are Mr. Bourassa and Mr.——

A great meeting was held in the village of Saint Eustache. I was not on the platform, but with the crowd in attendance, and if anybody then insulted the British flag, the Prime Minister of to-day and the prime minister of that time (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), they were those three gentlemen. They had undertaken to preach one policy in the province of Quebec and another in the West.

Their plan has succeeded. They went all over the different counties of the province of Quebec and deceived the electorate to such an extent that the former Prime Minister, who is now leader of the Opposition was defeated and twenty-two candidates supported by these three gentlemen were elected to this House with a mandate which they had never expected. Such was the compact.

After being insulted, as was the present Prime Minister, by these three gentlemen, including Mr. Monk and Mr. Bourassa, what happened the very next day? The portfolio of Public Works, the most important of the Borden Cabinet, was given to Mr. Monk, which well proves what I have just said.

Hon. Mr. Pelletier, to-day Judge Pelletier, for whom I have the highest consideration, and other honourable members on the other side of the House have mentioned the name of Mr. Armand Lavergne. Mr. Pelletier at the time was bowing low to Mr. Lavergne who was then but a young man, and was calling him his leader; yet here was he the very next day accepting the portfolio of Postmaster General. All the others went to the Government side. My hon. friend knows something of it; he well knows what happened in the province of Quebec.

Now, Sir, when you see such things, and others still worse, for I will show the means taken to deceive the people—I am not at all surprised at what is happening to-day in the province of Quebec.

Since Confederation, the Conservative party has always resorted to insult and has always had recourse to a double-faced policy; one for the province of Quebec and the other for the province of Ontario.

It was said in the province of Quebec when I was a boy, for I am concerned in elections since I am ten years old, that Sir

Wilfrid Laurier was a traitor to his race, that he had sold Canada to England; they said in the West that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was not enough of an Imperialist, but a papist and the champion of Quebec only.

I have no hesitation in stating that those responsible for what is happening to-day are the Conservative Government and the twenty-two members who had the honour to be sent here, but who never heeded their mandate.

It was said in this House, Sir, that the province of Quebec was not loyal to the British flag, and that we have not done our duty.

There are two ways to solve the problem which is now submitted to us: We have to decide if our contribution must be in money, if we have to pay the toll of blood in sending men overseas or if our contribution will be by sending supplies to the Allies.

The city of Montreal alone, and if I speak here, it is in consequence of a resolution adopted by the city council of Montreal, dated June 5, 1917, and worded as follows:

Copy of the minute of proceedings of the special meeting of the Montreal Municipal Council, held on Tuesday, June 5, 1917.

The order of the day having been read for the consideration of a notice of motion by Alderman Mayrand on the question of conscription, are submitted and read: (a) A communication from His Honour the mayor, transmitting a letter from Mr. D. C. Houlé, secretary of a citizens' league re conscription; (b) petitions from Montreal citizens objecting to conscription for the oversea service.

Alderman Mayrand moves, seconded by Alderman Vandelac:

That the members of this council have always been of the opinion that Canada should do its full duty towards the triumph of the Empire and of the Allied powers; but they believe likewise that it is their duty to oppose any conscription scheme under whatever form it may be introduced, as long as it shall not have been approved by the people of Canada by means of a plebiscite, and to declare that the enforcing of the Militia Act or of all other conscription laws, far from reaching the object in view, would create throughout the country a useless perturbation and would prevent us from supplying the Empire and the Allies with all essentials needed for the prosecution of the war;

That copy of the present resolution be sent to Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, and to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, leader of the Opposition;

That His Honour the Mayor, Mr. Médéric Martin, M.P., be respectfully requested to submit the present resolution to the Federal authorities, together with the various petitions which have been sent to the Council, on this subject.

And, a discussion having ensued,

Alderman O'Connell moves, seconded by Alderman Blumenthal:

That the council now adjourns.

The council divided upon the said motion, as follows:

[Mr. M. Martin.]

For: O'Connell, Ward, Blumenthal, Macdonald, Weldon—5.

Against: Larivière, Turcot, Mayrand, Ménard, Vandelac, Houlé, Elie, Dubeau, Lamarre, Brodeur, Lafortune, Bédard—12.

And it is rejected.

And a discussion ensuing,

Alderman Ward moves, seconded by Alderman O'Connell:

Whereas the question now before the council is now the subject of the most serious attention of both political parties in Ottawa and that any intervention on the part of this council might be interpreted as a lack of confidence in the House of Commons and the Senate;

That the discussion of the motion now before the council be suspended until the Federal authorities shall have passed upon the question.

The said amendment being put, it was lost on division:

For: O'Connell, Ward, Blumenthal, Macdonald, Weldon—5.

Against: Larivière, Turcot, Mayrand, Ménard, Vandelac, Houlé, Elie, Dubeau, Lamarre, Brodeur, Lafortune, Bédard—12.

The main motion being put, it was carried, on division.

For: Larivière, Turcot, Mayrand, Ménard, Vandelac, Houlé, Elie, Dubeau, Lamarre, Brodeur, Lafortune, Bédard—12.

Against: O'Connell, Ward, Blumenthal, Macdonald, Weldon—5

Resolved: In consequence.

(Certified.)

(Signed) J. Crépeau,
Deputy Clerk of the City.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, was adopted by a vote of 12 to 5; there was an amendment to adjourn moved by alderman O'Connell who, though not opposing conscription, wanted to delay the question in order to allow the two political parties of this country to decide the question, and he further stated that the adoption of such a resolution would be likely to hurt them to a great extent. It is said that Montreal, as well as the whole province of Quebec, generally, have not done their duty in the present war. I will take the liberty to mention to you the fact that we have adopted, since the beginning of the war, more than thirty resolutions, and the first, adopted by the Board of Commissioners and sanctioned by the Council, is good evidence we have done our duty. We have done, twenty-four hours after the war resolution, what the Government had not done and also what the Council of the Queen city of Toronto had not done. On August 4, 1914, when I saw that England was at war, as well as France, I submitted to the Board of Commissioners the following suggestion:

Resolution of August 5, 1914, with a view to pay half-salary to the families of the permanent employees who have left to defend their country.

I considered that the half-pay alone was not sufficient, and I did not weary. On the 17th of the same month, I went back before

my colleagues and I had them adopt the following resolution:

Resolution of August 17, 1914, with a view to amend the resolution of August 5, 1914, so as to allow the payment of the salary in full.

That is what has been the attitude of the Montreal City Council, of those who represent the ideals of the people of Montreal, and would any one be right in coming to tell us that we have done nothing.

By means of thirty resolutions we have spent since the beginning of the war $7,580,791.51, distributed as follows.

Resolution dated October 5, 1914, granting $1,500 for ten beds in an hospital organized in Paris for the care of wounded soldiers.

Resolution dated October 5, 1914, granting $10,000 to the Belgian Fund.

Resolution dated November 24, 1914, granting $10,000 to the French National Fund.

Resolution dated August 28, 1914, advising the city council to vote $150,000 for the Patriotic Fund.

That amount was in answer to the first request we received for a contribution.

Resolution dated September 3, 1914, calling upon the municipal servants to subscribe to the Patriotic Fund—An amount of $12,509.39 was subscribed on that occasion.

Resolution dated March 8, 1915, advising the city council to grant an additional sum of $50,000 to give help to the unemployed labourers.

Resolution dated May 3, 1915, recommending a grant of $1,000 to the Montenegro Benevolent Fund.

Resolution dated May 18, 1915, recommending a grant of $5,000 in favour of the Red Cross Fund .

Resolution dated October 19, 1915, inviting the municipal servants to help the Red Cross Fund. The amount subscribed on that occasion was $8,323.13.

Resolution dated November 12, 1915, to raise to $10,000 our contribution to the Red Cross Fund.

Resolution dated November 23, 1915, granting $5,000 to the Khaki League.

Resolution dated January 26, 1916, inviting the municipal servants to subscribe to the Patriotic Fund. This subscription amounted to $16,462.29.

Resolution dated February 12, 1916, granting $300,000 for the Patriotic Fund, and towards helping several public benevolent associations.

From this grant $250,000 went to the Patriotic Fund and $50,000 to the Benevolent Associations.

Everybody knew at the time that there was no employment to be found in Montreal. The wives of the soldiers that had enlisted were starving and we had to vote the money to help them. How many people have I seen lining up in front of my office, every morning! Hundreds of mothers told me that they could do nothing to save their children from starvation. Is there any justification, Sir, for the charge that the province of Quebec has been lacking in patriotism?

Resolution dated March 18, 1916, recommending a grant of $25,000 to the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

I must state that that Society had never before applied for help from the city.

Resolution dated March 25, 1916, granting $10,000 to the Charity Organization Society of Montreal.

We have here, Mr. Speaker, the undeniable proof that we, the French Canadians of the Metropolis make no racial nor religious distinctions. We make a fair distribution of the grants and we see to it that equal justice is dealt to all deserving parties.

Resolution dated May 9, 1916, granting $4,000 to the Baron de Hirsch Institute and the Hebrew Benevolent Society.

Another proof, Mr. Speaker, that we are giving fair treatment to all people. A large number of Hebrew citizens were in such a plight that they could not provide their families with the necessaries of life. You know as well as I do, Mr. Speaker, that those people, as a rule, are not poor; they generally have fairly large amounts to their credit. But this time they had been caught napping.

I feel it my duty, on this occasion to offer my hearty congratulations to Mr. Beaubien, mayor of Outremont, and a brother of the hon. Senator Beaubien. He foresaw that a good many of our soldiers who are fighting for liberty, will come back blind and with the co-operation of the Grey Nuns, he laid the foundations of an institution in which those maimed heroes will find work and the means of making a living for themselves and their families. The Government had nothing to do with that organization; they could not think of everything.

It is often said that enlistments, in the province of Quebec, have not been satisfastory. What was the duty of the Government before proceeding to enlist our young men? I am speaking of the Canadians from the whole Dominion. For my part, I maintain that before enlisting our married men the Government should have provided for their wives and children; they should have provided for the wives of the soldiers a sufficient allowance for their maintenance and the maintenance and education of their children; they should have seen to it that the families of those soldiers who suffer a glorious death on the battle field, will not live in dire poverty till the end. The Government have done nothing to that end.

Hon. gentlemen have no idea of the number of complaints that come to me every day,

as mayor of Montreal. Poor women come to my office and tell me that the head of the family has been killed and that they do not get a single dollar for the blood that has been generously poured in defence of the common cause.

Let me take up once more the list of the grants voted to help the various organizations in Montreal:

Resolution dated March 27, 1917, granting $1,500 to the association "Help to the Blind."
Resolution dated March 27, 1917, granting $2,500 to the "Comité de Culture."
Resolution dated June 8, 1917, granting $5,000 (budget of 1918) to the Overseas Campaign Fund of Y.M.C.A.
Budget of 1917. British Sailors' Club, $20,000.
Budget of 1917. Red Cross Society, $12,000, payable at the rate of $1,000 a month.
Contributions of the municipal servants, for 1917 (approximatively), $7,000.
To the deputation "Bonne Enterte," $86.50.
War Relief Fund, $10, $74, $140, $66.
For works on draining canals that were not urgent, but were executed to help the large army of unemployed, approximatively, $5,000,000.

Our contribution, to date, amounts to over $7,000,000. We have also voted one million dollars for the Patriotic Fund. I regret that my hon. friend for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) is not at his seat. He would bear testimony to the generosity and geniality with which the city of Montreal has answered every call for the Patriotic Fund. In justice for all interested parties I must say that this fund is well administered, notwithstanding the efforts of certain newspapers to cast discredit on those who have charge of its administration. In my capacity of Mayor of Montreal, I state positively that all the monies, to the last cent, have been judiciously and honestly distributed. It is hard work to stop the people from talking. There will always be found some one inclined to hurt his neighbour. As far as money is concerned, I have no hesitation to say that we have done more than any other province of the Dominion, in proportion to our wealth and our population.

On a certain date, in compliance with the wishes of the Imperial authorities, the Lieutenant Governor, Sir Evariste Leblanc, invited the province to organize a Tag Day for the benefit of the Red Cross. He asked me to take charge of the organization in the city of Montreal and do you know, Mr. Speaker, what was the result of a single day—eight hours—in the city of Montreal? We collected, in round numbers, no less than $93,000. Does not that compare favorably with what has been done by certain large contributors? The hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) told us last night, that certain big corporations had given $200,000; but remember that in eight hours time the workingman took nearly $100,000 out of his pocket. Is there not more generosity in this contribution of the workingman, than in the subcriptions of big corporations who—as it was explained last night by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) by several newspapers before that—made up for their losses by a cut of 20 per cent in the salaries of their staff? They have been generous at the expense of the workingman. There is no sense in reproaching Quebec with having failed to do her duty, and having exhibited a lack of loyalty to the British flag. We have constantly submitted to insults. You can have the proof of what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, by referring to Hansard, page 288, 229 and 707, Vol. I 1910-11, and pages 3219 and 3329, Vol. II of the same session. There you will find what the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) said concerning the French Canadian clergy. We all remember what happened in this House, concerning the Eucharistic Congress, one night that a Catholic bishop was in the gallery.

We are bound to respect all creeds, and when insult is offered to what the French Canadian holds nearest to his heart, his religion, that is not calculated to promote harmony between the various elements of our population.

In spite of all that, Mr. Speaker, in spite of all which has been said against us, we are just and fair.

In the administration of the city of Montreal, we have Englishmen, we have Irishmen, we have Jews, we have all kinds of nationalities.

When I came into power, as mayor, two hundred policemen had to be engaged. One of the conditions I imposed was that the policemen should have a knowledge of both languages, not perfectly, but enough, so that when a tourist would ask for some information, these policemen would be able to furnish it, for every one knows that when a stranger visits a city and needs some information, he generally applies to the policemen. They must therefore speak both languages.

Do you know what happened to me?

The first one which I had to swear in, when I asked him if he had paid any money to get his position and put him a few other questions in French, started to cry, saying he could not understand a single word.

You can see in what a plight I was. I thought that if I refused him, I would be charged with discriminating between the English and the French Canadians, so I turned around and said to him: "Here, my boy, go back to the chief, take your uniform, I allow you three months' delay, and you come back to me three months hence to satisfy me that you are able to say a few words in French."

That was three years ago. He never came back to me, but later when I inquired about him from the chief, the latter declared: "He is the best man we have on the force."

A month and a half later, being obliged to swear in a new man, a French Canadian, who could not speak a word of English, I dismissed him, I refused to accept him.

Take our department, for instance; we have many which are split in two, in order to do justice to the English population. In the Parks department, there are two superintendents. Why? We could get along with only one. It was to be fair to the English speaking population. The Mountain Park superintendent is Mr. Henderson, and the various other parks are under the direction of Mr. Bernadet. In the various departments, even justice is dealt out.

In every department, we strive to be fair to all. Why do they not act the same way in Ontario? My own opinion is that they deliberately will not do it. Should we not live in harmony and help one another as brothers? Everybody remembers that, some three or four years ago, in a certain city of Ontario, there was only one French Canadian policeman, a Mr. Lambert, and he was discharged.

Mr. Speaker. when the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) was speaking in this House, two or three days ago, referring to the Prime Minister who was asking the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to form a Coalition Cabinet, with the object of having the French Canadians of the province of Quebec submit to the conscription law, did he not ask the Government to employ five or six of the most influential Ontario men in travelling over this province and in urging the population to discontinue the campaign of slander and abuse against the province of Quebec? No, I repeat it, as to the animosity which exists between these two provinces, we are in no wise responsible, we of the province of Quebec, and we do all that we possibly can to maintain the Bonne Entente.

Do you want another example? Every one knows that, very recently, a Bonne Entente delegation came to Montreal and afterwards visited the different other most important towns of the province of Quebec. In Montreal, this delegation was the object of an official reception, and we spared nothing to receive it well. What happened? In a small municipality, it had been thought fit to pass a vote of thanks to the mayor, but the same courtesy was not extended to the mayor of the Canadian metropolis. We have also had the visit of the Win-the-War delegation, the city council voted a sum of $2,500 for the good work undertaken by these gentlemen. Have we not done in Quebec all that we should do?

Now, some are surprised that Quebec does not enlist. To show that the hon. Prime Minister has not kept his word, although I must repeat what was said by the hon. leader of the Opposition, I will quote the words he said on January 17, 1917:

"I therefore asked the Prime Minister to positively state whether, yes or no, we would have conscription. Put into such a fix, my right hon. friend replied—here is his answer, when I asked him if his offer of 500,000 soldiers meant conscription, or not:

"My right hon. friend has spoken of conscription, of the idea entertained in this country or elsewhere that conscription might exist in Canada. Speaking during the first two or three months of the war, I have clearly had the Canadian people to understand that we did not intend to establish conscription. I again declare it explicitly."

This is not all, Mr. Speaker. Referring to the law which is now before this House, if we consult "La Presse" of December 7. 1916, we will find the words which were uttered, before an audience of 2,500 to 3,000 people, by the Prime Minister when a reception was given him in the Monument National in Montreal; we will be in a better position to see what kind of a man is the Prime Minister who to-day wants to impose such a brutal law. I understand that in the course of a year, circumstances may be altered; but I will point out that this reception was given on December 7, 1916, not more than six months ago. We shall see what say these so-called democrats who pretend to safeguard the people's interests, but who, in reality, safeguard the interests of the Empire. I will even say that it is we who take the true interests of this country, by supplying the Allies with both ammunitions and food. Here is then what the Prime Minister said:

"Canada is a State in a larger State, which is the Empire. Our country enjoys the benefits of a constitution which was granted

to us fifty years ago, and which was written through the wisdom of the Fathers of the Confederation, men whose names are dear to every Canadian heart, the Macdonalds, the Cartiers, the Browns and the Tuppers.

It is true that there are no more such men on the Government side.

"By keeping within the limits of that Constitution, the people of Canada govern themselves, and every citizen exerts his personal and individual influence, when he is called upon to declare in which way he intends to be governed."

Is that what the Government is proclaiming to-day? That principle, Mr. Speaker, which was advocated in the Monument National, on December 7, 1916, by the Prime Minister, is the very one which the right hon. leader of the Opposition is putting into practice to-day.

"It is a right established conformably to the principles of every democratic government."

I repeat it, Mr. Speaker, is that what the Government wants to-day? The referendum which we are asking in the name of the whole people of Canada, they want to deny it and to impose an arbitrary law. Is not that exactly the condition as in Germany?

I say that it would be a good thing if the taxpayers of the country had the courage to come up here, in Ottawa, and make a clean sweep of the present Government, without injuring them, for no one has the right to do that. That is what should be done with these people who do not respect the Constitution, who do not respect the given word, who indeed do not respect anything, and here I refer most particularly to those members of the province of Quebec who are preaching to-day the very contrary of what they preached in 1911. Is this democracy? No, I claim they are autocrats and nothing else. Can anyone be surprised after all if, today, the province of Quebec turns a deaf ear to the Prime Minister's words?

I continue:

"But every right necessarily imposes a corresponding duty. The State protects the citizens, their person and their property; it sees to the enforcement of the laws and to good administration. Every citizen must, therefore, give a certain sum of service to the State, there never has been and perhaps there never will be an occasion to make that duty more imperative, more necessary, than the one now offered.

"For the Belgian and the French, the occupation of the national territory by the foe, the implacable manifestations of his iron hand, the terror inspired by his devastations constitute the most eloquent plea in favour of the organizing of the national service for every citizen. To us, the need seems more distant, but it is not the less real for all that.

That is what the Prime Minister had said if even, at that time, he had said: gentlemen, the circumstances are such that they compel us to change our minds, Canada is in danger, perhaps our own territory may be invaded by the Germans.

No, Mr. Speaker, never will Canada be invaded by the Germans. We have to protect us the United States, and on the other hand, we have England who will do everything possible to keep us among her colonies because it is her own interest to do so.

Here is what was said by the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Descarries), in reply to the speech from His Excellency the Governor General (See page 15 House of Commons Debates):

> I believe, in any case, Mr. Speaker, and I think I am voicing the opinion of the majority of the hon. members in stating that the constitution of the country forbids sending our soldiers to fight outside of Canada, without special legislation being enacted in this House and that no such legislation altering the very basis of our constitution would be enacted without its being first submitted to the people of Canada. No, Mr. Speaker, there can be no question of conscription. Obligatory enlistment is not needed. The people of Canada have given noble proof of their loyalty. Freely and voluntarily, four hundred thousand men have already answered the call. If they are required, one hundred thousand more will follow of their own free will. And thus the Prime Minister will have given to the Empire and the allied nations a royal and magnificent contribution to restore the peace of the world, which, let us hope, Providence will soon grant to Europe.

That was on January 18, I believe, or the 21st or 22nd. Mr. Speaker, with men who have no longer any mandate, men who are here only by their own will and by that of the Imperial Government, I say that they have not the right, as it suits their fancy, to try and take away the people's liberty, and especially so, after the speech made by the Prime Minister in the Monument National.

It is said and repeated that enlisting has not been a success. In Montreal, they put at the head of recruiting, as stated by my hon. friend the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) a Protestant minister, a perfectly honest man, I attended the first meeting he held in a theater. The clergy have done all they could. When one considers how the Prime Minister has deceived his Grace the Archbishop of Montreal, about the National Service cards, can one be surprised that no one gives any more credit to the Prime Minister's words? Obviously, the people are in-

censed, that their own archbishop has not been respected. I regret to be obliged to say this. I concede that a common individual may make a mistake, but when it is the Prime Minister of Canada who, in the space of five or six months, changes his speech several times on the floor of the House. . .

I say that the defeat of that man is not distant. He will perhaps pass the Bill now being considered by this House, there is no doubt it will be adopted by the majority at his back and who do not respect the mandate entrusted to them. I regret to be forced to say this. As stated by the member for Maisonneuve, the workingman is intelligent, but we have our full measure of ills in Montreal, we don't want any thing of this.

Here is where we are at: we have reached the point of having a Government in no wise responsible, having no longer the right to legislate.

On the second of next month, the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation will be celebrated. It is the end of Confederation that is coming, nothing else, if we continue to insult one another. Most frequently, it is the fault of certain newspapers, in order to make a few dollars. I say that if such abuse is continued, if this law is passed, you will have, unfortunately, civil war in this country. We have enough war, enough hardships, without having the Government bring about what they are bringing about to-day.

The Prime Minister has promised 500,000 men to England. He had no right to do so. He should have, at least, consulted his ministers, he should have, at least, consulted the leader of the Opposition; but no, he leaves, he goes to England, he returns; at a given moment, completely changed, the pledged word is broken, there is no more constitution, the people doesn't count. The people can be deceived once, twice, but the third time, they strike hard.

Mr. Speaker, I rely upon the opinion of a clear-sighted man, I refer to the greatest Canadian living, after Sir Wilfrid Laurier (Lord Shaughnessy) a good Irishman, who has received the highest honours which England can bestow upon one of our own. What did he say, when he returned from England: "That if the Government gave 500,000 men, it was calculated to disorganize the country." This interview has been published in the press, therefore I pass over many things. I had promised my hon. friend, the member for Maskinongé (Mr. Bellemare) to speak only ten minutes; I beg his pardon if I am taking advantage of his good nature, but I do not want to resume my seat before having added a few more remarks.

We, of the province of Quebec, we believe we can better serve the interests of the Empire and of the Allies by supplying them with ammunitions and foodstuffs. That is what was stated by Lord Shaughnessey, and if there is a man well informed as to our situation from the economical point of view, he is really the one; for me, he is in Canada the man who knows best. He is at the head of a large institution, the Canadian Pacific, which alone is worth more than the city of Montreal, more than the city of Toronto. Here is a peer of England, who comes to us and declares that, in the interest of the Empire, as well as in the future interest of Canada, our duty is neither more nor less, to supply munitions and to feed the soldiers.

The member for Red Deer (Dr. M. Clark) said the other day that while we were discussing, some one hundred and thirty people had been killed by German bombs and that victuals and munitions intended for the Allies had been sunk, had been sent to the bottom of the sea.

Now, a conference was held most recently in New York city, between Mr. Emile Level, the representative of France, and Mr. Hoover, the United States' representative. England's representative, whose name has been mentioned a few minutes ago, did not attend that conference.

Here follows a report of it:

France's envoy demands a billion bushels of grain.

Emile Level exposes to Mr. Hoover the allied nations' as well as the neutrals' needs.

The task of the United States and of Canada. Our own farmers will have to supply a considerable amount of provisions over and above the ordinary production.

Washington, June 2, 1917.—The Allies, as well as the neutral countries, will need a billion bushels of grain during the next twelve months, besides what their respective countries can produce, according to a detailed statement prepared by Mr. H. C. Hoover, who has been appointed by President Wilson food controller for the United States.

According to Mr. Hoover, the United States and Canada will be called upon to furnish the greater part of this grain which the belligerent and the neutral nations will divide among themselves as follows, always after his own calculations:

	Flour.	Forage.
Great Britain	225,000,000	170,000,000
France	175,000,000	70,000,000
Italy	90,000,000	60,000,000
Belgium and Portugal	50,000,000	
Neutrals in Europe.	10,000,000	
Other neutrals	5,000,000	116,000,000
	665,000,000	416,000,000

The required quantity of wheat and fodder reaches at present 971,000,444 bushels, but Mr. Hoover asserts it will easily aggregate 1,000,000,000 bushels, as the losses due to the submarine warfare must also be considered.

The approximate figures set down by Mr. Hoover were published following an interview the latter had with Mr. Level, food controller for the French permanent commission. Mr. Level estimated the required needs at 560,000,000 bushels of wheat alone, leaving out the fodder. Forage is just as necessary for the Allies, said Mr. Hoover, as the corn used for bread, because the Allies need it to feed their cavalry horses, their milch-cows and their fat stock.

Naturally, it would be impossible for North America alone to supply all that grain; it should, however, furnish the greater part of it. At all events, this shows us more forcibly than ever the necessity for a strict control of all exports and prices in order to protect our supplies, and the importance of preserving our resources and of avoiding every possible wastage, in order to increase our exports.

The quantity of grain which the United States can afford to send to the Allies, as well as to neutral countries, will be determined by a special committee which will act together with Mr. Hoover. After the purchases have been made, the grain will be distributed among the Allied European nations.

Mr. Hoover already insists in a most forcible way upon the importance of increasing the consumption of vegetables this summer, in order to thereby save a larger part of the nation's stores of meat, corn and sugar.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I say that we, of the province of Quebec, relying upon the knowledge of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and upon that of Lord Shaughnessy who, by the way, has more knowledge in his little finger than all the members on the other side of the House,—I do maintain that the best way to help the Allies is to increase our production in order to fill the requests made by these commissioners. Do you not think it would be far better to save the Allies from starvation--and starvation may be the indirect cause of the death of thousands and thousands of people—than to send a few more soldiers to the battlefields. I understand that soldiers are needed for the war, but I also understand that the soldiers must be fed. The side to win the final victory will be the one having the largest food supplies. Now, that is the way we, of the province of Quebec, understand our duty, and we consider that we are filling it by supporting the amendment moved by the right hon. leader of the Opposition rather than the Bill now submitted by this Government who want to enlist our people against their will.

I say, moreover, that the amendment proposed by the Nationalists is only a trick and nothing else. I have read in "Le Devoir" that Mr. Laurier was hardly better than Mr. Borden.

[Mr. Martin.]

To the statement made by this moribund Government, as they were designated by the leader of the Opposition--who, I am sure, will be Prime Minister before long—that the Canadian people are in favour of conscription, I answer that they are against it, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The proof of it, they have been given thirty-six months in order to enlist. Those in favour of conscription are the ones who have no sons and whom this measure will not affect. For instance: the ministers of this Cabinet, of whom six have no children; four others have daughters, but no boys. There might be the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sévigny) who has one or two sons, I believe, but they are far too young to go to war.

Mr. BOULAY (Rimouski): Where did the hon. member get his information?

Mr. MARTIN: From good authority. As for yourself, it is true you have fourteen children, but not one of them has yet enlisted. You may have some nephews in the army, but no son of yours.

Who is in favour of the referendum? I aiswer: the people. Now, who are those in favour of conscription? The Montreal Board of Trade, the Government contract-holders and those beyond the age limit.

They want to give women the right to vote. Does anyone believe the women will vote for conscription? I am sure of the contrary.

As I said a few minutes ago, the people of Canada are against conscription and the reason I gave is that, during the thirty-six months which have elapsed since the war broke out, and all those who believed it was their duty to enlist have had all the required time to do it. And the real reason why a referendum is refused, is that the people would declare against compulsory enlistment. Some Ontario and Western newspapers would be in favour of an open vote upon this question, but that would be in order to prevent the people from giving their free opinion. Do you really believe that the farmer, who has not seen fit to induce his son to enlist, would now be disposed to have him sent away forcibly?

As for these gentlemen who have boys, Papa's own boys, who are sent to college until they are 25 or 30 years old, do you believe they will be in favour of conscription, when, for the past thirty-six months, they have not seen fit to advise them to enlist and to go and defend the cause of Liberty? Do you believe that the married women who have, until now, had plenty time to advise their husbands to enlist, do

you think they will vote for conscription? I say no, for all those who wanted to get rid of their husbands, have already done so. Do you believe, Mr. Speaker, that the young girls would vote for conscription? The evidence is to the contrary, there have been more weddings than ever during the past four or five months; the young ladies feared conscription and would not let their friends depart. The proof of my statement is in the very Bill itself, which contains a special clause stipulating that young men married. on and after June 11, shall be considered as unmarried.

I declare, Mr. Speaker, that the present Government have not the right to pass such a law because they have no longer any mandate, and I say that you are doing just what Germany is doing. You are a murderous Government, nothing else, and you imitate the Kaiser.

A reproach was made to us, a few moments ago, that the enlisting had not been a success. I say that the Government should not have permitted those moving pictures, representing the horrors of the war. These scenes are reproduced here in a Sparks street theatre, as well as in our own theatres in Montreal. The only practical result has been to scare the people. The opinion prevailing among the people of Quebec is that the Government have tried by every possible means to stop enlistment. You have the case of General Wilson who is a perfect gentleman, but who does not know a word of French; if he does not know it, it is not our fault. If the Government had taken the necessary steps in order to stimulate enlisting, they would have had as much success as anywhere else. You have evidence of this in Major Asselin's regiment which was completed within two months, also in the case of a second regiment which was organized just as quickly.

Now, do you know what happened during Marshal Joffre's visit to Montreal.

When the time came for the inspection of the troops at the base of Mount Royal, where some 400,000 people were present, the general commanding the division could not say a word in French and as Marshal Joffre does not know any English, they could not understand one another. Marshal Joffre must have made this reflection: These soldiers must then all be English? Where are the French Canadians?

Mr. Speaker, the French Canadians of the province of Quebec cleaves to the soil. Our province is not like the other ones. We have only two big centres: Montreal and Quebec. There may well be Three Rivers, Hull and St. Johns, but when we speak of large centres, we have only two. We need all our manual labour for the manufacture of shells, which we are asked to make, and for all other articles required by the people of the province and of the other parts of the Dominion. What we need is farmers. The farmers clamour for help.

My hon. friend, the member for Parry Sound, in his speech yesterday, stated that Toronto, the province of Ontario, could not afford to give another man, that it was impossible, that they absolutely needed aid for farmers. It is the same thing in the province of Quebec. We stick to the native soil, but we also stick to our language and to our religion. We are, as said the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) in his speech, the pioneers of this country. When the French landed here to colonize Canada, the first thing they did, in disembarking, was to plant the cross and to celebrate mass.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our Ontario friends are trying, by all ways and means, to insult our faith. We are strongly attached to it, and we have the right to believe as we please, just as much as they have the right to believe what they please. When it has come to the point of attacking that which is most sensible in the human being; his faith, his tongue and his nationality, I say that those who are doing it are doing a nefarious work and only disorganizing the "entente" which has been advocated for so many years by the hon. leader of the Opposition and by the Fathers of Confederation.

For what is happening to-day, Mr. Speaker, they are responsible. Now, let us discontinue these ill-boding struggles, let us shake hands, let us blot out these religious and racial differences; we are all Canadians; French or English, we are all Canadians. Will our Ontario brethren at last understand? I hope so. As for us, we are familiar with such maxims, our religion teaches it, we know that we should live as brothers in this world.

As was stated the other day by the hon. member for Three Rivers, it would be desirable to send into our sister-province five or six good men to say to these people: Put an end to these struggles. Life is too short. When war will be over, the question of sharing will arise between the nations. Do not get away with the idea that the United States are fighting for nothing. I know that the United States owe a great deal to France and specially to Lafayette, but it might very well happen that the province of Quebec, which is divided. . . exempted by an imaginary line, the 45th, it is possible that

they might say: you will give us Quebec. It is not what I wish, but if this is kept going, you will see what will happen.

May I be allowed to recall a word uttered by the late hon. Mr. Mercier, stating that Confederation had been instituted, nevertheless, to serve the interests of a party, which was the Conservative party, and that it might mean the removal of the French Canadian influence.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of fifty years, the discussion upon this question of race, of religion and of language is still alive. His words come true.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, when we shall celebrate, next week, the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, on the site where the Parliament buildings are being erected, I do hope that, then and there, an understanding will be for ever concluded, that it shall be stated that never hereafter we will attack one another. We, the French Canadians, we are always ready and we must do it, it is not a sacrifice, it is a duty; but the yellows, with their Orange press, are provoking trouble wherever they are. Why? Have we not the right to exist as much as they have? We are the pioneers here. Well, Mr. Speaker, to conclude, I say that the best way to serve the interests of the Empire and our own country's interests for the future, is not in sending men; we have sent 420,000. I do not say that we have done too much. No, we owed it to England, to do what we have done, and we should even do more, if possible, but that, we should do it voluntarily and not forcibly.

When two persons are forcibly united, divorce soon follows suit. That is what is going to happen, you will create civil war in the country; you are not able and you have no right to say to the 700,000 tax payers whom I represent, you have not the right, do I say, to take their own opinion away from them. A man's opinion for the community, that may be nothing, but a man's opinion for himself, that is everything, and it is what you are trying to take away from him.

The Prime Minister, not very long ago, before a large audience in the Monument National, in Montreal, often referred to Democracy. Democracy like those, we find them in Germany and here.

I shall support the amendment of my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, because I believe that the people should be consulted, I am convinced of it, they are loudly crying for it, and it is the only way to obtain a fair and honest opinion. It is the only way that will give you the

right and power to do what you may wish to do.

Mr. Speaker, if I have gone a little too far, I regret it; I should probably have restrained myself a little more, but in the heat of the debate, the fact that I was speaking on a question as important as the one now before us, and after having heard in this House all the speeches made by persons better informed than myself, I may perhaps have made some mistakes.

Now, take notice of what is going to happen.

The present Government's act means that you will have a third party here at the coming elections. That party will be called, just so, the Unionist Labor party, who certainly will not act as did the Nationalist party in 1911, but will stand between the two parties, and when a question of public interest will be brought before the House, the workman who has always taken a deep interest in all public matters, will as ever before keep his word and will thereby hold the balance of the two parties and have the people's rights duly respected.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is not the right time to do what I will now suggest, because we are at war, but I am one of those who are against war; I would like that, at a given moment, in the understanding which will take place, when this war will be settled after the war is over, I would like to see, as I say, every gun to the last one melted, every piece of ammunition cast into the deep seas, and a general disarmament ordered. There is no reason whatever for the nations to cut each other's throats as they are presently doing it. It is only family quarrels among the governments. Sometimes, these quarrels, these wars are only roused in the sole interest of the big manufacturers.

Indeed, what do you see after these wars? You see colossal fortunes spring up and all this wealth is always made, during the war, out of the people who, for centuries, can never get out of it; the families run into debt, they are left in misery for centuries. Therefore, I do not hesitate to declare that I am one of those who are opposed to war, and I believe that after this war, as I have just said it, there should be a general disarmament.

Among the questions which should be dealt with, after the war, one of the first should be that of creating a tribunal of universal peace, which, to my mind, should be composed of representatives of all the powers in the whole world, from the crowned heads to the lowest of the Indian tribes. That is what should be done in or-

der that no nation in the future can attempt to do what is now going on. When we witness the painful spectacle which brings misfortune to the whole world, for the sake of a family quarrel between crowned heads, well, I say that this should stop, and the idea put forth by President Wilson will become a full reality.

Mr. Speaker, much more could be said upon this subjest, but I am through. I might, however, be allowed to say this more: Why send our men to the front if actually, as reported the other day by a newspaper, there are, according to the Minister af Labour, 3,500,000 men fit for military service, and that, of this number, 1,200,000 are to be found in the taverns, in the theatres and in the gambling places. Then, why not take these men and leave the population of Canada in a large country like ours, where we need labour for agriculture, in order that we be able to exist in the future.

Do they really mean to put us out of the way entirely, to replace us by others? It looks very much that way to us, it seems to be the present Prime Minister's policy.

No, the Government's act is a brutal act, which is not constitutional. This Parliament has not the right to legislate, because it has no mandate. You must appeal to the people and the people shall pronounce and decide.

I conclude by thanking this House for the kind attention given to me.

I will vote for the referendum proposed by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, because the people want it and because I am here to do the people's will and not to do as I please. That is the way I understood my mandate and it is the way all the members should understand it.

Mr. A. BELLEMARE (Maskinongé): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Marie (Mr. Martin) who has just spoken although it was my turn, promising to speak no longer than a quarter of an hour, or thereabouts, has broken his promise; how can he blame the Prime Minister for having broken his? May I be allowed to register a second protest against conscription? I say a second protest, because on the 30th January last, before the hon. Prime Minister's departure for England, I took the liberty to warn the House against this project which was even then threatening us as likely to be imposed upon the country. Indeed, at that time, I did believe that on his return from England, the Prime Minister would come back to us thoroughly imperialized and would force upon the country compulsory military service. I am entirely opposed to this Bill, and will be as long as the people will not have been consulted and declared their will. I say that we are opposed to the passage of the present Bill, because it is against the Constitution. Actually, if we ransack the pages of our political history since the establishment of the Parliament of Canada, we will not find a single instance where our great men, English and French Canadian, have at any time admitted the principle either of the colonies' intervention in the Imperial wars or even of going beyond our own territory, except for the exclusive defence of Canada. In that regard, Lord Elgin, who was one of our best Governors, wrote to Lord Grey, on December 18, 1854:

> Although I hold that so long as the colonists have no voice in the imperial councils they are entitled to look to the imperial authorities for protection against hostilities which they have no share in provoking, and that it is therefore fitting that imperial garrisons should be maintained at certain important military stations, such as Quebec, as a pledge that this protection, when the contingency occurs, will not be invoked in vain, I am confident that nothing will more effectually tend to the security of the empire or to the establishment of a high standard of national and manly morals among the colonists, than the assumption by themselves of some portion of the responsibility in respect of self-defence and the preservation of internal tranquillity, which has heretofore been cast upon the mother country. "Nevertheless, I am confident that if the inhabitants of the colony did assume a share of responsibility in the defence of their country and the preservation of internal order, a responsibility which until now has been entirely left to the mother country—nothing would more effectually tend to assure the empire's security and to establish in the colony a lofty national ideal and virile morals.

Holton, a minister in the Taché-McDonald cabinet, who was not a French Canadian, speaking of the Militia Act of 1855, said:

> This measure imposes to the province all the charges of an independent sovereignty without conference upon her sovereign rights and privileges. The ministry propose to tax the people in order to maintain a military force upon which they will exercise no control, and to pursue war operations decided upon without their having a voice in the decision.

And Galt said at the same date:

> In a case of war with the United States, a conflict which might arise from a quarrel in which we would have no interest but that would just the same cover our country with bloodshed, this measure would oblige us to maintain the militia under arms at our own expense.

Mr. Christie, a member, also adds:

> This Act confirms the principle of imposing without representation the tax required to pursue wars in the declaration of which we

have no voice. It puts upon the people of Canada the obligation of supporting Great Britain in all her disputes with the United States, without having a voice in their settlement nor the right to be consulted.

And, a little later on, when a new Militia Bill was introduced by J. A. Macdonald, he says:

In case of war with the United States, England would undoubtedly be willing to spend her last penny and give her last man for our defence. It is her duty to do so; we shall receive the support of all her forces; we have, however, the evident duty of organizing a large and efficient army, whose object will be to fight on our own territory, for our own possessions, our own privileges and our own liberties.

Upon the overthrow of the Cartier-Macdonald administration, during the same period, Hon. Thomas Loranger, an ex-minister also said:

It is perfectly understood that Canada left to herself would not make war nor be drawn into war. Should the country enter into a conflict with a foreign power, it will be the consequence of England's quarrels with that power.

What did Lord Lansdowne do in the case of the expedition to Egypt? He did not ask Canada any compulsory assistance; he replied to the British Government:

That the Government is ready to approve of recruiting in Canada to serve in Egypt or elsewhere. These forces should be specially enlisted under the authority of the Imperial Army Discipline Act and taken from various local battalions, the entire expense to be borne by the Imperial Exchequer.

From what I have just quoted, it can be seen that the sentiment of the Canadian people was in favour of establishing a militia, but only for the defence of Canada, and that everywhere, at all times, the principle, that no Canadian troops could be sent outside of Canada to take part in England's wars, was recognized. It was openly declared that we were ready to defend ourselves for the preservation of our homes, but, at the same time, they refused to accept any principle that might involve us in the participation to external wars. That was the idea of the English of Canada, as well as of the French Canadians and no one can suspect lack of patriotism in a man like Colonel Rankin, who had been employed by the English Government to suppress the insurrection of 1837-1838 in the province of Quebec. That Bill, therefore, looks to me to run amuck with the constitution. That we should voluntarily assist the Empire in a universal war like this one, wherein the world civilization is at stake, that may be tolerated, but that we should be forcibly sent over there, seems to me illegal, unconstitutional, and it threatens to

disturb the peace of Canada. We have no special mandate to impose such a measure. Last year, we granted ourselves a year's extension of our parliamentary term, so that the measure you would force upon the people is drastic and anti-national. I say anti-national, because, under the circumstances, we could render greater services to the Empire by employing our full manpower in agriculture, in munition factories, etc.

The wheat supply being almost exhausted in Europe, the world being under the menace of a general famine, I believe that we could, as I say, render greater services to the Allies, by providing them with foodstuffs in larger quantities.

A few days ago, I met a commercial traveller who used the following comparison. I will suppose that, crossing the Atlantic, you had three trunks to save; one contains the life of Canada, another the life of England and the third one, the life of France. The boat is sinking and they tell you that your trunks being fated, you can save one only. As a Canadian subject, which one are you going to save?

Obviously, it will be Canada's trunk which contains your own life. I was struck with that comparison, and considering the dangerous economic situation of Canada, I conclude that, "as true charity begins at home", we should moderate our participation in the present war and begin to safeguard ourselves before sinking into the depths of imperialism.

Some will say: the hon. Prime Minister has authorized 500,000 men, he must keep his promise. I will answer that never has the Canadian Parliament been consulted on this subject, neither has it given him any authority in the matter. We are told that we are in imminent danger; I say that nobody can prove such a statement and that, consequently, we should stick to volunteering. When I courted election for the first time in the county of Maskinongé, the mandate given me was to work against excessive imperialism, and the parishes of Maskinongé, Saint Léon, Louiseville, Saint Ursule, Saint Ignace du Lac, Saint Charles de Mandeville, Saint Paulin, Saint Didace, Saint Justin, Saint Alexis des Monts, etc., have sent me numerous petitions, strongly protesting against the passing of the conscription bill. Consequently, representing the opinion of my electors and out of respect for democracy, I declare in this House that I bow to the wish of my constituents. It will be thanks to the independents elected in 1911, if this measure be not adopted before the general elections.

It is we, the independent members, who will save the people from the spectre of compulsory service. It is thanks also to the doctrine of the referendum now adopted by the hon. leader of the Opposition, with the help of a certain number of his friends—who do not appear to me very numerous—if we obtain that the people be consulted before this Bill is enacted. I congratulate the members on the left of the Speaker who are in favour of the measure. In 1911, I myself, in my county, advocated the referendum on the Naval Service question. I wanted the people to be consulted, and the same to-day. I say that we advocated that policy in 1911. Indeed, how read the Saint Eustache resolutions, in that year? They were to the effect that no contribution of men and of money should be granted, unless authorized by a referendum. That is exactly, says Le Canada of June 21 what Sir Wilfrid Laurier proposes to-day. I will therefore support as strongly as I can this amendment or any other measure of a nature to prevent the adoption of this Bill. I am much afraid that it may be said, in affer years, of several among us, as Sir Hippolyte Lafontaine did say, one day, while speaking upon an important measure in the old parliament of United Canada: "You have saved the ministry, but you have sacrificed the people."

Mr. JOSEPH GIRARD (Chicoutimi-Saguenay (translation): Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty on so momentous an occasion in Canada's parliamentary history to give a few explanations for the stand I have decided to take in regard to a Bill which the Prime Minister has seen fit to submit to this House for its approval.

As I am not a lawyer or in any sense versed in the law, I must refrain from discussing the legality or constitutionality of this measure. But, after closely following the discussions carried on by the principal legal lights of this House, after listening with surprise to statements made here by the best lawyers of the Liberal party in the various provinces, who regretfully part from their leader because they are in favour of the Bill, I am wondering whether in their inner conscience those men are not satisfied that this Bill is constitutional. I learned to know them, during the seventeen years I have met them in this House. I have had many evidences of their high sense of honour, of their disinterestedness and their enlightened patriotism, and I know that, in so serious a circumstance, they are acting only after most serious consideration and for reasons entirely free of sectarianism. Duty is their only guide. Hence it is evident to me that the Prime Minister and his colleagues have also, necessarily, been guided by the same sentiments of honour and of duty.

The same considerations prove to my mind the urgency of the measure. Moreover, if we consider the unpopularity of this law, a fact which the Government as the lowest of the electors could readilly foresee, it is plain that only the greatest emergency, vividly impressing itself on the minds of those in office, could impel them to take such action.

I may say to the Prime Minister that I accept with pleasure his momentous declaration, when presenting the Conscription Bill before the country, that he acted only as Prime Minister of Canada, performing his duty, and never under the pressure direct or indirect of any external influence. I respect him enough and I know too well his sense of honour to allow myself the liberty of questioning his word in any way whatever, above all when he gives it so solemnly as upon this occasion.

I am not of those who believe our Prime Ministers should be locked up in the country as traitors, and avoid the contact of the men who govern the Empire and the European nations. I rather believe that we have all to gain by letting our rulers travel abroad, in order that they may study and open all kinds of connections, to increase our trade facilities. Without being an Imperialist more than it is necessary, I do not believe Imperialism be such a dangerous scare-crow that we must avoid even the thought of it.

Neither am I in accord with those who contend that the Act of Confederation has been a mistake. On the contrary, Confederation has been the work of great men and an act of which the Canadians are proud. On the other hand, here comes the leader of the Opposition, a lawyer of long standing and a most experienced parliamentarian, supported by other important lawyers, contending that the law is unconstitutional and that this is not such an emergency as would justify such an action. His supporters come from all the provinces, especially from the province of Quebec, which is almost unanimous upon this question.

They maintain that volunteering is sufficient to provide the promised number of men, that Canada's effort is already too great for her population, and that to go any farther would be to drive the country to actual ruin. I notice that, on account of such claims, a minister representing the

province of Quebec has resigned, fearing a danger for national unity, which Canada needs so much. In certain quarters it has been charged that the province of Quebec has not furnished her full quota of men, and they even go as far as to charge my province with being disloyal. If the Government should be credited with good faith, honour, uprightness and a strict sense of duty, one must also necessarily recognize in those of different opinions the same qualities and the same motives.

In my province there are well-read men with good judgment and moderate views, and who have long pondered and reflected before taking a stand. Therefore, to me—as I am no advocate nor lawyer—their judgment, once rendered, especially when these men are friends of the present Government, must be an almost infallible guide. It is true that the Conservatives of Quebec are not absolutely unanimous, but the large majority are opposed to the Bill. It is well understood that I only refer to the laymen. Then, is the law constitutional and is there an emergency? The majority of Parliament shall say and decide that question.

Indeed, we are facing a terrible problem, the consequences of which cannot be foreseen, especially if the element shouting rebellion predominates. But I cannot be led to believe that, in this abominable world-wide storm where the best pilots know no longer how to trim their sails, what is going on in Europe cannot be repeated here. Over there also, terrible resistances are encountered; there also they speak of revolts, but just when everything seems lost, the good common sense gains the upper hand and the rulers succeed in guiding their people towards the sole object of all the Allies and of the Canadians; the utter reduction of German barbarism.

Honest people, good citizens and responsible men are everywhere numerous enough to prevent a greater evil and let common sense have its way. But it is painful to me to hear in this House some authorized voices say they are not ready to admit that the people would be wrong in revolting.

Has Canada done her share generously? Yes, she astonishes the world. Can she go any further? Those who oppose the Bill say no, unless it be with great care and moderation. It is the almost unanimous contention of the province of Quebec.

In the district which I have the honour to represent, the friends of the Government, unanimously, were the first to address me long before the Bill was introduced; resolutions adopted in every parish, on the request of the central Conservative organization of the county, asking me to lay before the House their unanimous opposition to any conscription scheme, for the following reasons: Conscription endangers national unity, voluntary enlisting suffices, if well organized; Canada's financial situation is in jeopardy, seeing the immense debt already existing and daily increasing; in the country-places where is barely the number of farm-hands required for the agricultural production which must be daily increased; the cost of living is already too disproportionate; the Canadian industries cannot be maintained if the labour is reduced, and moreover the United States will send to the front millions of men who will be ready before the proposed Canadian levy.

My friends are those of the Government; they are unanimous with the Conservatives of my province. Among them, there are very wise men and men of great experience, and I must add that my adversaries think as they do. I have promised my electors that I would be the echo of their opinions; my duty, therefore, is to represent them here as they want me to upon this so important and so momentous question, and to vote against the Bill.

Now, why such an immovable opposition, by my friends, to the proposed law? First the assurance, often repeated, that there would be no conscription. At my request, the late lamented Hon. Mr. Casgrain held three meetings in my district—at one of these, he was accompanied by the Hon. Mr. Patenaude,—to explain Canada's situation in its true light, and give confidence to the population in the war organization. The word of these men was well received and respected by large audiences who had faith in their statements.

On this point, I believe I should add a few remarks. The Prime Minister, the leader of the Opposition, and all of us, we have spoken too much, although in good faith. All of us, we were in the first place satisfied that the war would not last so long, and no one could foresee all the complications which, since August 4, 1914, have arisen almost every day. Who could have foreseen Russia's defection? Who could have foreseen this abominable submarine war? Who are those who foresaw Rumania's disaster? Who are they who have not made mistakes, in Europe and in America, since the beginning of the war?

During the last fifty years, outside of Germany, who are those who had a clear foresight? England alone who, noiselessly, had so prepared the future that, when war was

declared, she was able to bottle up, around Heligoland, the immense fleet of Germany which has not been able to stir since. And England has been able to keep the word she had given her colonies, to wit that she would protect them at all times.

I remember a day, in the good times of peace, when all was calm and serene, the Parliament of Canada saw fit to ask England to denounce her treaties with Germany; if England had not been able to bottle up the German fleet, I wonder if the Kaiser would not have remembered the action of Canada and crossed the Atlantic to avenge that denouncement of the treaty. And, therefore, if the provinces of eastern Canada, especially Quebec, are not like Belgium since October, 1914, that is due only to England's mighty fleet, to her foresight, to her respect for pledges and to her firm stand at the right moment. If the trade of Canada and of America has been practically continued since the declaration of war, because the high seas have been cleared of the pirates by the British fleet, that also we owe it to England. How much does it cost daily to the English people, that gigantic effort of which the British colonies reap the first benefit and the whole world besides? It is good to recall these facts.

How dearly the whole world is paying, at the present day, for having refused to believe in the constant growth, under its very eyes, of an infernal power whose intentions were plain, and whose sudden action was as much of a surprise that we are now forced to admit that it will probably take the entire strength of the nations of the world to reduce it.

Considering this universal lack of foresight, it is not surprising, I think, that the Prime Minister, the leader of the Opposition and all the members of this House should have made statements which it would have been preferable to dispense with, and the effect of which has been to mislead public opinion. But we must admit that, even in December last, in the face of the war's ever changing fortunes, the Prime Minister refused to guarantee that there would not be any conscription. It was a notice given to the whole country, and what was the result? All that work which has been done through winter, in Montreal and elsewhere, in order to create an opposition to the principle of conscription. If the efforts of Hon. Mr. Blondin have been so little productive, what is the cause of it; if not that a certain press was eager to ridicule him and that certain men, even in this House, tried to deprecate him? That is how public opinion was guided, and so the doctrines advocated have borne fruit. That preposterous organization of recruiting appeared so objectionable to the people in my district that, six months ago, I felt obliged to notify the Militia Department that I would no longer be responsible for its working and left it to them entirely henceforth; and, as a matter of fact, after I had repeatedly complained about the way things were being managed in my county, matters seemed to be going from bad to worse. And I informed them that the result of it was a public opinion wholly averse and opposed to everything in connection with the war.

And now we are reaping the fruits to-day and the harvest is a rich one: absolute and unanimous hostility to anything pertaining to the war, because what has been tasted of it only breathes of deceit, wastage and dishonesty.

Many times, among friends, we would say that all that immense scandal could be nothing but deliberate conspiracy against the Government, for all the strangers sent to do recruiting were undisguised Liberals, among whom two brothers of Dr. Michaud, the Liberal candidate chosen for the coming Federal elections of Chicoutimi, who had nothing else to do but to carry to his friend Elie certain cheques payable to soldiers' wives which he thus had the advantage of distributing. That is why I cannot help laughing when I hear people say that the Government was using recruiting to serve its political ends.

Necessarily, the odium of all this is laid at the door of the Government. But, for those who know, it should be attributed to the power behind the Throne who, I do not know how or why, can laugh at the minister and even resist him when he commands. The military laws, so I am told, are so made and, to overrule an officer, it would almost take the King himself. Indeed, the one, who, from the start, was responsible for that deplorable organization is very guilty, if results are to be taken into account.

I hold as responsible for this condition of affairs the headquarters whose formation I know nothing about, but who, through inexperience I hope, have created the sad situation we are in. In Quebec, they have established rather a breeding station where the best trimmers have succeeded in getting positions in large numbers, at high salaries, as recruiting officers, instead of leaving for the front. That is the manimous opinion in my district, where every one is asking for months past, why these good-for-nothings

are not yet at the front. There, at least, they might earn the money we pay them. If recruiting has been done every where in Quebec as it was in my district, there is no reason to be surprised if they talk of revolt in some localities.

However, from my district, a good number of men are at the front since 1914. German bullets have reached several of them, and the Demeules, Dubé and Topping families mourn the loss of their sons, heroes who have fallen for the defence of the law of nations. The famous Capt. Tremblay, whose reputation as a fighter is widely known, is a son of the county I have the honour to represent; we have then done our share and we are proud of those who represent us at the front, but all the same, we believe we are perfectly right in making the objections we have to increased efforts.

It must also be admitted that as soon as it became known that the French Canadian forces, organized under the understanding that they would form units over there, under officers who spoke their own language, were being disbanded and sent here and there in foreign regiments, the enthusiasm cooled down enormously and it is only common sense. How many English Canadians would enlist if they were assured of being commanded by French Canadians from Quebec who would not speak English?

Here are the three great causes which, necessarily, have paralyzed recruiting in my district and throughout the province, and, indeed, they are most serious. First, the bad organization of the recruiting work; secondly, the disbanding, on the other side, of the French Canadian units, no longer commanded by officers of their language; thirdly, the education given since 1896, and even previously.

I am glad to acknowledge, as I think I should, that the present minister of Militia (Sir A. E. Kemp), since his coming into office, has shown himself much more sympathetic and much more energetic than his predecessor, in his relations with the public as regards the work of recruiting. It is my duty to make this statement which he greatly deserves, from all reports I have received regarding him. But he must allow me, in the name of public decency and of the respect due to him, to ask him to put out, as soon as possible, from my district, the remainder of the idle so-called recruiting agents, who have shocked public opinion by their presence for too long a time, and to accept the patriotic offer made by the united officers of the 18th regiment of Chicoutimi, who are desirous to handle recruiting in Chicoutimi-Saguenay, under Mr. J. E. A. Dubuc as honorary colonel. All of them, Conservative or Liberal, are citizens of good reputation; they enjoy the people's confidence. Major Lachance has the honour of having a youthful son at the front, who fought like a lion at Vimy. Let us try to please the people, specially in war times.

Had recruiting been well organized, the necessity for the proposed act would never have arisen and Canada would be proud to be at her post without having to go through the present crisis.

But it is easy to remedy the situation by resorting to proper means, creating a spirit of confidence which must soon develop, having merely been set back by the causes which I have just mentioned. The French Canadian is peaceful at home and his heart is in the right place. He loves his King, he is proud of his flag, and for it he will give his last drop of blood and his last cent. But he wants to be respected as a man, he wants to deal with honest people, and he wants to see his sacrifices appreciated at their real value, and lightened as much as possible by a friendly, sympathetic and even-handed leadership. Let me give you an instance to prove that voluntary recruitment, well organized and by popular men, gives good results. Captain Piuze, of Fraserville, a young man of good repute, has organized the 189th regiment in his district in a very short time. Major Asselin who, however, had fought the Nationalist battles in Quebec, has also formed a battalion in no time. Here are two striking instances that go to demonstrate most evidently that, when the organization is good, when the organizers are known and deserve confidence, the people do answer by confidence. But the treatment inflicted, later on, upon both these regiments, has had a dampening upon the people's enthusiasm. Let us then try again voluntary recruiting by men of good sense, like Piuze and Asselin —there is quite a number of them in Quebec —and we are sure to get the same results.

Not one discordant note was heard when Canada entered upon this war; it was a question of heart and of duty. Let us regret the deplorable errors of the past, but let us repair them by means which appeal to the heart that is not dead, but only sick on account of mistakes committed by subordinates who had the power to make them, and who have had the hateful courage to commit them.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of talk about Quebec nowadays; in certain quarters,

she is abused and insulted, and her sons are falling over there every day. Her clergy, so noble, is being made an object of public scorn and obloquy. For instance: that infernal card which was distributed in this very House. They have forgotten our bishops' collective letter of 1914, enjoining their flocks to do their duty in the war.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the two first names my mother taught me were those of God and of the illustrious Queen Victoria, and all the French Canadian mothers were doing the same in those days and all of them have since upheld the same principles of education for their children, only substituting, when circumstances made it necessary, the name of the King. Every Sunday, at the foot of the altar, the French Canadian people pray God for their King and throughout Quebec, every one is proud of belonging to the British Empire. Therefore, how regrettable it is to find in the Dominion, westward from Quebec, some Englishmen, more English than the King, brutally attacking my province and her language and her children.

A few days ago, one of our good friends in this House was asking himself if it would not be possible to find twelve good men, independent men, who would go to Quebec and speak the language of the present times and appease the minds that, according to him, see things under a false light. This is a good idea which I accept, if my friend could on the same day find also in Ontario twelve good men independent citizens who would go through his own province to calm the people who scorn Quebec, who persecute her children while allowing them very little French and religious education in their schools; these same gentlemen should also go to Manitoba where they have completely turned out of the schools both Christ and the French tongue, and also into the two western provinces, where every year some new attempt is being made to also put out both French and religious instruction from the schools. What a splendid work these men would accomplish nowadays, if they could succeed in having the province of Quebec known as she actually is: the paradise of Liberty, where Protestants are masters of their schools as at home, and where the Irish Catholics are treated just as brothers; and if they also succeed in obtaining that in Ontario and particularly among our Irish Catholic co-religionists who do not speak our language, Quebec would be respected. During these dark stormy days, how good it would be to see all our family troubles forever gone!

To be fair, the position taken by Quebec does not speak disloyalty, no more than that taken by the English element which thinks like she does and which is larger than is generally admitted.

To stop a little, reflect and look into the future which is gloomy, that is prudence, that is wisdom, that is reasoning. The Germans must be beaten, that is agreed on by all; but in order to beat them the soldiers must be fed and clothed.

Now, in my district, we just have the farm labour we need; the large industries we have are often short of hands and the fisheries along our northern coast occupy the whole population, so much so that the mills of Clark City have to import men. And they would want to take away a portion of our manual labour. Those who live in the district know what the circumstances are; and so, the people do resist. An agricultural producer departing for the front would cause a deficit in the food production equal to that of thirty soldiers. Let us keep our farmers at home.

Then, there is the high cost of living; here is a problem which is appealing to all. It is almost beyond control, for neutral countries have to contend with it as much as ourselves. But it was particularly difficult of settlement in Canada, as long as the United States did not join the Allies. Now, it can be more eff ctually remedied by the joint work of both governments.

Upon this point, I wish to make a few remarks. In 1880, I landed at Lake St. John as a settler, to live on the land. Then and for the three or four years following, the settlers of the district I have the honour to represent, were facing the same problem. There was no war then, the country was prosperous and things were in a fair way. In those days, we paid flour $11 a barrel—and such flour—pork, 5 cents a pound, syrup $1.50 a gallon, salt $10 a bag, and it took three days to procure these indispensable articles. The wages were 50 cents a day, and in winter, the lumber dealers paid $10 and $12 per month, and young men would come to the Ottawa lumber camps where they got $15 to $20 a month, with their board included of course. And it was at that time, that people worked like Trojans in my district, to make of it the fine agricultural county, which the province of Quebec is so rightly proud of to-day. How is it that, nowadays, with salaries of $4, $5, $6 and $7 a day, people can hardly live?

At that time, Mr. Speaker, the unbridled extravagance which predominates to-day was absolutely unknown. The requirements

of ease and of comfort, extended, as they are to-day and have been for several years, to their utmost limits, are the greatest cause of the present moral and financial disarray. It takes some money to support a family, but how much more will it not take for clothes, if the thought of the future and the idea of what is proper do not predominate? My explanation of the high cost of living is to be seen in the scandalous displays in every shop window. Should we not reproach ourselves, every one of us, in every rank of society, for having allowed to be created in our country that false education which has made the fortune of the shop keepers and maintained in poverty the workman and the farmer? If the prohibition campaign had been started 20 years ago, if intelligent economy, had been advocated, we should not hear so much of drunkenness, and there would be to-day less jewels, trinkets and silks, the sight of which are so painfully offensive to our common sense. Luxury is ever the parent of all vices and the cause of all ruin; let us throw it down, now is the time.

Since the present horrible war calls daily for money and still more money, why not tax heavily all the useless fancy goods which ruin our population? Have they not seen to this in England and are not the responsible men generally preaching economy? Have not the higher social classes set the example?

Let the Canadian Parliament seriously attend to this question and the cost of living will no longer be a bugbear. But, nevertheless, there must be no delay in laying the hands upon the vampires who are sucking the people's blood and getting rich in a dishonest way through iniquitous speculations.

Should we still take part in the war? I believe everyone is agreed on this point, in Quebec as elsewhere; but we ought to proceed with prudence, with calculation and with due care. The effort we have made is the wonder of the world; perhaps, have we, in our enthusiasm, proceeded too quickly? Then, let us now be cautious.

I have heard it repeated many a time that there are presently in the country one hundred thousand men who have no visible means of support, produce nothing, help nobody and are, for the greater part of them rather a public nuisance. If that be true—at all events, it is certain there is a large number of them in the cities—let us find them and send them across to fill the gaps; over there they will be useful, they will be a credit to the flag and their temporary absence from the country will do no harm.

Under the present Military Service Act, it would be an easy matter to reach them, by inserting a special section providing that the generally unemployed having no regular trade be the first called.

Mr. Speaker, we are now facing, I fear, not a political, but a national crisis. The parties are divided and the leader of the Opposition sees his dearest generals leave him in such numbers that, before long, his family will be greatly disunited. And the Government's forces will be very strong upon this conscription issue. Before long, Quebec shall stand alone solidly against this measure and facing the other provinces badly divided. And what next? What terrible responsibilities are being shouldered in these dreadful times; one cannot but tremble at the thought!

Quebec is intelligent, patriotic, sincere and loyal to the extreme; but Quebec believes it is time to look to the future and not rush blindly into bankruptcy. Quebec believes that conscription is useless, oppressive and contrary to Canada's interests. A certain part of the population thought that the leader of the Opposition would save the situation by his prestige over his party; but that was an illusion and it is evident that, were he in power with his friends, he would impose conscription, not selective, but by ballot which is still worse, and without referendum, as in 1910. Then, whither are we drifting?

The Conservative party of my province and of my county is unanimously opposed to the Bill. Among them are to be found men most friendly to the Premier, great thinkers and great philosophers. My duty in this House is to voice the opinion of my electors who are to a man, opposed to the measure; that duty I shall fulfil by speaking and voting against the bill. I so notified the Prime Minister a long time ago.

I must add that I sincerely regret to be forced to part with the Prime Minister upon a measure of such importance; I know that he is sincere, I know he is upright and that he is actuated solely by the idea of performing an urgent duty. I know the uprightness and the disinterestedness of his colleagues; I know that every one of them realizes the terrible responsibility he assumes; could they possibly be right?

Considering the situation in this House as I see it, I must admit that the future is far from being bright.

The leader of the Opposition, whom I respect, proposes that the present law be submitted to the people, before it be applied, for most serious reasons which he men-

tions; I know that his Quebec friends rely upon his great prestige to maintain his party and defeat the Government. He seems in favour of the principle of conscription, but he will not so state until the people has rendered his verdict, he has to second his motion, his former colleague who, for his part, is against the Bill because it does not go far enough; he would like to have it settled by drawing lots. What a difference between the arguments of the mover and those of the seconder!

But now his leading partisans who, every day, declare themselves in favour of the Bill, are compelled to state that they part with their leader with his permission, but that they remain in the Liberal party. Let us suppose a general election and the Borden Government defeated, what policy will the country face? Selective conscription will be defeated and then we will have conscription by drawing lots, as provided in the Militia Act. An interesting question to put to the electors. Why did not the leader of the Opposition, as he did in 1896, move the six months' hoist? Never has a similar political situation been witnessed to my mind, in this country. Would all this agitation resolve itself into a mere party move? What is now going on in Quebec is pregnant with suggestions. I received this letter signed by a man of the highest character and it reads as follows:

June 18, 1917.

Sir,—Will conscription pass (according to the newspapers, the Liberal members are going to vote for that Bill), or will there be general elections? Jos. Guay is giving lectures on agriculture; he gets the parish priest's endorsation and says nothing worth while. On the 18th, he gave four, at Hébertville, at St. Bruno, at St. Joseph d'Alma and at Delisle. He speaks for an hour; he says: When the agriculturist will come here later, listen to him carefully and follow his advice. If you listen to him, you will produce ten times more, but he ends by stating: I have a son at the front and I might say a few words about the war; and that is a pretext for speaking against the Government. Enough has been done or too much has been done. Borden had promised there would not be any conscription. By imposing it, he deceives the people. He has deceived Mgr. Bruchési. Then he gives the names of important people who have told him that Canada had done too much for the past two years. He says: Borden has tried to catch Laurier in his trap, but Laurier told him: "Go back, Satan, with thy coalition," and, immediately like the good old hen, he has called all his little ones under his wings, and at the roll-call, the Liberal party solid as a rock will vote against the Borden Bill which will jump into the lower regions under the eyes of Laurier, who is the saviour of the people. Then, in his thundering voice, he cries hurrah for the old rooster. That's Jos. Guay, all right.

I tell you these things, not to blame any one, but to keep you advised of what is going on here.

Yours truly...

Have the Quebec Government come to the point of sending their political heelers through our parishes, and announcing them as agricultural lecturers paid by the province?

This is a serious case which I believe it my duty to denounce immediately. Jos. Guay is an hotel-keeper of Chicoutimi, proprietor of the big six-room hotel called "La bonne ménagère", whose milk has stopped. He has Spanish blood and delights in Toreador tournaments. He is greatly interested in poultry and his young daughter is the President of the Chicoutimi Farming Ladies Circle, under her father's guidance. Two years ago, at his request, I obtained from the Government, for his circle, the shipment of twenty-five hens and one rooster for their hen house; the whole lot was duly received in good order, according to the official correspondence, but considering that the cost of living was already increasing, a way was devised to declare the hens sick—they had been put in the cellar of "La bonne ménagère", instead of placing them in the poultry-houses built with Federal money—and the boarders of "La bonne ménagère" ate the twenty-five hens, bragging, in the cars, that the Borden chickens were delicious. The rooster was left for the circle. I do not know whether Jos. Guay refers to this poultry-breeding experience of his in his lectures. I am giving it out to the public so that it may be recalled, should he forget.

The appeal to the people is a fine business. It is the people who govern. But, in the United States, are the people the rulers, when in November last they elected a peace Congress who set them at war a few days after their mandate was in force?

And does not our historical records show that the people's decision is null and void when, in most cases, election programs are burned on the night of votation and buried in the victory; 1896 and 1897 are there to demonstrate that fact.

We have here friends of the leader of the Opposition pretending that often the people prefer being guided to directing themselves; but the Liberal leader wants an appeal to the people; some of his lieutenants say no, because the people prefer to be led. The leader of the Opposition declares the Bill unconstitutional; his lieutenants reply that it is perfectly constitutional and they support it; but, at the same time, they declare they are all of them under the crook of the same leader.

In what state of chaos are we! What future is there in store for us? Many serious people are asking themselves that question

and praying God that the national unity be not broken and that the people's good faith be not deceived. After having studied the facts, here is the situation as I understand it: If the Government were left alone with their friends, the Bill would perhaps not be adopted; then, it is the adhesion of almost all the leading English Liberals which makes the Government's position tenable and which will cause the Bill to be carried by a respectable majority, I believe. At this moment, the Liberal party must assume its equal share of responsibility, before the country and before the electorate, and the confidence of the anti-conscriptionists in the prestige of the leader of the Opposition is a terrible illusion. And these important members of the Liberal party, who assume that responsibility, I know them, they are all of them men of high education and perfectly upright in every respect. For them, the Bill is not directed against Quebec, as it is sometimes unfortunately stated. On this point, may I be allowed to publicly thank the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Dr. Clark) for the sincere sympathy towards my province I have heard them express, not long ago, in the course of a private conversation where I was not alone, as well as the embarrassment they felt in the face of the position taken by Quebec. And their other colleagues think the same way, I know it.

So then, here we have such important men who refrain from overthrowing a government which they have most severely criticised upon war questions and who extend their full support to pass a law of which they know the absolute unpopularity, as well as the terrible possibilities implied. Necessarily, conscience alone speaks and dictates to these men and I have no right to attribute to them any unworthy motive. It is not therefore a duty for every public man in the face of such a situation to urge the whole population of the country to be calm and every class of the society to remain within bounds?

Before resuming my seat, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make to the Prime Minister and to his colleagues, as well as to all those who support him, an appeal which springs from my very heart:

Considering that the population has not been prepared for the enforcement of the proposed Act;

Considering that it is evident that voluntary recruiting has not given the expected results on account of its thoroughly objectionable organization;

[Mr. Girard.]

Considering that its reorganization on a business and common sense basis might quickly give good results;

That, if the law passes, its application be suspended until there is absolute evidence of the failure of well organized volunteering and until the people have been consulted.

I may state that, in my district, there is no reason to fear a revolution, whatever be the Parliament's decision; but it is painful to hear vituperation against friends whom we respect.

Let me assure you also, Mr. Speaker, in concluding, that whatever may happen, the province of Quebec and my district, especially, in the future as in the past, on awakening every morning, shall hail, though perhaps with tears in their eyes, their God and their King. In both of them, I hope, and through them our rulers may finally find the right way to fulfil their present duty and preserve at the same time the national unity upon which depends the future of our fair Canada.

Should the Bill pass, the leaders of both parties in this House shall have a serious task to perform, if we are to preserve that national unity which must be saved, at the cost of any sacrifice. Such is the wish I express from the bottom of my heart: Be they equal to the task, for thereafter responsibilities there will be for them greater than ever. The whole country is watching them.

On motion of Mr. Boivin the debate was adojurned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Hazen the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m.

Friday, June 29, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table the report of the Librarian of Parliament and his recommendation in the matter of the appointment of Joseph Ludger Parr as clerk in the Library of Parliament.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 107, to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: Explain.

Mr. ROCHE: This Bill contains several minor amendments the purpose of which is to make our legislation harmonize with practices that have grown up in the department as a result of the war. There are, however, two or three amendments of greater importance. One is to accomplish the object intended to be accomplished by the amendment introduced by the member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), but ruled out by the Speaker. The purpose of that amendment is, in the case of persons who are the owners of purchased homesteads or of pre-emptions, and who have performed all the necessary duties except that of making payment for the land, to enable a certificate of recommendation to issue, which shall be valid for twelve months. During that period the persons who have so purchased homesteads or pre-emptions will have the privilege of raising a loan upon the land in order to pay the Government price of the land.

Another amendment applies to abandoned homesteads upon which liens have been given in respect of seed grain or relief. Ordinarily, those who desire to secure abandoned homesteads may do so under the ordinary homestead conditions, but in order to protect the public from loss of money that had been advanced to the original entrant, whoever secures abandoned lands is required to pay off the seed grain lien. This applies to the securing of lands either by entry or by purchase. There are two or three other amendments of a minor character.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

PROPOSED MORNING SITTINGS POSTPONED.

On the motion being called:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

That on and from Tuesday the 3rd of July, and until the end of the session, the House shall meet each sitting day at 11 o'clock in the morning, and that in addition to the usual intermission at 6 o'clock, p.m., there shall be an intermission from one to three o'clock, p.m.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I had a conference with my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) about this motion. He represents to me that it would be better to sit later at night than to have morning sittings, particularly in view of the probability of their being hot weather during the coming month. He has also informed me that so far as he is aware the debate upon the second reading of the Military Service Bill will probably be concluded within two days—although, of course, it is difficult to fix an exact limit. In view of these considerations, I am content to let the motion stand. Perhaps I might venture to express the hope that in speaking upon the Bill hon. gentlemen will be as concise as may be consistent with their purpose of making their attitude absolutely plain to the House and to the country. If that can be done, the length of the debate may be curtailed without any disadvantage to the gentlemen who speak upon it, and with some advantage to the public interest by reason of our being enabled to conclude the business of the session at a somewhat earlier date than would otherwise be possible.

Motion stands.

MARBLE FOR PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): I wish to make an inquiry based on an article in the Canadian Mining Journal. I will read it:

It is said that the marble for the new Houses of Parliament at Ottawa is to be purchased in the United States. The estimates call for marble to the value of $200,000. As there are in Ontario and Quebec deposits of suitable stone, it is strange that Canadian quarries are not to supply the marble needed for the Canadian public buildings. Does the fault lie with the Government, or the owners of the quarries?

I should like to ask whether there is any truth in that report.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS: I am not aware that there is any truth in it. The committee in charge of the construction of the Parliament building are taking care to have purchased in Canada, as far as it is possible to do so, everything suitable for use in the construction of that building. I have not the exact facts in my mind, but I shall be glad to look them up, because I think that the statement quoted by my hon. friend is entirely incorrect.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Consideration of the motion of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto, and on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barrette, resumed from Thursday, June 28.

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, since your appointment to the

honourable position which you now hold, I have not taken up too much of the time of this House in discussing the different measures, some very good, others not so good, submitted by this Government for the successful prosecution of the great war in which Canada is engaged as part of the British Empire—a war, Sir, which every member of this House desires to see brought to a speedy and successful conclusion, not only for the honour and glory of our King, our country and our flag, but for the peace, liberty and civilization of the entire world.

The measure which now confronts us is so important, involving as it does the liberty of the subject, that I cannot vote thereon without explaining to this House and to this country, for the benefit at least of the electors whom I once represented here, the reasons why I intend to vote against the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette), if it is declared to be in order, for the amendment submitted by my right hon. leader, and if that amendment is defeated, then against the second and subsequent readings of the Military Service Bill.

Referring to the electors of Shefford county, I used the expression: "The electors whom I once represented here," because, Sir, when a majority of them gave me their votes and their confidence on September 21, 1911, they elected me as their representative for a term of five years—no more—and I feel that since the month of September, 1916, when another general election should have been held, I have no longer the same right and the same authority to express their views and voice their sentiments and opinions. I may be asked why I tacitly consented to a renewal of my mandate by an amendment to the Canadian constitution made by the Imperial Parliament at the unanimous request of both Houses of the Parliament of Canada. If so, I will promptly answer that when the petition asking for an extension of the present Parliament was unanimously approved by both parties in this House, I, like many other hon. members on this side, was under the impression that the war policy of the Government had been clearly defined and would be faithfully carried out. Its policy, as I then understood it, was to send to the trenches in France and Belgium, every Canadian citizen who had the courage and patriotism to enlist, to see that he was supplied with the best arms, ammunition and clothing that "science could devise or money could buy," to see that his dependents did not suffer at home during his absence, nor after his glorious death and that in case of his being returned, maimed, wounded and disabled, to surround him with all the care, attention and assistance that he so righteously deserved. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) had preached production and more production; the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) had counselled economy and more economy, and the Prime Minister had placed the natural resources of Canada at the disposal of the Mother Country, in order to insure the soldiers of England as well as those of Canada and their dependents, against famine and starvation, while they were risking their lives for the common cause. It is true that the Prime Minister had, a few days before the opening of the last session, without any authorization from Parliament or the country at large, promised that our contribution would attain the figure of 500,000 men. It was a New Year's gift from the Prime Minister to England, which was later ratified by an Order in Council, and subsequently called a pledge, although the Prime Minister himself admits that it should not be so considered. But pledge or unauthorized gift—call it what you like—that contribution was to be voluntary. This is proven by the statement made by the right hon. gentleman which, although already quoted during the course of this debate, I must repeat. Sir Robert Borden on January 17, 1916, said:

> 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 conscription. I repeat that announcement to-day with emphasis.

Later on during the same session, when proposing the adoption of the petition to the Imperial Parliament, asking for an extension of the life of this Parliament, Sir Robert Borden on February 8, 1916, said:

> On the outbreak of war, the Government of Canada pledged the assistance of the Dominion to the Empire, and when the subject of war was brought before Parliament in the August session of 1914, the Government presented proposals regarding assistance to the Empire in the war upon a larger scale than had ever before been proposed or undertaken. It might have been urged by persons who are specially influenced by constitutional usage that a mandate from the electorate should have been then sought for that reason.
>
> The Government considered that public opinion was practically unanimous in supporting the course which the Government proposed.

Canada was thereby pledged by the then legally elected representatives of her people, without a dissenting voice, to the voluntary contribution of all that she could give

and all that she could do, to avenge Belgium, punish Germany, for her disregard of treaty rights, and assure the continuance of that democracy, liberty, and freedom of which we always have been, yes, of which I hope we may always be so proud. We were to have no conscription, our contribution was to be voluntary, and our duty as members of Parliament resolved itself into carrying out the pledges made when we had a right to make them. We did not know, we could not believe, in spite of the then current rumours to this effect, that there would be troubles and disagreements in the Cabinet itself, and that politics, patronage and graft would continue to exist in the party opposite as has been clearly proven on many occasions since that date. We consented to an extension of our mandates to save the turmoil of a general election and to demonstrate to the world, what the people of Canada already knew, that unlike its opponents, the Liberal party was more concerned about winning the war than in attaining office and dispensing party favours to party friends. I have been told by speakers who favour this Bill, that, because conscription has been adopted in France, in England and in the United States, conscription must be adopted here. I will refer to England later on in my address and show that conscription has not been so popular nor so successful there as was originally hoped for. I remember the words of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) yesterday, when he heaped praise upon the United States for their entry into this world-war, and for the immediate adoption of conscription in that country. With him and with those who applauded those words, I heartily agree.

It was a great date in the history of humanity when the United States entered this war. Despite the Monroe doctrine, despite German immigration, despite the ties of all kinds binding the two countries, the aggressive policy of Germany forced into the war the nation which was most firmly resolved to remain at peace. President Wilson conducted his policy from the first, like the great man of law that he is. His impassibility and his refusal to pass judgment sometimes surprised us, but his attitude from the very first gave his final decision the force of a verdict, the verdict of the conscience of humanity before the tribunal of history. But although the moral influence of the United States will be great, her material assistance counted in men—conscription and all—is for the present limited to less than one million—proportionately the same number sent by Canada during the first few months of the war. France has given, and is giving, the last drop of her blood. All honour to her for it.

But, Sir, even if because conscription was adopted in those countries, is that a reason for us to impose it upon the Canadian people? In which of those countries did the leader of the Government tell the people until the very last minute that conscription would not be necessary, and then impose it upon them witnout preparation and without education, like a cloud-burst from a clear blue sky. I blame this Government for having misled the people. If that is too strong a term, then, for having failed to inform them in advance of the gravity and dire necessities of the situation which confronts us. Is it any wonder that this Bill is not accepted with enthusiasm by all the people? Is it any wonder that hundreds of petitions bearing thousands of signatures from all parts of Canada, have been laid upon the table of this House, protesting against conscription and asking this Government to consult the people by means of a referendum before adopting this measure?

What mandate have I, what mandate have any of us, to do more than carry out the pledges made by this Government when, in the words of the Prime Minister himself, it had the people of Canada solidly behind it? Can it claim that solidarity now? Who can tell me that I would today be the member for Shefford, if an election had been held in 1916? Who can say that the Prime Minister would be the representative of Halifax city, much less that he would continue to hold his present position, if he had sought re-election as required by the unamended law in 1916? And if we had been so re-elected and returned upon the pledge then given of "No conscription in Canada," what authority would we now have to force our electors to become soldiers against their will? I will not pretend that this is an illegal Parliament. I do not say that our mandate could not legally be extended by the Imperial Parliament, but I do say that we should adopt no new policy and introduce no new measure of such vital importance without consulting the people. Besides, this Parliament is not complete. There are twenty-three vacant seats to be found here and those twenty-three votes which cannot be given, the eloquence and sound reason of those twenty-three unknown men who cannot be heard upon the merits of this

measure, might possibly make a material and permanent difference in the result of the votes upon the Military Service Act.

Who will speak for the electors of Antigonish, whose member resigned on the 30th May, 1916? Who will speak for the electors of Bellechasse, whose member resigned on the 12th of May, 1916? For the electors of Brandon, whose member resigned on the 16th of July, 1915? For the electors of Brome, whose member, the late George H. Baker, was killed at Ypres on the 3rd June, 1916? For the electors of Carleton, Ontario, whose member resigned on the 28th June, 1916? For the electors of Grey East, whose member was appointed to the Senate on the 3rd of December last? For the electors of Hamilton East, whose member died on the 20th of June? For the electors of Kings and Albert whose member has recently been appointed to the Senate? For the electors of Kings, Nova Scotia, whose member resigned on the 24th of April, 1915? For the electors of Lincoln, whose member, the late Mr. Lancaster, died on the 4th of January, 1916? For the electors of Lisgar, whose member resigned on the 16th of July, 1915? For the electors of London, whose member died on the 12th December, 1916? For the electors of Montmagny, whose member resigned on the 6th of June, 1916? For the electors of Montmorency whose member also sits for Charlevoix? For the electors of Nicolet, whose member, Mr. Lamarche, resigned on the 21st of September, 1916? For the electors of Prince, P.E.I., whose member died on the 9th of March, 1915? For the electors of Quebec County, whose member died on the 29th December, 1916? For the electors of Regina, whose member resigned on the 20th of October, 1916? For the electors of Restigouche, whose member died on the 17th of November, 1915? For the electors of Soulanges, whose member also sits for Quebec East? For the electors of Yarmouth, whose member died in the memorable Parliament Buildings fire on the 3rd of February, 1916? For the electors of Stanstead, whose member died on the 17th of October, 1916? And last, but not least, who will speak for the electors of Terrebonne, whose member, Mr. Gedeon Rochon, died on the 11th of February, 1917, and to whom, in the absence of the Prime Minister, not even a passing reference was made in this House by the leaders whom he had served so faithfully and so well.

If I had authority to speak for the electors of Shefford and bind them by my vote in this House; if I was to vote upon this measure according to the wishes of the majority of those electors I could do nothing else than vote as I have already stated.

I do not pretend for a moment that they are all opposed to conscription; far from it. Three-quarters of the population and two-thirds of the electors are French Canadians. One-quarter of the population and one-third of the voters are English-speaking Canadians. Most all of the former and a large number of the latter are opposed to conscription and have frankly told me so. The majority of the English-speaking electors are in favour of conscription. They favour compulsory military service. Many leading citizens of my county and city, high up in the financial and business life of our Dominion, have not waited for conscription to give their lives, their brothers and their sons to our sacred cause. I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, that after making such a sacrifice for British freedom and British democracy, they can to-day advocate that popular sovereignty be trampled under foot by a Parliament without a mandate from the people which it pretends to represent. They are in favour of conscription though their neighbours be against it. They believe that the majority of Canadians are in favour of compulsory military service, but whether this be so or not, they are willing that the people of Canada should be consulted, and they are prepared, believing, as they do, in government of the people by the people, to abide by the result of that referendum, whatever it may be. Is that not the spirit which should animate every true Canadian? Is not that the stand which should be taken by all those who, like my right hon. leader, desire that inter-racial and inter-provincial strife shall forever cease, and that upon the golden wedding anniversary of Confederation, peace, harmony and happiness shall prevail in every corner of our great Dominion? The French-Canadians are a small minority in this country. They are willing that in every matter where their rights and privileges are not concerned the will of the majority should prevail. This measure relates to militia and defence; it is a Federal matter, and all they ask is that the people of Canada be consulted. Not the people of Quebec, but the people of all Canada. They are ready and willing to submit to the will of the majority. Do they ask too much?

The majority of my electors desire a referendum, and if that referendum is refused they ask me to vote against the Bill. On the 20th of June I handed to the Clerk of this House a petition which bears 1,439 signatures, among which are to be found

those of several of the aldermen of the city of Granby, the mayor of that city, the pastor and curates of the Catholic parish of the same name, and hundreds of our leading citizens, including that of a proud father of two sons, one of whom has been wounded and the other killed somewhere in France. The petition is as follows:

To The Honourable The House of Commons,
In Parliament Assembled.

The Petition of the undersigned inhabitants of the City and Township of Granby, in the County of Shefford, in the Province of Quebec
Respectfully represents

1. That on the 17th day of January, 1916, the right Honourable Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, speaking in the House of Commons, said: "I made it clear to the people of Canada that we did not propose any conscription. I repeat that announcement to-day with emphasis;"

2. That on the same date, the Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking in the House of Commons, said: "There is to be no conscription in Canada;"

3. That it was only after these statements had been made that the life of the present Parliament was extended by the Imperial Parliament;

4. That when the people of Canada through their representatives asked for the extension of the present Parliament, it was with the distinct understanding clearly stated by the leaders of both parties that there would be no conscription in this Dominion;

5. That on the 18th day of May, 1917, the Right Honourable Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister, announced that he would introduce a measure into the House of Commons providing for compulsory military service in Canada;

6. That the present Parliament whose life was extended upon the express understanding that there would be no conscription, has no mandate to enact any law or resolution providing for conscription for overseas service;

Wherefore Your Petitioners pray that Your Honourable Body do not pass any Bill or Act imposing compulsory military service upon the people of Canada until the mandate of Your Honourable House has been renewed by means of a general election and until the people of Canada have been consulted by means of a referendum;

And, Your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Granby, Que., June 3, 1917.

Copies of resolutions from four municipal councils in my county contain the same request. I am sure that the House will bear with me, while I read them in the exact words in which they were received:

Province of Quebec,
Municipality of Roxton Township.

At a special meeting of the municipal council of Roxton Township, in the county of Shefford, held in the Secretary Treasurer's office, in the village of Roxton Falls, Saturday, the 26th day of May, one thousand nine hundred and seventeen, at the ordinary hour of the sitting of said council, at which meeting were present councillors Hyacinthe Dupuy, Wilfrid Boileau, Alfred Brisebois, Edward Coté and Didace Bédard, all the councillors forming a quorum of the members of said council, with Mr. Damase Briu, the mayor, as chairman.

The Secretary-Treasurer was also present.

Councillor Charles Brisebois is absent, but he was duly notified.

Whereas it is understood that the Prime Minister of Canada, the Hon. R. L. Borden, is introducing a Bill, with a view to provide for conscription in the Dominion of Canada.

Moved by Councillor Hyacinthe Dupuy, seconded by Councillor Wilfrid Boileau,

That Mr. Georges Boivin, member for the county of Shefford in the House of Commons, be asked to give his vote against this law and that he demand by speech in Parliament that, before such measure be adopted, the people of the Dominion of Canada be called upon to express their views concerning it by means of general elections and that copy of the present resolution be addressed to the said Georges Boivin and to La Presse.

Unanimously adopted.

(Signed) Damase Briu, Mayor.
E. Dalpé, Sec.-Treas.

True copy.

(Signed) E. Dalpé, Sec.-Treas.

Province of Quebec,
Municipality of Roxton Falls Township.

At a monthly and regular meeting of the council of Roxton Falls Village, held Monday, the 7th day of May, one thousand nine hundred and seventeen, at the ordinary place and hour of the sittings of the council, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Code of the Province of Quebec; at which meeting thus adjourned were present: Mr. F. X. Racine, Mayor; Councillors J. B. Lavallée, P. D. McGrail, L. Beauregard, A. Racine, W. Despart, J. Bouchard, forming a quorum, with His Honour the Mayor as Chairman.

It is enacted by resolution of the council as follows:

Whereas the Prime Minister of Canada, the Hon. R. L. Borden, is introducing a bill which provides for conscription in the Dominion of Canada, it is moved by Councillor W. Despart, seconded by Councillor J. B. Lavallée, that Mr. Geo. H. Boivin, member for the county of Shefford in the House of Commons, be asked to vote against this law and that he demand by speech in Parliament that, before such measure be adopted, the people of the Dominion of Canada be called upon to express their views upon this question by means of a plebiscite, and that copies of the present resolution be addressed to the said Geo. H. Boivin and to the press.

Unanimously adopted.

True copy.

(Signed) L. Tranchemontagne,
Sec.-Treas.

Province of Quebec,
Municipality of the Parish of Ste. Anne de Stukely.

At a regular meeting of the council of the parish of Ste. Anne de Stukely, held Monday, the 7th day of May, one thousand nine hundred and seventeen and adjourned until the 4th day of June, at the ordinary place and hour of the sittings of the council, at which session, so adjourned, were present: Mr. Achille Lagrandeur, Mayor, Councillors Uldéric Brien, Félix Ther-

rien, Ovila Petit, Joseph Allain, Edouard Casavant, Ferdinand Ducharme, forming a quorum, with His Honour the Mayor as Chairman.

It was moved by Councillor Félix Therrien, seconded by Councillor Ferdinand Ducharme, that the council of the parish of Ste. Anne de Stukely beg Mr. Geo. H. Boivin, member for the county of Shefford in the House of Commons, to give his vote against the Conscription Act and that he demand by speech to the Parliament of Canada that, before passing this measure, the people of Canada be called upon to express their opinion concerning it by means of a plebiscite and that copies of the present resolution be addressed to the said Geo. H. Boivin and to the Journal de Waterloo.

Unanimously adopted.

True copy.

(Signed) F. X. Villeneuve,
Sec.-Treas.

Province of Quebec,

Corporation of the Village of Ste. Prudentienne.

At a regular session of the municipal council of the village of Ste. Prudentienne (Roxton Pond) held the 5th day of June, 1917, were present: Mr. Dolphis Goyette, acting Mayor, and Councillors Hector Casavant, Dr. Emile Labelle, J. B. Lebrun and Félix Larose.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted.

Dr. Emile Labelle moves, seconded by Mr. Félix Larose, that the municipal council of the village of Ste. Prudentienne, representing the views of all the tax payers of this municipality, protest with all possible energy against the proposal of the Government of the Dominion of Canada to impose military conscription upon this country, without having previously consulted the electors by means of a plebiscite or general elections.

And that copies of the present resolution be sent to Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister, to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, leader of the Opposition, to Mr. George H. Boivin, member for the county of Shefford, and to the newspapers.

(Signed) Dolphus Goyette, acting Mayor.
Albert Houle, N.P., Sec.-Treas.

True copy.

(Signed) Albert Houle, N.P.
Sec.-Treas.

As I stated before a certain percentage of my electors favour conscription and I respect their opinions as I respect those of every hon. member in this House who has spoken in favour of the measure, without insulting those of us who do not share his views. Like the hon. member for West Lambton, (Mr. Pardee) those electors are of the opinion that Canada's first duty is to send men and more men to fill the gaps in that human wall of Allied heroes whose bodies form a rampart against the flood of German barbarism and German autocracy. Like him their opinions have become convictions. They see a few hundred young men idle upon the streets of our cities and decide immediately that they should be in the trenches. And Sir, I agree with them, if those men cannot find work just as useful to the cause to be done at home. But who should decide this question as the court of last resort, if not the people of Canada?

Now Sir, let us see, why the majority of my electors do not believe in conscription as the best method of winning the war. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) has given us their economic reasons and figures in hand, have shown us the necessity of keeping our men at home for the proper administration, operation and development of the farms and factories upon which Great Britain so largely depends for its food and its ammunition.

The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) has delved into the pages of history and brought forth arguments, which even the able Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) could not destroy, to prove that conscription for military service overseas is contrary to the spirit of our Milita Act and the Canadian constitution. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) whose reputation as a speaker of superior ability was well known to us all, delivered his masterpiece during the course of this debate and gave the moral objections which his compatriots have to the present measure.

The French Canadians have been taught for years that the truest and best patriotism is the love of that corner of the earth where they were born and where they hope to die, the attachment to that corner of the earth fertilized by the blood and ashes of their forefathers who on more than one occasion, and notably in 1776 and in 1812, fought to repulse the invader and maintain the supremacy of Great Britain under which they have learned that true democracy means, in addition to the respect of minorities, the government of the people by their freely elected representatives. As the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) stated the other day, they are a logical people. I take his word for the fact that they are more logical than he is himself. They cannot understand how in the name of democracy they can be forced, without consultation or consent, by a Parliament which has outlived the term for which it was elected, to take up arms and fight in Europe, even for the most sacred cause.

A Parliament maintained in office by a higher authority imposing conscription upon them, they consider to be autocracy and not democracy. Are they not right? Must we resort to German methods to defeat Ger-

many? The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who favoured us with his views upon this Bill, says that he is in favour of conscription in times of war to avoid conscription in times of peace. Conscription in peace is bad, conscription in war is worse unless it is the last and only way of winning the war. Cannot he trust the citizens of his adopted country to decide whether or not it must be imposed? If not, why did he ever take up his abode among people in whom he has so little confidence? His answer might be that he is familiar with conditions in Quebec and fears the French Canadian vote in that province. But, Sir, the majority of our citizens in Canada are of his own race, and if that majority decides in favour of the measure, the French Canadians of Quebec will bow to the will of that majority and, when they do, they will be found in the front ranks repeating the glorious exploits of their brothers who fought and died at Courcelette and elsewhere in the present war.

The population of loyal Ontario—I use the word loyal in its true sense, because its sons have enlisted numerously and nobly in the cause of the Empire of which they form a part, is larger than that of the province of Quebec and its voting power is proportionately much greater, owing to the fact that its number of children is much less. The population of western Canada is much greater than that of the Maritime Provinces, who so far have not been taxed with disloyalty. If Ontario outvotes Quebec; if western Canada outvotes eastern Canada, within two months conscription can be imposed upon all Canadian slackers with the consent and approval of a united people. But, said the hon. member for Carleton, what will happen if the result of a referendum is unfavourable to conscription? The answer is easy indeed. There will be no conscription and popular sovereignty will have achieved another victory without the loss of a single drop of blood. Voluntary recruiting will continue and if it does not, owing to the mistakes and misdeeds of the Government who have allowed graft and partisanship to creep into the very heart of the Canadian army, then the right hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues will have to hand over the reins of office to other, if not better men. Would that be a national calamity? I am prepared to admit that worse men might be found, but less than a month ago every Conservative newspaper in Canada was urging the Prime Minister to get some that were better.

If the people are mistaken, it will be the duty of the new government to enlighten and educate them and again consult them before imposing conscription. But, Sir, I have no fear of the people making a mistake in this matter. I am prepared to put my opinion aside to adopt that of the majority. I ask only that they be consulted. I am not an ardent admirer of the referendum. I would prefer to see a general election with party lines obliterated and a candidate in every county supporting conscription and another opposing it. But, Sir, every one admits that to be impossible. There are men in both parties who support conscription, there are men in both parties who oppose it. Both are entitled to the respect of their opinions and convictions. The division is not alone upon racial or provincial lines.

My firm conviction is—and it is shared by many of my fellow members who support the Bill—that there are in every province of this Dominion a number of citizens who support conscription and a number who oppose it. If, as every one believes—except a few omnipotent beings who claim they should lead but who really attempt to drive their constituents—that the will of the majority should prevail, how better can it be ascertained than by allowing each and every voter in Canada, our soldiers included, alone in a polling booth with his conscience and his God, to answer truthfully the question: Are you in favour of conscription? If the result of the vote is not favourable to conscription it will mean that the present Government has not given the proper education to the people and removed the causes which might prevent a favourable vote. If it does not mean that, then it will mean that conscription is not necessary and that compulsory military service is not the best way to win the war.

This, Mr. Speaker, brings me back to the reasons why the majority of my electors do not consider conscription to be the best policy at the present time.

They are opposed to the measure because they cannot, even now, secure the farm labour required to till the soil of their province and supply the needs of the munition workers and other inhabitants of our cities and towns. They are opposed to conscription because they believe the words of Lord Shaughnessy, who has never been taxed with disloyalty,

that Canada requires her men for her farms and factories. They are opposed to conscription because of the almost frantic appeals made by the Department of Agriculture for more production and greater production. They are opposed to conscription because they are aware of the fact that farm labourers for western Canada are advertised for in the American press and that they are promised immunity from compulsory service.

They are opposed to conscription because they have been told that there will be less wheat harvested in Canada this year than last year, and that there are this year less acres of wheat land under cultivation.

They are opposed to conscription because they consider it will be a great deterrent to European immigration after the war has been concluded and peace restored.

They are opposed to conscription because they are convinced that, with national service properly organized, the few thousand young men now found idle upon the streets of our cities could do better work and more effective work upon the farm than in the trenches.

They are opposed to conscription because they consider that Great Britain, with her small territory and large population, needs food supplies worse than men.

They are opposed to conscription because they have read of the German submarine campaign and the ravages it has caused in the merchant shipping of the Empire. They believe that more boats, both large and small, should be speedily built, and that our surplus men should be employed in building them.

They are opposed to conscription because it will, by placing conscripts and volunteers together, diminish the glory of our gallant boys now at the front.

They are opposed to conscription because they consider that Canada's contribution of 420,000 men should be proportionately equalled by the other allied nations and sister dominions before Canada is asked to do more.

They are opposed to conscription because they lack confidence in the present Government, and have their doubts about the fair and impartial operation of the selective system.

They are opposed to this measure because the age limit is even greater than the age limit in the conscription law of England, because married men with large families of children are placed in the same class and will be called at the same time as married men without children, and because the system of appeals for the privilege of exemption, from one tribunal to another, no matter how fair these tribunals may be, will favour the rich and prove a hardship to the poor.

They are opposed to conscription because they consider this war to be a war of attrition and their own country in no immediate danger of attack.

They are opposed to conscription as it is now proposed, because the present Bill conscripts man-power alone and leaves wealth and riches untouched.

They are opposed to conscription because Nationalist eloquence, paid for by Conservative gold, has argued that Canada owed nothing to England.

They are opposed to conscription because their boys who volunteered were not left under the command of the officers in whom they had confidence and to whom they had been confided by their fathers and mothers, but were sent to other regiments and their officers returned home.

They are opposed to conscription because the only member from my province who holds a mandate direct from the people, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, obtained that mandate under false pretences by assuring the electors of Dorchester that there would be no compulsory military service in Canada.

They are opposed to conscription because they love their province and their homes, and do not care to follow the advice of the Postmaster General and avoid service by crossing an unguarded boundary line of 4,000 miles between Canada and the United States.

They are opposed to conscription because selective conscription has not been a success in England, as evidenced by the following article entitled "The Great War," by Brigadier-General F. Z. Stone, in the Saturday Review, May 12, 1917:

"What are we doing to give them the men? Some of the tribunals have gone on strike, because they object to the revision of their findings by the appeal courts; friction is in many cases becoming increasingly evident between the military representation and the civil members of the local tribunals, Brig. Gen. E. A. Grove stated in a letter read at the sitting of the Chesham (Bucks) tribunal that there were 50,000 exemptions current in his district, most of which were unconditional without any time limit. He also stated that since January 1st 40,831 applications had been made for exemption, and three out of four men had been exempted. If this is representative of the average state of affairs throughout the country, we may, at all events, congratulate ourselves on the vastness of our untapped re-

sources, whatever we may think of the spirit in which the call for men has been met hitherto.

They are opposed to conscription because, as pointed out so ably by the hon. member for Kamouraska, it is opposed to the spirit of the Canadian constitution.

They are opposed to conscription because they consider that the law was introduced more for the purpose of winning the next general election and causing people to overlook the scandals of this war Administration, than to assist in winning the war.

They are opposed to conscription because they fear that Canada, in spite of her vast natural resources, cannot do more than provide adequately for her volunteers and the pension fund required to do justice to the boys already at the front.

They are opposed to conscription because of the campaign of slander carried on against Quebec in the other provinces, and the statements made even by a minister of the Crown in this House, that the Bill was introduced because Quebec had not done its duty.

The Honourable the Minister of Labour, speaking in this House on June 20, 1917, said, as reported at page 2592 of the unrevised Hansard:

"If they (recruits) were to come as numerously from that province (Quebec) as they have from some of the other provinces, neither the Militia Act nor the Military Service Act would be necessary at all."

At page 2595, in the same speech, he throws out these remarks:

The question is not whether our sons fought valiantly at Queenston Heights or Chateauguay—some people think we should live on that as long as possible—but whether the sons of those sires have inherited the heroism and the valour that enabled their fathers to do credit to themselves and to their country on the field of battle. The spirits of our sires who fought at Queenston Heights and Chateauguay hover over us to-day; God grant that they do not look down upon any degenerate or recreant sons.

My answer to those remarks is not that Quebec has done as much as any other province, but that it has done more than it has received credit for, and more than any other province would have done under similar circumstances. There are men in our province, many of them, both Conservatives and Liberals, both English and French, who have sought for and found the reasons for the lack of enthusiasm among our people, so far as recruiting is concerned.

The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) referred to the defects in the recruiting system. I need not repeat, but let me add that patronage and partisanship resulted in the dismissal, or placing upon the reserve list, of several men who were willing to sacrifice home, business, family and fortune, for the privilege of leading a battery or a battalion to meet the Germans.

I will cite just one example. It is the case of Col. J. Bruce Payne, of Granby. I cannot, without infringing upon the rules of debate, give all the details, but I propose to do so when the Militia Estimates are again considered in Committee of Supply. Col. J. Bruce Payne, who is a well known cigar manufacturer, had for years been in command of the 15th Shefford Field Battery, and had been for some time officer commanding the 7th Brigade. The fact that he was a Liberal in politics drew upon him the ire of Col. Morrison, Director of Artillery at Ottawa, and during the first days of the war Col. Payne was placed upon the reserve list of officers, without excuse other than a pretended offence, which was later brought home to another officer. The former Minister of Militia and Defence, to whose attention the matter was brought by myself, took the required steps to replace Col. Payne upon the active list, and soon after authorized him to recruit the 27th Battery for overseas service. He gladly accepted, left his large cigar business and other interests in the hands of his employees, and, having the confidence of his fellow-citizens, he found no difficulty in securing the consent of their parents to bring with him to England and France a large number of the young men who were members of his local battery. He successfully passed his medical examinations, and, after training at Valcartier and replacing several drafts made upon his battery, proceeded with it overseas. Some time after the arrival of the Battery at Westenhanger hutments in England, General Morrison, who had also gone overseas, was given command of the Artillery Division. Without reason or justification, so far as Col. Payne knows to this day, he was removed from his command and sent to Ross Barracks, where he remained for almost two months, and from where he sailed for home, to report for instructional duty, and later, secured his discharge. London Truth of November 3, 1915, has the following to say about General Morrison:—

"If there is any truth in statements current at Folkestone, the military authority in Canada will do well to keep an eye on Brigadier-General E. W. B. Morrison. This officer having gained the D.S.O. at the front, returned to take

over, at the beginning of October, the command of the Canadian artillery training in that part of Kent. After about three weeks he summarily removed the officers commanding five batteries and an ammunition column commander. This was apparently done without warning or reason given. All these officers, some of whom, if not all, have come out in command of their batteries from Canada, are transferred to the Reserve Brigade which means that their prospects of going to the front are closed for an indefinite time in favour of the new selections of the brigadier. Such a wholesale shunting of men at such short notice will require a good deal of justification. The brigadier seems to have had in Canada the reputation of being rather "a harbitrary gent" and arbitrariness on the above scale may have its disadvantages in a voluntary army."

In the meantime, the fathers and mothers who confided their sons to Col. Payne have worried over the welfare of their children, and, in many cases, young boys have been kept from enlisting in other regiments owing to the incident just referred to. Col. Payne was removed from his command to please General Morrison, who wanted to even up old political scores in Canada and give the best positions to his own favourites.

The General remains in command of an Artillery Division and no redress is possible under this Government. Proper admonition to the political general, and, better still, his return to Canada, where he could be kept under the eyes of the Headquarter's Staff, would have assisted recruiting, but it would have spoiled the political game which must be played, even at the price of conscription.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (Simcoe): Is the hon. gentleman not aware that Colonel Morrison is under the immediate control of the British General in charge over there?

Mr. BOIVIN: Precisely; I have no doubt about that whatever.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Then how did political pull keep him there?

Mr. BOIVIN: I did not say that political pull kept him there, but I said that political pull sent Colonel Payne home.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: It is a good job that Colonel Morrison was kept there.

Mr. BOIVIN: In February, 1916, I had the honour of addressing two large recruiting meetings at Massey Hall in Toronto. I am not pretentious enough to believe that my voice was required to urge the people of Ontario to enlist, but I took advantage of the invitation to thank them for what they had done and were doing for Belgium and France, as well as for democracy and civilization.

I had my own province in mind when I went to Toronto to address those meetings.

I was anxious that Quebec should do its duty and I was already aware of a few of the reasons which rendered some, if not all of my compatriots, less enthusiastic about recruiting than they would otherwise have been. At that meeting I deprecated the speeches made by Bourassa and Lavergne in the province of Quebec, but in doing so I warned my audience that the school laws of Ontario were being used by many as an argument against recruiting in my province. Striking Regulation 17 from the school laws of Ontario would have sent more French Canadians to the front than this Military Service Bill. Remember, Sir, that I did not then discuss, and I do not propose to discuss now, the merits or the demerits of Ontario school legislation; that is a matter for Ontario to decide. But I say once more to the people of Ontario: even if you are justified in making the law you have made; even if the law is not as unfair to the French Canadians as they believe it to be; even if their refusal to obey the law is deserving of censure—would not the sending of 25,000 more men from Quebec to fight Germany have been worth the price of meeting the French Canadians half way and of giving to their children the right to study their geography and history and arithmetic in French? What reply can the recruiting officer or the public man who is appealing for recruits in Quebec, give to the man who says: You ask me to go and fight for liberty and democracy under the British flag. You want me to fight for the rights of small nations and minorities to govern themselves and enjoy their own religion, language and laws. You compare my liberties with those of German subjects. But what about Ontario and Manitoba? Are they not British provinces? My brother, my uncle, or my cousin, who lives there, tells me that he is deprived of the right to have his children taught their own language.

Mr. BLAIN: My hon. friend must know, if he knows anything about it, that that is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. BOIVIN: I am willing to admit that the statement of the Quebec peasant that his relatives are deprived of the right of having their children taught in their own language, may be incorrect. But when we endeavour to explain we have to produce Regulation 17, and admit that he is wrong for the first two years only and that after that he is absolutely right.

Mr. BLAIN: If the inspector makes the statement that the child shall be taught

longer than two years the child is taught longer than two years. My hon. friend must remember that Regulation 17 was put upon the statute-book not as against the French-speaking minority, but as in their favour.

Mr. BOIVIN: All I can say is that it was a very queer way of favouring the French Canadian minority.

The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Ernest Lapointe) seeing the condition of affairs, moved the following resolution in this House on May 9, 1916:

That it has long been the settled policy of Great Britain whenever a country passed under the sovereignty of the Crown by treaty or otherwise, to respect the religion, usages and language of the inhabitants who thus become British subjects:

That His Majesty's subjects of French origin in the province of Ontario complain that by recent legislation they have been to a large extent deprived of the privilege which they and their fathers have always enjoyed since Canada passed under the sovereignty of the British Crown, of having their children taught in French.

That this House especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with.

This was not a want of confidence motion. It had nothing to do with the policy of this Government. Still it was bitterly opposed by those same members who to-day claim that the province of Quebec is not doing its duty. It was voted upon on May 11, 1916, and defeated by a vote of 107 to 60. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that a united appeal from the Parliament to the legislature of Ontario would have had some weight with the Government of that province? If every one had said: this request is consistent with British liberty and British democracy; do you not think that such an appeal would have had its effect upon recruiting in Quebec? Instead, however, we were told by members on the other side of this House that the French Canadians had no rights outside the province of Quebec. The member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) said:

It is absolutely admitted by the speakers on both sides of the House that there can be no just claim by the French Canadian people of Ontario to any legal right to the use of their language in the school system of that province.

The member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) put the following question to the member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell):

Is the descendant of a Frenchman whose family has lived in the Detroit river settlement for a hundred and fifty years a newcomer to Ontario?

To which the member for South Toronto replied:

He is entitled to only such rights and privileges as the constitution as the province of Ontario allows him.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONELL: Does the hon. gentleman want to break the constitution of any province?

Mr. BOIVIN: Not at all. But in the course of a speech in which the hon. gentleman endeavours to point out that the French Canadians are asking too much, he answers the question whether French Canadians have any rights in Ontario by saying: they are entitled to only such rights and privileges as the constitution of Ontario allows them. The people of Quebec, who regard their language as the most sacred right next to their life and their religion, and who were told that their rights were limited to their own province, took it for granted, Sir, that their rights and their obligations were co-existent, and that, as their rights and privileges were limited to Quebec, there also was to be found the limit of their obligations. I do not advance that theory, but I say that it is one of the things which retard recruiting in Quebec. Can they be blamed for this belief when the New Witness, a publication of London, England, the heart of the Empire, completing an article which was read by the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) the other evening, which he found in its issue of May 24, adds the following in its issue of May 31, 1917:

By the help of a printer's error in last week's comment, we are now able to state very clearly the gravity of the French Canadian grievance. We said that French-speaking masters of Ontario were forbidden to teach French in their schools. Now, that obviously would not matter much, for all their scholars speak French—it is their mother tongue. What we meant to say was that the French-speaking masters are forbidden to teach their French-speaking scholars in French. A devlish trick! We published our comment on Empire Day, and that day was marked in Montreal by demonstrations against conscription, accompanied by the breaking of a few windows and the blacking of a few eyes. And now the English press invites you to consider the disloyalty of these French Canadians of Montreal. Luckily, in the province of Quebec there is a French-speaking majority,

and the Legislature is unlikely to imitate the monstrous example of Ontario and Manitoba. But is it reasonable to expect that conscription will be welcomed by men of a race which is suffering elsewhere such tyranny from English-speaking majorities without hindrance from the Imperial Government? That they should have volunteered so freely was more than we had the right to expect. It was far more than Prussia expected of the Poles. That we shall get many more volunteers is doubtful. Apparently Ireland has taught us nothing. Once again, we are doing our best to estrange the people from our cause. But, say some, have we the right to say to Ontario that she shall not forbid the use of French in French Canadian schools? Certainly, we have that right. We ought not to allow her to do anything which offends against the principle of equal rights for all the peoples of the Empire, which is supposed to be the basis of our Imperial rule.

That is not a comment of mine. It is a comment made under date of May 31, 1917, by the New Witness, a paper published in the English language in London, England, the very heart of the British Empire.

Mr. BLAIN: How does my hon. friend account for the fact that in the French population of Ontario the percentage of enlistments was larger than it was in Quebec, if the grievance on the part of the French Canadian people was so great against the Ontario Government?

Mr. BOIVIN: I can give a very good answer to my hon. friend. From all along the Ottawa Valley in the province of Quebec, hundreds of French Canadian soldiers came to the city of Ottawa to enlist, and Ontario got the credit for their enlistment.

I desire to pay to the sub-amendment moved by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette) a little more attention than it really deserves. The hon. member for North York (Mr. J. A. M. Armstrong) has said in this House that Sir Wilfrid Laurier personified French Canada. Does not that explain the telegram sent by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) previous to the 1911 elections approving all the methods employed in Quebec, and containing the now historic words "Anything to beat Laurier?" Does not that message agree with the prediction then made by the Prime Minister: "The voice of Toronto will be the voice of Canada?" The prediction has come true. To-day we see the result; but elections are coming, and something must be arranged to beat Laurier, to destroy the influence of a united Quebec, after the next election. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette), and a cleverly engineered sub-amendment, will fill the Bill. A six months' hoist as a sub-amendment!

[Mr. Boivin.]

I have been told by many old and able parliamentarians that a point of order concerning any motion, amendment or sub-amendment, can be raised and discussed at any time before it has been voted upon by the House, or until the point has been considered and decided by the Speaker. I purpose this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, submitting an argument to the effect that this sub-amendment is out of order. I will ask you kindly to consider my remarks after they have been inscribed upon Hansard and you have had time to verify the authorities I may quote, and to give, on Tuesday or Wednesday next, a ruling upon the matter. Let me first say that I accept, fully and unreservedly, the statement made by the Prime Minister, that he had no knowledge of this sub-amendment, and the declaration of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. L. J. Gauthier) that by his remarks he meant no reflection upon the fairness and integrity of the officer presiding over this Chamber. I take it for granted that the question of the sub-amendment being in order has never been seriously considered. I take the liberty of adding that the point of order raised is not for the purpose of avoiding a vote upon the sub-amendment, and I declare here and now, with the expressed approval of the members on this side who favour a referendum upon the matter, that they will vote against the sub-amendment if it remains before the House. I will vote against it, first, because, according to the admissions made in his speech by the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) it enables the Tory-Nationalists to assist the Government, by voting for it, then against the amendment of my right hon. leader, and later pretending in Quebec that Laurier was too much of an Imperialist in agreeing to accept the will of the majority, while their friends are pretending in Ontario that he is too much of a Nationalist in proposing a referendum. I will vote against it because my people are democrats and believe that the majority of the Canadian people should be consulted upon such an important question, and they do not want the matter shelved by a six months' hoist unless the referendum is first refused by this Parliament. I will vote against it because I do not consider it to be in order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us consider whether this sub-amendment is in order or not. I find in the Votes and Proceedings of June 18 the following:

Sir Robert Borden moved, That the Bill No. 75, An Act respecting Military Service, be now read a second time.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved in amendment thereto,—That all the words after the word "That" in the said motion be struck out and the following 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."

And a Debate arising thereon, the said Debate was, on motion of Mr. Morrison, adjourned.

In the Votes and Proceedings of June 20, I find this:

The House resumed the adjourned Debate on the proposed motion of Sir Robert Borden for the second reading of Bill No. 75, An Act respecting Military Service and the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in amendment thereto:—"That all the words after the word "That" in the said motion be struck out and the following 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."

And the question being proposed on the amendment:

Mr. Barrette moved in amendment to the said amendment,—that all the words after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—"this Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months."

And the Debate still continuing, the said Debate was, on motion of Mr. Pardee, adjourned.

I have read this, Sir, to point out to you the fact that when my right hon. leader moved his amendment, there was only one word left of the original motion. That was the word "that". His amendment begins with the words "the further consideration." The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette) comes along with a sub-amendment asking that all the words after "that" in the amendment be struck out, but there is no word "that" in the amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BOIVIN: Hon. members should not laugh too soon. They will perhaps find some authorities that will make them cease smiling. This word "that" was what remained of the original motion. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's motion is struck out entirely, and the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier is inserted. I find in Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, edition of 1906, page 318, this statement:

When an amendment has been proposed, it is competent for any member to move an amendment to the same. In this case the original question is laid aside practically for the time being, and the first amendment becomes as it were, a substantive question. The Speaker will then submit the three motions in the order in which they are made, and first take the sense of the House on the last: "Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the amendment? If the amendment is rejected, it is regular to move another, provided of course, it is different in purport from that already negatived, as soon as the Speaker has again proposed the question: "Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the main motion?"

If the amendment be resolved in the affirmative, it will not be competent to move that it be struck out in whole or in part.

How could the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier be amended by the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Berthier which strikes out every word of that amendment and makes it absolutely another amendment?

I quite agree that the six months' hoist is in order on the motion for the second reading of the Bill, providing it is proposed as an amendment to the main motion; but not otherwise. Hon. gentlemen opposite smiled a few moments ago; some of them even laughed outright. Do they know more about parliamentary procedure than Bourinot, who in his Parliamentary Procedure, 1906 edition, says at page 320:

Only two amendments can be proposed at the same time to a question. Some limit is necessary, and the usage has grown into law, that an amendment to an amendment is allowable, but that no motion to amend further can be entertained until one of the two amendments is disposed of.

A few lines below on the same page we find:

It has also been frequently ruled that an amendment which was merely an expanded negative cannot be proposed from the chair.

There may be a difference of opinion as to whether this is an expanded negative or not. But that is not all. Sir Erskine May, in his excellent work on Parliamentary Practice (Edition of 1906) at page 299, says:

Every amendment proposed to be made, either to a question or to a proposed amendment, should be so framed that, if agreed to by the House, the question or amendment, as amended, would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

I will now read the sub-amendment proposed by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette):

That all the words after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—"this Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months."

If this sub-amendment is adopted, Sir, how are you going to put from the Chair the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier as amended? Can you do so? Is the sub-amendment in order? Perhaps the authorities cited are not sufficient to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. May, at page 293 of his Parliamentary Practice says:

It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed.

And at page 298, I find:

When the original amendment is to leave out certain words, in order to insert or add other words—

That is absolutely the case here.

—no amendment can be moved to the words proposed to be substituted, until the House have resolved that the words proposed to be left out shall not stand part of the question.

And at page 299, I find this:

An amendment to a proposed amendment cannot be moved, if it proposes to leave out all the words of such proposed amendment; but in such a case the first amendment must be negatived before the second can be offered.

That, I maintain, is the position here. The sub-amendment of the hon. member for Berthier may be quite in order after the House has voted on the amendment proposed by my right hon. leader. I am not bringing this point up because I have any fear about the vote which will be given on this sub-amendment. I have already stated, with the authority of every honourable member on this side of the House who will vote for the referendum, that they will vote against the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Berthier. I shall do so myself. But I want to avoid establishing a precedent in this House, at a time of great excitement in this country, which perhaps will be invoked against us upon other Bills in days to come. My point of order has been submitted. I do not ask for a ruling, Sir, at the present time, but I ask you to give the point of order your attention, and to give your ruling before the vote is taken on the amendment.

I will not refer to the speech of the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard) who preceded me. I moved the adjournment of the debate last night in an earnest endeavour to ascertain whether he was opposed to or in sympathy with the Government upon this question of conscription. I have read Hansard this morning, but I am no more enlightened concerning his intentions. I will not, after speaking so long, refer to the previous speeches. Allow me, however, to congratulate the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) upon his faith and confidence in the valour of our Canadian soldiers, 100,000 of whom, according to his statement, are required to stop the onward march of 750,000 Germans released from the Russian front.

Let me address a word to the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) who thought the best kind of a speech to make would be another attack upon Laurier and Quebec. Quebec according to his figures had up to May 15 of the present year sent 45,277 men to the front. French Canadians with a population of 1,605,339 had only sent 6,917. This is the kind of argument often used by the detractors of our province, but they overlook the fact that there is another side to the argument. If 1,605,339 French Canadians sent 6,917 men to the front, then 316,103 English-speaking Canadians in that province sent the balance of 38,360—more than 10 per cent of their population, and they are therefore almost twice as loyal to the Empire as the constituents of my hon. friend from Frontenac or those of any other portion of Canada. The figures may be wrong, and the French Canadians may have done a little better than the hon. member would have us believe. If not, I can only account for the loyalty of my English-speaking friends from Quebec by saying that they reside in a province where they are in a minority, and where, owing to the just and fair treatment which they receive from their French Canadian fellow-citizens who form the majority, they are in a better position than any other to appreciate the true significance of British freedom and British fair play.

Just one word of reference to the address of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue in connection with this debate. His reason for remaining in the Government with the Postmaster General is an excellent one. It is not conviction, it is not principle. I must quote his own words or I will not be believed. He said:

If my colleague Blondin and I would abandon the Government, what other French Canadians would consent to succeed us?

What a calamity it would be, Mr. Speaker, for his race and his country if the hon. minister resigned his portfolio! Especially in view of the fact that he is a good French Canadian, proud of the great men of his race and willing to do them justice!

Not long ago, speaking at a political gathering in Montreal he tried to secure a front page editorial in the Orange Sentinel by accusing Sir Wilfrid Laurier of having sown discord and hatred between the two races who inhabit this country, and in his recent speech he refers to my honoured leader as follows:

I have before me a man of 76 years of age who is ending his career by seeing the two races more divided than ever. History will tell what he could have done but did not try to do.

I listened with amazement to these words falling from the lips of the young minister,

who has made several blunders in his comparatively short career. He has even confessed publicly that his blunders were due to his youth, and to the fact that he did not then know the right hon. the Prime Minister. He has told us he was only 29 or 30 years of age when he preached treason to his compatriots—

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. Is it within the rules of the House for an hon. gentleman to say that an hon. member of this House has preached treason in the province of Quebec or anywhere else? That is what the hon. member has charged against the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Minister of Inland Revenue had preached treason.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: Those were his exact words; that is why I rose to the point of order. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would not mind repeating what he said.

Mr. BOIVIN: If I could, in repeating the language of the Minister of Inland Revenue, use any other words than his own words, I would not use the word "treason," but what I said was this: That he had already excused himself for having preached treason when he was young in the province of Quebec. I made use of no other expression. I did not attribute treason to the minister.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member should use such language.

Mr. BOIVIN: I am not addressing that remark to the minister. I do not wish to insinuate that he is a traitor in any way. I am repeating the words which he used himself. If you rule that I have no right to repeat the words which he used himself, I bow to your ruling.

Mr. WRIGHT: Might not the hon. gentleman read the words from Hansard?

Mr. BOIVIN: I say that he is almost 40 now and we can hardly forgive his want of respect for the white locks of a man whose spotless life, whose ardent patriotism and whose broad statesmanship have been recognized in all parts of the world. The unfortunate allusion of the hon. minister to the grand old man of Canada will not soon be forgotten. His words of scorn will perhaps torture his conscience in years to come, when he will realize that he was the only public man who ever dared to justify his own conduct of former years by such remarks concerning his illustrious compatriot. Slightly younger than the hon. minister, but as a Canadian of his day and generation, may I be permitted to say that long after the name and career of Sevigny have been relegated to oblivion, the fair name and splendid career of Laurier will continue to live in the hearts and memories of his fellow Canadians, irrespective of race and creed. He has been severely attacked during this debate by certain members. History will say of him that he consecrated his talents to his native land and devoted his life to the unity of Canada. Posterity will recall that he was humble as he was great, and that, unlike certain politicians, he was the very essence of a gentleman, genial, kind, considerate, courteous and chivalrous to old and young, great and small, rich and poor alike.

He has, according to the hon. member for South Renfrew, been right upon many occasions in connection with the public business and affairs of this country, but he may be wrong now. That is where I differ from the hon. member for South Renfrew. He was right upon every occasion mentioned by the former Minister of Railways, and he is right now. His amendment has for its object to save the structure of Confederation from disruption and disintegration upon the occasion of its golden jubilee, and it will have my hearty support. I still hope that the Government will accept this amendment and that the people may be consulted upon this proposed law. Had I hoped otherwise I would put a pertinent question to the right hon. the Prime Minister, not directly, Mr. Speaker, because the rules forbid, but through you, Sir, I would ask: "Sir Robert Borden, are you the servant or the master of the people of Canada? If you are their servant, why do you refuse to consult them and obey their wishes? If you are their master, what is the difference between the Canadian Parliament and the German Reichstag?"

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I shall, in the few remarks that I will address to the House this afternoon, not attempt to follow the vagaries the wanderings and the meanderings, to use no stronger terms, of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Boivin), nor do I care to descend to the tone of debate that he adopted throughout the greater part of his speech. What he said has answered itself. If the one hundred and one reasons which he gave why the people he represents are opposed to con-

scription are analysed and argued out, they will be found to be good reasons why they should favour conscription. Be that as it may, he will have to settle that with his own people and with the people of Canada. We are not here to speak for localities or to consider individual interests. As I understand it, every member of this House is here to represent not only the particular constituency who sends him here, but Canada at large.

My apologies are due to the House for the very little time that I shall take up, because what does appeal to me is that every moment, every hour, every day that is lost in the passing and enforcing of this Act is a crime against "Canada in Flanders." The hon. member for Shefford spoke about the huge petitions that came to this House from all over Canada. That is quite an inaccurate statement to make, not to use any stronger term. I would say about those petitions that have been presented, doubtless by the hon. gentleman and many others from the province of Quebec, that if those who circulated them had devoted to recruiting the energy and time that they did to the circulation of those petitions it would have been better for Canada. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has made no new points in this debate. We are here dealing with a very concrete matter which has been boiled down, during the course of this debate, to a very simple issue of fact. We are told by the philosophers of old that facts are stubborn things, and so they are. The eloquence of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and of those who sit behind him and support him cannot becloud the issue or the facts. What are the facts? We are at war; we all know that. Are we going to consider those who are fighting for us, the men that we sent to Flanders? If we are, then let me read a portion of a cablegram which was received on the 25th of this month by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) from General Currie who is now in supreme command of the Canadian troops as to the need or otherwise of the reinforcement of these troops at the front. General Currie in his message says, in part:

> I note with special gratification your assurance that the troops in the field can rely upon Canada giving them all necessary support. They have given their blood freely to maintain their nation's honour, and now confidently expect that the full fruits of their sacrifices will not be prejudiced. It is an imperative and urgent necessity that steps be immediately taken to ensure that sufficient drafts of officers and men are sent from Canada to keep the corps at its full strength.

That is known and undoubted; no one can controvert it; it is a fact. If we are to abandon these men, then argument ceases. Are we to do that or are we going to maintain our honour and support these men whom we sent over and who honourably went? Surely we are. Every man who has fallen, every wound that has been inflicted, is a call for reinforcements and General Currie has put that in concrete form and in a way that will appeal to everybody. The facts are there and really that is all there is to be said. We need the men. I do not desire to say anything that is acrimonious in this debate.

I desire to say nothing that would put province against province or neighbour against neighbour. This is a time when we should all unite, when, I would not say that the churches should close their doors, but they should close their ranks and come all together. All classes of our people should be united; there should be no race or creed that would separate our people. The provinces themselves should stand shoulder to shoulder. We should be one and united in this effort, for it is one that calls for the whole strength of our country, and if we are divided in making this effort, it must be very indifferent and unsuccessful. Much that has been said during this debate is to be deprecated because of the acrimony that has been cast into it with regard to race and creed. I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Boivin) wandering over the universe and digging up the bilingual question. What has bilingualism to do with this Bill? We are at war. Are we one people or are we divided? Surely we must stand shoulder to shoulder, man to man, if we are to win this fight—that is the only way to win it.

The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) the other night said many things that could be cavilled at and disputed, but I shall refer to only one of them. He said that the Prime Minister was listening to the voice of Toronto, not to the voice of the soldiers in the trenches, in asking for more infantry at the front, and he went on to dilate upon that and raised racial matters and cries with reference to Toronto. Much has been said about Toronto. Toronto has no recriminations to make, nothing to say. Hon. members may talk about and abuse that city, but the record speaks for itself. What has been done in

the Toronto military district, district No. 2? The total enlistments for No. 2 military district to the 15th of June, 1917, were 93,187, very nearly one-quarter of the whole force. Of these the total enlistments of Toronto men numbered 48,391. And yet this is the town that my hon. friend from St. John city and county (Mr. Pugsley) casts stones at; he would ridicule this place. So far as Toronto is concerned, and I am referring to it only because the hon. member for St. John has referred to it, all parties there are agreed. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has pointed out how the parties there had agreed, and so they have; our Liberal friends have come along splendidly there, shoulder to shoulder with Conservative citizens. We know no politics there—I was going to say we know no church differences, but that is not quite correct; but the churches have come together, we are all one, we have church unions of all kinds, and our one thought is the war. The mind of every one there is where his heart is, with the Canadians in Flanders, and this whether the soldiers come from Quebec or from Ontario.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in his very eloquent speech the other afternoon, said that in his opinion the Parliament of Canada had no right to exercise compulsion, that it was a moribund Parliament, and so on. Let us analyse this statement for a moment. A moribund Parliament? Will my right hon. friend go back to the war session of about four days only, in August, 1914, when he joined with everybody in this House in holding high the hands of the powers that be, the Government of Canada, in sending men, in mobilizing our money, in mobilizing everything. That was a unanimous session, we all agreed to what was then being done. No one suggested that at any future date what was being done then would be questioned as the right hon. gentleman now questions it. Time went by. My right hon. friend knows the necessities of the occasion. No man could foresee what has happened; the wisest men in the world have been misled by the circumstances connected with this war. All that can be done is to make the best of conditions and situations. Who could foretell at that time or at any session that has intervened since, when everything was unanimous, the condition in which we are to-day on account of this war? It is a condition which makes the situation serious because of facts that every man in this House knows have arisen since the outbreak of war. There is no occasion to dilate on the urgency of the conditions, the need of men, the need of money, the necessities to prosecute this war in a manner that no one ever dreamed of. These things have impressed themselves upon the mind of every member. So it is that the parliamentary term was unanimously extended; Commons and Senate agreed to it; my right hon. friend was one of the foremost in agreeing to it; the Imperial Parliament put its imprimatur upon it, and what is the use of talking now of a moribund Parliament, harking back and wasting time on something that has been done and done properly, and has been concurred in by everybody? No one has been forced, no one has been coerced, and we are a Parliament properly constituted. Parliament has a duty to perform. Who else could perform that duty except Parliament? We all know that the situation to-day calls for action by the Government. The Government of a country must govern the country—a country cannot govern itself, it must be led, it must be governed.

What does my right hon. friend propose? I desire to be perfectly frank and fair, and I leave it to posterity to judge if the words I am now going to use are not correct. I say that the policy of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to-day is a policy of destruction; it contains no suggestion of any ways and means to accomplish things; it is simply to destroy, nothing must be done, apparently. Why does not the right hon. gentleman suggest something? What is his suggestion? Nothing but to tear down and destroy. The Government, on the contrary, is trying to keep the army at the front, trying to reinforce it; it is raising money to do so. My right hon. friend has always concurred in what has been done and why now at this last moment, when the men at the front are in direst need of reinforcements and strengthening, does he suggest nothing? So far as I can understand his speech, and I think I have done him justice, there is no proposal in it except that of a referendum. Now, what does a referendum mean? In fact a general election would be a straighter and cleaner and a more satisfactory procedure to take. I think it is safe to say, that all the church courts, municipal bodies, boards of trade and similar organizations throughout the country

have gone on record as opposed to a referendum. That is a very general statement, but I think that, with certain local exceptions, it is a correct statement to make. What would the referendum mean. What would the referendum be? It is a taking term, a pleasant idea. A referendum to whom? The right hon. leader of the Opposition knows that, under the statute that gives to the soldiers the right to vote at elections, which is known as Chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1915, assented to on the 15th day of April, 1915, no right is given to the soldiers to vote on a referendum. The Act pre-supposes candidates and the volunteer, that is, the soldier at the front must mark his ballot as a vote for the Government, or the Opposition, or the independent candidate, as the case may be, for whom he desires to vote. What provision is there for soldiers voting on a referendum? My right hon. friend has not proposed to amend this Act so that soldiers might have a right to vote on a referendum. Moreover, how could the soldiers' vote be taken? Do not misunderstand me; I am not arguing in favour of a vote by the soldiers at the present time. We all know, those of us who have friends at the front—and I do not intend to speak of my own people who are at the front—what is going on at the front? We can almost hear the heart beats of the soldiers, almost hear the familiar voices of the absent. How can they, in the discharge of their duty, loving and serving their country in this noble manner how can they pass around a ballot box? What do they care about elections? They are fighting for their lives, for the life of their country, for the life of their Empire, side by side with other noble men from the Old Country, from home, and the other Allies. What facilities have they for taking a vote, even if there was a provision in the present Act giving votes to soldiers, to vote in the case of a referendum of this kind?

Then, too, what proportion of the voting population of Canada do the soldiers represent? We have some 425,000 soldiers overseas. The total vote in Canada at the last election was about 1,200,000, and statisticians have esimated that, having regard to the increase of population on the one hand, and having regard to the sending away of soldiers on the other, there are probably as many voters to-day in Canada as there were at the time of the last election. So that we have more than 25 per cent of the total vote of Canada overseas, as sodliers serving their country.

[Mr. Macdonell.]

Referendum is suggested. Referendum to whom? To slackers—those who have not faced their duty, who have not realized their duty? and to the foreign born. As I have said, most of the provinces have passed a law since the last general election giving women votes. How should they be provided for? What provision is there? Who should vote? If there were a referendum and a vote, there would have to be a Franchise Act passed, before the vote could be taken. What does that mean? That means delay, and delay would mean the very destruction of all we have in view. The prime necessity of the moment is expedition. The last thing we want, and the last thing we can afford to have, is delay. I notice my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, in speaking in the House the other day, prefaced his remarks with some very unhappy words—"Hear me for my cause." We know where those words came from. It was from the play of "Julius Caesar," and the words were used by Marcus Brutus, as he came fresh from Caesar's assassination, to explain to the citizens of Rome the death of Caesar. I am not drawing a parallel, but it is a very significant thing. The words are unhappy. They were taken from the unhappy reference that I have referred to, and there is a strange parallel between them—"Hear me for my cause"—my cause, the bleeding soldiers at the front, their wounds unstaunched, the soldiers appealing for reinforcements, help and succour. What does that all mean? It simply means the abandonment of the men who have gone, and the breaking of the pledges we made to them. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is well aware—no man is better aware of what will happen in the event of Germany winning this war. It is not a probable thing, but it is certainly not impossible for her to win the war. My hon. friend, when speaking on this very Bill said: "I believe that the victory of Germany would mean for Canada, as for the rest of the world, envelopment in the black shroud of German insolence, cruelties and barbarities."

What does the right hon. gentleman propose in order to avoid this? This may come. It reminds me of the old legal plea of "Confession and avoidance". All lawyers are familiar with it. My right hon. friend confesses the danger and the urgency, he confesses what would happen to us if Germany should win the war, and, forsooth, he avoids it by some reference to a referen-

dum or something of that kind the old plea of "confession and avoidance," and that is all there is in it.

What is the conscription provided for by this Bill? Is it a fair measure? Every hon. gentleman in this House will agree with me, I think, in saying that voluntary enlistment has outlived its day and done its work. Early in this year the last voluntary enlistment effort was made on the Home Defence plan. It was hoped that men would enlist for home defence, that they would catch the infection of the soldiers' life, and that a martial feeling would come over them, that they would go overseas and join the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and serve their country in that capacity. The home defence effort was enforced vigorously. It was tried and failed, and it is the last voluntary effort possible. I know of no other voluntary effort that is possible now. If there be any, let some person suggest. What is the situation? There being no further voluntary enlistment, we are compelled to adopt conscription, or to abandon our honour and our soldiers at the front. That seems to me the only way. The reasons that are given for opposing selective conscription and for supporting a referendum are various, but it is said by many hon. gentlemen in this House that we should have had conscription from the start. If we had adopted that policy at the commencement of the war, we would certainly have retained in this country many splendid men, and a great many other men, who could easily be spared I will not call them undesirables because they are Canadian citizens—could have gone and served their country overseas, but the Government desired to bear with the people, to make their burden as light as possible. They hoped the war would be won and they resorted to every expedient before resorting to selective conscription. But now, there being nothing left but selective compulsion, it is obvious that it must be adopted. It has been said that by sending more men overseas many of our industries, possibly agriculture, will be more or less interfered with. We cannot have our cake and eat it, but we must win this war. We cannot send our men over there and have them here. No man can be in two places at the same time. But there are still a great number of young men in this country, who can very well be spared. Every hon. gentleman in this House knows, in his own daily life, that thousands of men are going about the cities, to places of entertainment and amusement who could be spared, and there is no reason why a sufficient number of these men should not be sent. The provisions of this Bill are just and humane. Compare them to the lottery system, or the ballot system of the Militia Act, and they are vastly superior to it. As the Prime Minister has said and elaborated over and over again, the Government is only too willing to receive, and fully consider any and all amendments suggested, the idea being to make the burden of selective conscription as unoppressive as it is possible to make it, having regard to the object to be accomplished.

Perhaps it would be labouring an argument if I should refer to the power of Parment either to pass this Act and to put it into operation or to send men overseas under the present Militia Act. But what could be more plain and explicit than the statement made by the leader of the Government in this connection, and the section of the Act which he quoted to the House? Section 69 of the Militia Act, chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, provides:—

> The Governor in Council may place the Militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada for the defence thereof at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

No doubt the leader of the Opposition recollects what took place when that section was enacted. The then Minister of Justice, as reported on page 8083 of Hansard of 1904, made it abundantly clear that under that section the Governor General in Council might send the Canadian militia overseas—say, to India—if in his opinion such a course was necessary. Let me, for the benefit of my friends from Quebec, whom my right hon. friend leads and represents, be reminiscent for a moment. My right hon. friend recollects the condition and history of the old militia of Canada. In 1649 a body of militia, consisting of about 50 men, existed for the protection of the settlers of the colony which is now Canada against the attacks of the Iroquois Indians. The population of the colony at that time was only 1,000. From that day to this we have had a constantly expanding militia, always available for service. In no place was that militia stronger or more willing to be called out than in Quebec; nor in any place did it give better service. The right hon. gentleman knows that at the time of the siege of Quebec, in 1775, the day was largely saved by his own compatriots, the French Canadian militia. In the war of 1812-14 we had an army of 41,000 or 42,000 troops, including about 13,000 British soldiers. I have no desire, especially in view

of the splendid behaviour of our friends to the south, to refer to the war of 1812-14 in any other than a purely historical way. Noble men fought on both sides. Those of us who are familiar with our country's history, written as well as unwritten, know that many victories were won by the British and Canadian troops during that conflict. Many were won on American territory, all the way from Mackinaw to the State of Maine. Canadian soldiers invaded the territory of our neighbours to the south, even as they invaded our... Detroit fell; Buffalo, Black Rock, Ogdensburg and Oswego were captured. I ask hon. gentlemen: did our Canadian troops at that time wait for an Order in Council or an Act of Parliament before going across the boundary line and fighting outside of Canada? Should their victories now be annulled and declared unconstitutional—if that were possible—because they went outside of Canada, as my right hon. friend would say, contrary to the terms of the Militia Act? No. They went out and fought, and we know the result of that war, which preserved to the Empire the great heritage of Canada.

I have no desire to refer to Quebec in any terms other than those of fairness and encouragement to further effort. Much has been said in the House concerning the reasons why Quebec has not recruited as largely as she should. Upon that subject I make no comment. Facts are stubborn things, and speak for themselves. But hon. gentlemen from Quebec, and one hon. gentleman from Ontario, the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), complained about the recruiting system adopted by this Government in Quebec. They gave excuses for non-enlistment in Quebec, offering as one reason the fact that a Methodist clergyman, Rev. Mr. Williams, was sent to Montreal to assist recruiting. I should like to point out that Major-General Lessard—splendid soldier he is, too—was the officer commanding Military District No. 2 at Toronto at the outbreak of war. He was most active in recruiting after the outbreak of war. He held that post from December 1, 1912, to December 31, 1914, a period which included the first five months of the war, when recruiting was most active and successful. In December, 1914, he was selected to act as Inspector General in Eastern Canada, which position he has occupied up to the present time, with office and headquarters at Toronto. Major-General Lessard is a French Canadian who is proud of his nationality; he makes no bones about it. Did the presence of Major-General Lessard in Toronto hurt recruiting in that city? Has the fact that Sir Eugene Fiset, as good a soldier as can be found in Canada or out of it, and a French Canadian, has been Deputy Minister of Militia, made any difference to recruiting in Ontario? Not in the least. Let us forget such piffling things as the contention made by hon. gentlemen respecting the assignment of a Methodist clergyman to engage in recruiting in Quebec. I understand that some 500 recruiting officers were appointed for Quebec—I have not the exact figures, but I know that a large body of men were appointed. We in Toronto welcomed Major-General Lessard; no man did better work. He was liked, he was looked upon as a splendid soldier from Quebec. No man was more successful in getting the people of Toronto to stand by their arms than Major-General Lessard.

Without going into detail as to the figures of enlistment so far as the different nationalities are concerned, I wish to point out that enlistments among the Canadian-born speaking the English language amounted to 125,245, which is a very good showing. Enlistments among Canadians who were British-born amounted to 155,095. The enlistments among French Canadians in Quebec have already been put on record; I shall not show disparity between those figures and those which I have just given by referring further to them.

The member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) referred last night to the attitude of labour in the matter of selective conscription. I wish to make a frank, and, if you will, a bold statement on that subject. The labour leaders, including the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville), who spoke in this House last night absolutely do not speak for labour in Canada. I know something about labour, and I say publicly that they misrepresent and degrade labour, and the day will come when labour will resent their statements. In the city of Toronto and the surrounding district, roughly speaking, 100,000 men have enlisted, and the great majority of the rank and file of those men are from the ranks of labour, and they are splendid men. The workingman nowadays has usually to live in the suburbs of a big city because he cannot afford to live in the downtown parts. There is in the northern part of Toronto a little suburb known as Earlscourt that is famous because it has sent more men to the front than any

other part of Canada of its size has done. I say it with grief, pain and anguish, that in that village of Earlscourt one block contains twenty-four widows of workingmen who have died at the front or on active service. I am as much a workingman as the men who claim to speak for labour, and I say that they grossly misrepresent labour. Labour in other countries as well as in Canada is on our side. I notice this despatch of June 21 from Petrograd:

> The all-Russia Congress of workmen and soldiers to-day unanimously resolved upon an immediate Russian offensive.

The working people of Great Britain, Canada and all the Allies are with us in this war. In Great Britain there is no more splendid spectacle than the robust, manly stand of labour in this war. The working classes there have denied themselves many of their privileges; they have foregone many of their rules, regulations, bargains and agreements in order to stand shoulder to shoulder with the state, and the same is true of labour in Canada. Any man who attempts to say that the labouring classes of this country are not in favour of this war, is telling the people of this country what is not true. In Ontario, we have no stronger supporters of recruiting than the labouring classes. If one goes to any of the great recruiting meetings held throughout Ontario, one will find that nine out of ten of the people at those meetings who are applauding the speakers, supporting recruiting and enlisting, are what are commonly called the working classes.

Are not those who are opposing this Bill making a mountain out of a mole hill? Let us realize the facts. Facts are stubborn things. It has been estimated that the number of men in Canada to-day between the ages of twenty and forty-five who would be affected by this measure and who would be proper subjects of consideration under it for military service, amounts to 1,583,000. Of that number 100,000, or a little less than one man in fifteen can easily be spared. A proper and thorough inquiry and investigation, for which this Bill provides, can easily locate more than one man out of the fifteen who can well be spared to serve his country. We are not tearing a man from his wife or his family; we are not taking a man from a sick bed to serve at the front. Only those who are able to go and who have all the qualifications for going and who can be spared, will be called upon to go. There should be no hardships in the selection, and I do not believe there will be any. The statement laid on the Table by the Minister of Militia makes that plain.

Let me say a word about the need of reinforcements at the front. I do not think hon. members would ordinarily, on the public platform, make reference to certain facts to which we feel compelled to refer here, and one of those matters is the present condition of our recruiting and of our casualties. It was stated in this House recently that our casualities now run to something like 10,000 per month. The casualties for May amounted to 10,841, for April to 13,098, and they amounted to less than that during the earlier months of the year. During the last two or three months the casualties have risen enormously, and the enlistments have unfortunately decreased. The total enlistments for the five months, January, February, March, April and May, of this year are 33,712. The total casualties reported from overseas for the same period are 30,272. The total number of discharges in Canada, which are casualties in that sense, being men who have been sent to the hospitals here, is 12,366. Therefore, the total number of casualties reported from overseas and discharges in Canada amounts to 42,638 since the beginning of the year, as against a total number of enlistments of 33,712. The balance is on the wrong side of the books, and the situation is not improving. In the month of May the enlistments amounted to 6,407, whereas the casualties were 10,841. What are we going to do about the matter? The Prime Minister made it amply plain to the House, and it has been made plain by other speakers, that the urgent need is for infantry. In the statement placed before the House by the Minister of Militia, it appeared that there were 126,241 men in England, but the great majority of those men are not effectives. The infantry enlistment is very slight. Of the 6,407 men who enlisted in May, only 1,208 enlisted in the infantry. We cannot shut our eyes to the facts. If this condition continues, what is going to happen? The four divisions at the front will dwindle to three, the three to two and the two to one. Is that what we want? Surely not. Of the 126,241 soldiers in England, only about 28,000 are ready and able to go to France and Flanders.

With casualties at the rate of 10,000 a month, what margin have we, then, to draw upon? On the 4th of June, 1917, we had 136,000 troops of all ranks in France, and on the 1st of June, 1917, there were 17,353 troops of all ranks in Canada. Our forces here are almost depleted, because, since that date, we have continued sending troops overseas, especially since our neighbours to the south have entered the war. The Government to-day is face to face with a con-

dition of dire necessity; the men have to be got.

Then, many of our soldiers are in hospitals. Over 7,000 members of the Canadian forces are under the care of the military Hospitals Commission in Canada. In addition to this, there are in Canadian and British hospitals in Great Britain 22,562 patients. These, of course, make a corresponding gap in our available fighting men available for the front. And yet we often hear the question asked in this House: where are our soldiers? Every man is doing his duty; every man is needed. What has happened to those who have gone? The Minister of Militia, in his speech the other day, gave a very full account of our casualties, which total 99,639. The total number of wounded is 68,629; prisoners of war, 2,460, and dead, 28,550. Something must be done; the devastation is continuing on an increasing scale.

The frontiers of Canada are the most open and extensive of any part of the British Empire. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has been in the habit of pointing to the fact that there are no Germans near our borders, and we can, therefore, wait, he says, until the menace reaches this country. I can tell my right hon. friend that the only place to fight the foe is where we are fighting him now. It is preposterous to think of waiting till the Hun sets his foot in this country. If we wait for invasion, how are we going to protect ourselves?

In days to come Canada may be the centre of the Empire, the bridge, as it were, connecting and cementing the English-speaking races the world over. Having regard to the splendid behaviour of our neighbours to the south, and to the fact that we have sprung from those good old British loins overseas, the day may come when Canada will be the connecting link between British subjects in Europe and English-speaking peoples in the country to the south of us. There may be an English-speaking union; we do not know what will happen, but let us all get together. Let us realize our destiny and make ourselves worthy of it. Let us preserve our country intact, but far more important still, let us preserve our honour and the respect of our neighbours to the south and the good opinion of the people in the Old Country, so that we may be considered worthy to take our place side by side with the Old Country and the country to the south, and play our part in whatever may be the ultimate destiny of the great English-speaking nations of the world. Let us preserve our honour that we may have strength and character when that time comes.

In concluding, perhaps I cannot do better than quote in part a poem which is well-known to some hon. members:

> When the war drums beat no longer,
> And the battle flag is furled,
> In the Parliament of men,
> The federation of the world.

After the war, those of our soldiers who have come through will return to this country, and we all recollect what took place on the return of the heroes of the South African war. The whole country acclaimed their return; the scenes are still vivid in the minds of all of us, and these scenes will be re-enacted only on a greatly enlarged scale. But with these living men there will also return the spirits of the army of the dead. Those who have died overseas will return in spirit, their voices will echo in their households in this country. All that we can say of them is, "the pity of the men who paid the price." Let us realize now the conditions that will be with us after the war, and let us, as parliamentarians charged with this duty, take every step to meet the situation. Let us put in force this Act; it is the only thing we can do; it is our dernière resouree, as the French say. It is the only fair and reasonable thing to do. The Act will have my robust, full-hearted, thorough, and conscientious support, both in its passage through this House and in its operation.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, a great many speeches have been made on the subject which is now before the House, and much information has been given to hon. gentlemen and to the country on the question which we have been deliberating for the last fortnight or so. I shall detain the House only a very few moments with what I have to say, and I do not expect to add very much that is new to the debate.

Since August 1914 Canada has been participating in the greatest war with which this earth has been stricken. Personally, I do not care whether Canada's participation in this war has been for England or with England, whether our participation has been as one of the Allies or as part of one of the Allies. As a matter of fact, Canada has been fighting for human justice, human liberty, and for democracy and the free peoples of the world. In the session of August, 1914, no voice was raised against Canada's participation in this war. We met

in the House of Commons a united Parliament, and we voted all the money that was required for Canada's participation in this war. Throughout the length and breadth of this land we were a united people. From north to south and east to west not a voice was raised against Canada's participation in the war, with perhaps the exception of a small section of the people of the province of Quebec, and I do not wish to say anything about the Nationalists, because they are entitled to their opinion, and must answer to their own conscience.

It is for that reason that, since the war began, I have done my humble bit to assist Canada in her participation in this struggle. Canada has done nobly under the voluntary system of recruiting and Canada's public men have done nobly in voting supplies to carry these men along. The time has now come when the people are told that voluntary enlistment has proved a failure. I do not think that is a fair way of putting it. When Canada, with a population of a little over 7,000,000 has contributed over 425,000 of her best to the cause of war I do not think that it can be truly said that voluntary enlistment has been a failure. I am not arguing for voluntary enlistment. It is true that voluntary enlistment at the present time is not as great as it was at the beginning of the war. It is but natural that having contributed over 425,000 men to this war, voluntary enlistment should be a little on the wane. It is not quite fair to the people of Canada to say that this sort of enlistment has proved a failure.

The question however, is as to whether we shall have to resort to conscription of the man power of Canada or whether we shall confine our efforts to the system which we have followed during the past two and a half years. Is it possible for the Government, the Parliament and people of Canada to so utilize the voluntary system of enlistment as to provide for the reinforcement of our boys at the front? Thus we are at the parting of the ways. The Prime Minister when he brought down his Bill, told us that in his opinion, and in the opinion of the Government, we must resort to conscription. To the people of Canada, as to all British peoples, the word "conscription" has in the past had rather a bad odour. A lot of objections that are raised to the Bill before the House are due to that fact. If it is proven to the people that in order to provide proper reinforcements and reserves for the Canadians in the trenches we must resort to conscription, I believe that people will forget the meaning which the word "conscription" has had for them in the past and will support the Bill.

But the question further arises as to whether or not there is sufficient before the House to inform us as to whether we must resort to conscription or not. I am not speaking for Canada; I do not know what has transpired in any of the other provinces, in the West, Ontario, or Quebec, beyond the fact that we have a general knowledge as to the number of men who have been enlisted in those provinces. But I have a fairly accurate idea of what did transpire in the province of Nova Scotia in regard to enlistment. We have raised a considerable number of men in Nova Scotia, and every regiment, battalion and draft authorized by this Government to be raised in Nova Scotia was raised and its ranks filled to overflowing by voluntary enlistment. We have raised the 64th, 25th, 107th, 112th, 85th, 185th, 193rd and 219th battalions, and we have also provided the 17th and 36th Field batteries. We have also contributed battalions which were raised in other parts of the province and with which I am not so familiar. We have also contributed, perhaps more than any other province, corps of tunnellers because in Nova Scotia we had an immense number of miners who were anxious to enlist and they enlisted as tunnellers. We have also recruited a forestry battalion. I am not saying that Nova Scotia has done its full share but the point I am making with respect to Nova Scotia is that no battalion, battery or draft was authorized but whose ranks were filled to overflowing under voluntary enlistment. I do not know what has happened in the other provinces.

It is true that Quebec has not done her share. There is no need of mincing matters; I say that Quebec has not done her share. I am not going to give any reasons and I am not going to talk about the reasons that were given in this House for her not doing her share. The fact stands out boldly and prominently that she has not contributed to the overseas forces of Canada what she should have. But, as I have already said, there are no facts which can be stated in this House to show that the voluntary system has been a failure in Nova Scotia. Within the year drafts were asked for to reinforce the Highland brigade, the 146th Battalion and the 36th Battery, the last of which went from the constituency which I represent. Drafts were asked for the 17th Battery, whose

headquarters is also in the constituency which I represent. These drafts that were asked were not only supplied but the ranks were filled to overflowing and hundreds of young men were sent away. You may ask me for some testimony along that line. I picked up a paper from my riding a few days ago, the Sydney Post of June 26, and this is what it says regarding one of these artillery drafts:

> The draft depot at Sydney now has about forty men and about ten more are wanted to make up the complement. Lieut. Yetman told the reporter this morning that he was turning men down practically every day who were approaching him with a view to enlistment. Twelve young men from Glace Bay offered themselves for the battery yesterday, but owing to the fact that recruiting for the battery has been officially stopped they were not accepted.

I am not finding fault with the Government for having stopped recruiting for siege batteries or artillery because I understand there are sufficient recruits. But I do not think that these young men who came forward to enlist in the artillery would not enlist in any other branch of the service if there was an opportunity of doing so. There is a question too as to whether or not recruiting has been called off. I really think it is due to the people of Canada that the Prime Minister, for whom I have every regard as a Nova Scotian and as a big man, should in some way counteract the effect which the speech of the late Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) had when he spoke of the stoppage of recruiting in this country.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend may not have been here, but even if he was not it remains the fact that, when that question was raised a day or two ago, the right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) gave an unqualified denial to the statement or implication that he had ever called down recruiting or had in any way tried to retard it. That is on Hansard.

Mr. CARROLL: I was in the House when that statement was made. I would, of course, accept the word of the Prime Minister as readily as I would that of the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence. But the fact that the ex-Minister of Militia produced in this House a private and confidential letter by which he said he could prove his contention in the matter, has been a factor in making the people of this country believe that there was something in the statement that recruiting had been stopped. As a matter of fact, recruiting was stopped in some portions of this country—and I am not finding fault with the Government for having taken that course. Public recruiting meetings were forbidden in my native town and in the mining districts over a year ago. When recruiting for the 185th Battalion, we were never allowed to hold recruiting meetings in the mining districts; I daresay for good and sufficient reasons.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARROLL: But, nevertheless, we had no difficulty in filling up the ranks, and when we hear hon. gentlemen speaking about slackers walking our streets, let me say that the recruiting for the 185th Battalion was done principally by personal canvass, and I had something to do with it; and I never approached a man with the object of having him enlist in that battalion or any other battalion being formed down there, who I thought should go, who refused to go. That is, I have never met a slacker in the county of Cape Breton. I have no doubt in the world that there are people in that county and in the Island who should be at the front and who are not there; but, so far as my personal experience is concerned, I have not met a slacker, because I have asked no man to go who refused to go. Of course, I was very careful to ask only men who I thought could go, and would go if the case was properly presented to them.

How am I to come to the conclusion that voluntary enlistment has been a failure in this country? I do not know. It has not been a failure in Nova Scotia, and I am willing to say that that province will supply by voluntary enlistment every man necessary for reinforcements for the battalions which it now has at the front. I have no doubt about that in the world. Many of these battalions went to reinforce battalions from other provinces. About that I have nothing to say; it was necessary and proper, and had to be done. So far as Nova Scotia is concerned, I do not think we shall have the least trouble in replenishing the broken ranks of our battalions at the front by voluntary enlistment. We have proved that in the past. The conditions may be different in other parts of Canada, but I have no doubt in the world of the truth of my statement. If I have a suggestion to make it is that I believe that if the proposition is placed before the provinces today to supply reinforcements by voluntary enlistment, it will be done without the assistance of this Bill. My friends will say: well, Quebec will not do her share. Well,

leave Quebec out in the cold. I understand that she only has two battalions at the front. Surely the people of Quebec are proud enough and noble enough and true enough to their traditions and to the traditions of the British people to replenish the two battalions which they have at the front. I am sure that the people of the other provinces are. I think that this suggestion, even coming from a humble member of this House, is worthy of consideration, whether this Bill goes through or not. The fact is that we are only looking for reinforcements; we are, I understand, going to place no further divisions in the field. We have four divisions there now. As a matter of fact, we have four and practically one-half of another division, the fifth division. There has been no intimation from the Government whether that division is going to be authorized. But there was at least the basis of a division, and those men went to France before Vimy Ridge and fought there as a unit. That is a proposal which I think is worthy of some consideration, that whether this Bill goes through or not, each of the provinces be asked to supply by voluntary recruiting the reinforcements which are necessary to keep up its battalions at the front.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 76, for the relief of George Walter Sherald Garrett.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 77, for the relief of Gertrude Ellen Beal.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill No. 78, for the relief of Donald George Whibley.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 79, respecting a patent of Ernest Mead Baker.—Mr. Robb.

Bill No. 81, respecting a patent of James B. King and others.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 88, for the relief of George Maisey.—Mr. Wilcox.

Bill No. 89, for the relief of Herbert Featherstone Conover.—Mr. Henderson.

Bill No. 87, respecting the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 90, respecting The Security Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 60, respecting The Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Wilcox.

Bill No. 32, to incorporate The Cascade Scenic Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 93, to incorporate The Kenora and English River Railway Company.—Mr. Carrick.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 96, to incorporate Dominion Good Roads Association.—Mr. Achim.

Bill No. 105, to incorporate the English Valley and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Webster.

Bill No. 106, for the relief of Rozilla Lamb.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 104, respecting the Vancouver Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton) (resuming): Mr. Speaker, before the House rose at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to point out that in at least some portions of the country the voluntary system had not proved a failure. The Prime Minister, in introducing this Bill, said that for the year ending May, 1917, the number of enlistments in this country was 85,306 and the number of casualties, 75,000, so that in the past year there were over 10,000 more enlistments than there were casualties, and this is not taking into consideration the fact that a large proportion of those who come under the head of casualties would return to the front as effective soldiers. If the statement of the Prime Minister that during the next seven months we require 70,000 men to reinforce the four divisions at the front is correct, we have not lately been securing a suffiicient number of men to fill the bill. Every hon. member who cites figures as to the number of men we have in England and in Canada, I am sure, desires to give correct information to the House. This afternoon, the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) said that out of the 126,241 men in England at the present time, only 28,000 were effectives. I know that the hon. member did not wish to mislead the House in that regard. What the Minister of Militia did say was that out of the 126,241 men in England, there were only 28,000 who were at the present time in a condition to go to the front. That does not mean that the balance of the men are not effectives. Reading over the list as presented to the House, I find that only 150 of the 126,241 men in England are termed as non-effectives; that is, that they are good for no branch of the

service. The Government should give us more information as to where, outside of the particular province which has been so much discussed, voluntary enlistment has fallen down, because from the figures in regard to voluntary enlistment for the year ending May, 1917, we are bound to conclude that the voluntary system of recruiting has not fallen down for that period at least. From a memorandum given to the House the other day by the Minister of Militia we find that on June 4, there were in France 136,400 men, or about 56,000 over and above the four divisions. I do not wish to infer from that that the 56,000 are reinforcements for the four divisions; they are taken up in other branches of the service. In the near East and at St. Lucia there were 877; in England there were 108,736, and this included those who were on passage to England. In Canada, at that date, there were 17,353, making a total of 263,366. We were told that 425,000 men enlisted in Canada for overseas service, so that, subtracting the 263,366 accounted for on the 4th of June, we have a balance of 161,634. According to the figures given by the Prime Minister in introducing this Bill, 99,639 casualties have occurred since this war began, so that taking no account at all of those who were wounded, the number of whom amount to about 70,000, who would return to the front, we find a shortage of 61,995. I know those men can be accounted for, and I think the Minister of Militia should give us some further statement, that is, if it does not interfere with the secrecy which I know the Militia Department must have regard to in some matters. The people throughout the country are speaking about this; I do not know if they are making it a matter of criticism; but it is only fair when we, in this House, are asked to vote for a conscription measure, that these figures should be made a little plainer.

The Bill under discussion is for conscription, or for a selective draft; and if we could all call it a selective draft, I do not think there would be so much opposition to it in the country. As regards the question of a referendum, the leader of the Opposition says that there is one part of this country which is opposed to conscription, but he gives us his word of honour that if the people of this country will decide by their votes, either through the ballot or through a referendum, that conscription is necessary, the Conscription Act will be easy of enforcement. Otherwise he has his fears. Apart from the province of Quebec there is a large volume of opposition in this country

to this measure, but I will deal with that later on.

The chief argument that has been made by those opposed to the referendum is that no time should be lost in putting the Act into operation. I would point out that in the negotiations between the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition for a coalition government, the Prime Minister said that if a coalition government was formed a general election would be held. To those who say that a referendum would delay the effectiveness of this Bill, I say that a general election, as was proposed by the Prime Minister, would delay it far more. The obvious inference from the correspondence passing between the two leaders is that the Prime Minister was of the opinion that the Act before being put into operation should be submitted to the people in some form or another. If we wish to get the people's verdict, what is wrong with the referendum? One of the greatest living English statesmen, Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, who spoke in this House only a few weeks, ago, said in London in 1911 when the question of tariff reform was before the people:

> 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.

You may say that conditions are different now, that these are war times. But the Prime Minister has proposed a general election in war times, and the referendum is no worse than a general election. I say that the people's opinion could be more readily and more directly taken by means of a referendum than by a general election, and that is one reason why I am in favour of the referendum. There is another part of Mr. Balfour's speech in this House not long ago which I wish to quote, and which I do not think has been quoted before in this debate:

> I know that the democracies of the old world as well as the new—whether they belong to the British Empire, or are outside of it; whether they speak the English language, or the language of other free nations —will come out of this struggle not merely triumphant in the military sense, not merely conquerors where victory is essential to civilization, but strengthened in their own inner life; more firmly convinced that the path of freedom is the only path to national greatness, and that the strength which is derived from having behind efforts the consent of a free people is greater than all the strength

that can be secured by the most elaborate, the most tyrannical, and the most well thought-out system of military despotism.

I need not explain what he meant by that. Apply his language to the present case, it means that if the people's opinion is taken on the question of conscription, and the people vote for it, conscription will be more easily put into force; there is no question whatever about that.

Coming to the principle of the Bill, I repeat that the Bill as it stands at present is not popular in a great many parts of this country outside altogether of the province of Quebec. We have heard hon. gentlemen say that labour men in this country, both organized and unorganized, are not against the war. Of course they are not against the war, or against Canada's participation in it; no one has any doubt about that who has followed the events of the past two or three years. I do not pretend to be speaking for labour in this country, although I represent a constituency which has perhaps as large a labour vote as any other constituency in this country, but I say that although labour men are not opposed to the war, they are opposed to the Bill as it has been presented to the House.

That does not mean that they are opposed to conscription. They would, however, be more favourable to this measure if it had provided for the conscription of wealth. There are men in this country who profess not to know what conscription of wealth means. It is perhaps rather a vague term to one who has never heard it before, but the people of England know what conscription of wealth means, and so does my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), who said in the special session of 1914 that one way in which money should be raised in this country for the purpose of carrying on the war was by means of an income tax. I had the proud privilege of advocating the same method of taxation at that time. I said, too, that the luxuries of the rich should be taxed, and that if possible the foodstuffs of the people of this country should be left alone for the time being. The people of New Zealand also know what conscription of wealth means, and I should like to read what a very eminent colonial statesman has said on this question. Sir Joseph Ward, formerly Prime Minister of New Zealand, and now Finance Minister in their coalition Government, on his way home from the Imperial Conference in London, said recently in a public speech at Winnipeg:

> Let me tell you, gentlemen, that you will have to do more than make up your minds to conscript the man power of the country—you will have to conscript the wealth also. . . . Britain would never have been able to introduce conscription—

"Introduce," mark you, not "pass."

> Britain would never have been able to introduce conscription of her men if she had not first practically conscripted the wealth of the country. She could never have put it through. If you are going to call upon certain men in this country to get out and sacrifice their all—their lives, if need be—you must be prepared, you men of wealth, to see that they are properly pensioned, to see that your money is employed in the country's behalf where you cannot give yourselves, to provide the wherewithal. Canada has done magnificently, but she must go on; there must be no turning back.

So say we all. Let us see whether Sir Joseph Ward was correct in saying that conscription of wealth preceded the conscription of men in England. He went even further and said that conscription of men would have been an impossibility in England if it had not been preceded by conscription of wealth. The facts are these: The Budget providing for the big increase in income taxation in England, which was at least a partial conscription of wealth, was brought down in the British House of Commons in September, 1915, and the Military Service Act, known as Act No. 1, did not receive the Royal Assent until some months after, January 27, 1916; so Sir Joseph Ward was right in that. Then the second Bill which conscripted married men and others came down a little later.

As far as the labour people are concerned, I believe they would have no objection in the wide world to conscription of the man-power of the country if they even had an assurance from the Finance Minister, or any responsible man in the Government that this would be followed by conscription of wealth. Why not? May I, before leaving this question, show what England has done towards conscripting wealth? They have had for many years in England an income tax but they increased it to an almost alarming extent after the war began. They are taking, by means of the income tax, some of the surplus wealth of the rich. That is conscripting wealth. We will take an example. A man with an income of $1,040—they begin pretty low in England too—pays a tax of $36. A man with an income of £5,000, or $25,000 a year pays $5,144 per year or a little over 85 cents on every $5 of his income. As the income gets larger

the percentage increases. A man with an income of £20,000 or $100,000 pays an income tax of $30,145 a year or $1.20 on every $5 of his income. That is what they have done in England and Sir Joseph Ward told them that unless they did that conscription of man power would be impossible. I do not know enough about it to say whether he is right or wrong but he must know a good deal about the question. In addition to that, in England they impose a tax of fifty per cent on any business whose profits since the war began exceed the profits of the year previous to the war. The calculated revenue from this tax was £300,000,000 but as a matter of fact the actual revenue has exceeded that amount.

We have no assurance in this country that we are going to have any conscription of wealth. The labour man—and I suppose we are all labouring men—who is told that he must go to the front as provided by this Bill will say: Why is it that a man must be conscripted and sent forcibly to the front when wealthy people are left in the position that they can either voluntarily contribute their wealth or not contribute it at all? The wealthy people have done handsomely in their contributions to various charitable and patriotic organizations and funds, such as the Red Cross, Patriotic and other funds. The labour people are not opposed to Canada's participation in the war, they are in favour of it and have been since the beginning of the war, and whatever opposition they have to present to the conscription Bill is not an open opposition to conscription but it is an opposition to this Bill in that it does not in some way deal with conscription of wealth. I followed the other day very carefully the Minister of Finance in his speech on this question. In order to make sure, I read his speech, but I found no assurance in it that the wealth of the country was going to be disturbed by way of an income tax, conscription, or whatever you may call it, any more than it is at the present time. We may be told that he has conscripted some of the wealth of the country. He has; all honour to him for doing so. But, it is a very small proportion. Let me say again that if the people had an assurance from the Minister of Finance, or the Prime Minister, or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, or any other member of the cabinet who would have to deal with the question, that they would conscript wealth, it would take away a whole lot of opposition which is in this country and which will remain against this Conscription Bill.

With reference to the referendum, I desire to make just one more remark. If I had had the responsibility of dealing with this matter, I think that perhaps I would have timed my amendment somewhat differently. I think that I would have made my amendment to this Bill on the third reading, because then the Bill would be passed and the people would know exactly what they had to deal with. However, the motion for a referendum has come in a different spot and we cannot all be suited. This is only my personal opinion. One objection which has been brought against the referendum is that conscription would be defeated. I do not know that it would be defeated. On the contrary, even with the present condition of the Bill, I do not think it would be defeated, because if the people are convinced—which they are not now—that conscription is necessary, there is no doubt in my mind that there would be an overwhelming vote in favour of conscription if the question was submitted by means of a referendum. If there was the assurance which I spoke of before that an attempt would be made to conscript wealth, there would be absolutely no doubt of the vote which would be polled on the referendum.

This is a serious question. I hope every hon. member, whether he is on the other side or this side of the House, will believe me when I say that I have given it the most sincere consideration that I could possibly give any question. I am not going into the details of what has moved me to take the stand which I am taking in voting for the referendum. They are varied, and the House has heard them reiterated time and time again. I am not one of those who believe that there will be a rebellion in this country if an attempt is made to enforce the terms of the Conscription Bill. I do not believe there will be. Neither am I of the opinion of those who say that there will be labour strikes in order to prevent the terms of this Bill being put into effect. I do not believe there will be. When you come down to close quarters with the people, you will find that their hearts are in this struggle, and that they are too much in earnest in their determination to do everything they can to win this war, for any such action as that. While we may discuss this question from whatever angle we wish, and while we may look at it from all standpoints, when we come down to close quarters with the people, we will find that they are in favour of Canada's participation in this war to the last man and the

last dollar. There is no doubt about the sentiment of the Canadian people in that regard. If we disagree as to just what is the proper method of getting men to make Canada's efforts more effective, it is not because our whole hearts are not in the winning of this war. I am, of course, speaking for myself.

In conclusion, let me say that perhaps there are too many bickerings in this House on both sides of the question; there is a little too much recrimination, there is a little too much talk about the province of Quebec, there is a little too much talk about the province of Ontario and about Toronto being the only place in Canada. We have been a united Canada in so far as carrying on the war and putting forth our best efforts are concerned. I believe we will remain a united Canada. If we do not there will be no man in this country more sorry than I am. Although a very young Canadian, I yield to no man in the desire to win this war. I yield to no man in this House or in this country in the desire to give our boys in the trenches the most effective and strongest reinforcements.

I have, perhaps, as many friends in the trenches as most members of this House. I have, perhaps, as many friends buried in the soil of Flanders as any man in this House. And if I am voting for a referendum I am not doing it to prevent reinforcements being sent over to help those boys; I am doing it because, after a sincere consideration of this Bill, I believe that voluntary enlistment should be given another chance in this country. If the Government want to put the Bill through, if it is true that they are going to have an election, as was said some days ago by the Prime Minister, in order to get the views of the people on the measure, I believe that the referendum would be the best way of ascertaining the views of the people. In that way there would be less bickering and fewer of the usual concomitants of a party election. If the referendum should fail, I would not stand in the way of passing the Bill; in fact, there would be no man in this country who would give it a better support in order to make it effective than I would. I would assist with all my heart in making it effective. But if the Bill passes, as no doubt it will, I believe it would be better for Canada and more likely to secure the required reinforcements if the two parties would unite in some effort—I am not now talking about a coalition Government—some united effort to give voluntary enlistment a last and final chance. I believe that the people of Canada will enlist. I believe that, if the proper facts are placed before them, they will enlist in as great numbers, proportionately, as they ever did. And I shall ask the Government, as the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) yesterday asked them, although we approach the matter from different standpoints, to give the voluntary method one more trial. If it does nothing else, that will promote and continue the unity which has prevailed in this country for the past two and one-half years, so far as our efforts in carrying on the war are concerned.

I may not be in the House when the Bill is in committee and do not wish to discuss its details. But may I be permitted to say that I hope the Government, assisted by the Opposition, will make some provision in the Bill for greater care in the physical and medical examination of the men procured under this measure. My friend from Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) said that there were some 12,000 men in England who would never become effective. I think he is right. I have said nothing of this matter in the House, but I have brought it to the attention of ministers. I think that much of this trouble is due to the fact that the examination of recruits was carried on in, to say the least, a very casual manner. There is no reason for that, and I say that that should be safeguarded in this Bill. If I am in the House when the Bill is in committee, I shall perhaps have something further to say on that subject. But, in conclusion, let me say that, whatever may become of this Bill, I believe that the people of Canada will give their whole heart and their united effort towards making it a success. If they do not, they are not worthy to have been protected by the British flag, they are not worthy of the name of Canadians, and far less are they worthy of the name of Britishers or democrats.

Mr. W. A. CLARKE (North Wellington): Mr. Speaker, it is with profound reluctance that, at this late hour in this important debate, I shall attempt to make a few remarks. Perhaps I would best serve the interests of our Dominion and of the allied cause if I simply said most emphatically and at once that it is my intention to support the Bill and to oppose the referendum, and then resume my seat. However, I come from a constituency which has done most creditably under the voluntary enlistment system, as have a great many of the counties throughout Ontario, and it may be

well to explain my position more fully. I was very proud the other day as 9 p.m. a representative of the county of Wellington, to hear the splendid speech of my respected friend the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), and I have received a great many letters from impartial persons complimenting my hon. friend on his patriotic stand on this measure. Much as I have always respected him, I felt, at the conclusion of his address, like rising and giving him the most hearty applause I was capable of giving.

No man can find fault with the results that have been obtained under the system of voluntary enlistment. I remember quite well in the spring of 1914, before the war broke out, attending a large gathering in the city of Toronto under the auspices of the 48th Highlanders, a battalion now nearly altogether extinct, and I heard the ex-Minister of Militia deliver an address in which he stated that it would be possible for him to secure, equip and land in England, in case of war, a force of 20,000 soldiers. A ripple of laughter passed among his officers, and I think that very few believed that this was a possibility. But when the war broke out, we know what was accomplished under the guidance of that same gentleman, in six weeks. Since that time, under the voluntary system, throughout all Canada—and I am not here to criticise any one but to help in every way possible the winning of the war—the voluntary system of enlistment has produced the huge number of 425,000 soldiers. That is the kind of enlistment we like, that is what we were all so proud of, and that is what has placed this Dominion of Canada and this Parliament in the sun. We should be delighted if we could be sure that it was still possible, under voluntary enlistment, to procure the necessary number of soldiers to provide the required reinforcements to maintain our divisions now fighting in the great allied cause. But we know that that is not a possibility; we know from the figures that have been presented to us from time to time, from the figures read here this afternoon by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), that this condition no longer prevails.

The people throughout the Dominion of Canada are very anxious to be assured that some arrangement will be made, so that sufficient reinforcements will be sent over to supply the deficiency in the ranks of our men at the front. Referring to this Military Service Bill, I may say that they have had for many long years a compulsory service law in France. The great statesmen of England found it necessary to enact a similar law, and the great statesmen of the United States, profiting by our experience, or inexperience as the case may be, the moment war was declared enacted a law similar to the measure now before the House. That ought to be sufficient to justify our passing this measure. And if it be not sufficient, I would go still further and say that, after having listened to this debate for the last two weeks, having heard the leading statesmen on both sides declaring themselves in favour of this measure, and opposed to anything in the shape of a referendum, or anything else that would prevent us taking immediate action, I am convinced that we are adopting the right course.

I suppose it would be right for me to state my views in reference to a referendum. I think it is an utter impossibility to have a referendum which would satisfy the people of this country. Our men who have gone to the front—at least the remnants of them—at the present time are in such a position that they are not thinking of referendums, elections, or anything of that kind, and are not in a position to cast their votes. In my opinion, a referendum at the present time would be the most unfair and unjust thing that could possibly be presented to the people. Some have taken exception to this Bill because of the exemptions. As I understand it, certain classes, by reason of former legislation, are supposed, or considered, to be exempt from military service. I refer to the Doukhobors, Mennonites and others. Many people residing in Canada, and exercising the franchise at the present time, are possibly more objectionable than either of these classes. I know nothing about the Doukhobors, but I know something about the Mennonites. In Wellington and Waterloo counties we have a great number of these people. As the hon. member from Waterloo stated last night, they are a quiet, inoffensive, and prosperous people. They do not molest anybody, but simply attend to their duties as farmers. They entered this country under an agreement that they would not be called upon to fight the battles of the country. If that agreement holds good now I would have no objection to their still retaining the franchise. On the other hand, throughout the whole Dominion, we have very many foreigners of all kinds, and if we are to pass a measure excluding such foreigners from the right of franchise I would like to make the measure a sweeping one, and ex-

clude every one except real British subjects, and including, of course, in the franchise these Mennonites and some others who came to Canada under a guarantee that they should not be called on to bear arms. After all, it appears to me that the House of Commons is a kind of select conscription itself. We are all elected as members of the House of Commons to represent different constituencies from all over the Dominion. We come here individually, if I understand aright, and take our oath that we will be loyal to our King and country. We have certain responsibilities, and I think it is up to each of us to ask himself whether he has done what he considers right, in the interest of the Empire to which we are so proud to belong. I should like to have all the members of the House come together, and conclude that they have a common cause. Let them get behind our chief, Sir Robert Borden, and show their sympathy, cease indulging in so much unnecessary and unwarranted criticism and pass this Bill. The hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) said he did not think there would be any difficulty in securing men from any part of Nova Scotia, and that we should be able to secure sufficient recruits from the different provinces to make up the 500,000 men, the quota justly due from Canada. In my opinion that would be the correct thing to do. We could raise them hurriedly and get them in the fighting line, to relieve those who are now in the trenches. I think, by action of that kind, we will be maintaining the glory of the fair Dominion, and as a Parliament doing all that is expected from us.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, it has been said, in the course of this debate, that members of Parliament often have two different conceptions of the part they must act in the performance of their mandate; some are guided or influenced solely by their constituents, restricted outlook, the others by larger principles based upon the people's expression of opinion concerning the measures submitted to Parliament.

In the case now before us, I am sure that I represent the idea and the wishes of the county of Two Mountains, in particular and of the majority of the voters of the province of Quebec, but also, and I do believe it and sincerely assert it, the sentiments of the Canadian people of the whole Dominion. All of us, we have a common goal, the Allies' success and the crushing of the Huns; we only differ as to the means Canada should adopt in order to secure final victory.

The moment is too solemn to let it pass unperceived; that is why I believe it my duty to participate in this debate and to expose to my electors and to my country the attitude I propose taking. I have not the pretension, Mr. Speaker, to furnish any new argument after the long and judicious list of those already set forth against the conscription Bill and in favour of the referendum now under consideration. I simply desire to protest as strongly as I can and with the utmost energy against the adoption and the enforcement of this ill-boding, autocratic and antidemocratic bill; I do not want to lay the blame upon any of the provinces of the Dominion, or upon the result of voluntary recruitment, but I shall say, in spite of all that has been stated, the province of Quebec has done her duty. Neither am I of those who claim that we owe nothing to England or that we have done too much, but I do believe that we have done enough and that conscription destroys our autonomy, removes our liberty and leads us to ruin. I will not undertake to discuss the legal and constitutional principle of the proposed law.

The hon. leader of the Opposition, and after him, the hon. members for Rouville and for Kamouraska, among others, have demonstrated, without ambiguity and without sophistry, that our Militia Act, since its origin in 1808 up to that of Sir George Etienne Cartier in 1868, completed by that of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1904, has never contained any provision authorizing and permitting the sending of our militiamen beyond the ocean and beyond the frontier for other motives than the defence in case of invasion.

And, should the terms of the Cartier Act have given rise to any false interpretation in the sense of permitting the sending of our troops beyond the sea, the Laurier law of 1904 put an end to it by explicitly decreeing that the Canadian troops cannot be sent outside of Canada except for the defence thereof.

Mr. Speaker, under such an important circumstance for the future of Canada, it has again been attempted, as in 1896 and in 1911, to play a double game and to misrepresent the facts and actions, the conduct and the sincere and honest statements of the venerable and venerated leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as published by the Daily Telegraph of Quebec, on June 12 instant, in an article entitled:

"Double Dealing Politics," and which reads as follows:

Double Dealing Politics.

The old campaign of misrepresentation in regard to Sir Wilfrid Laurier is already being revived again. To one section of the people of Canada, he is represented as an insular racialist. To another section he is represented as an imperialistic militarist. While the English Tory press hold him up as an enemy of Empire, the French Tory press hold him up as the foe of local autonomy. It is another manifestation of the campaign of 1911, when Laurier was declared to be an American annexationist in Ontario and a naval Anglophile in Quebec. Nothing could more clearly demonstrate the hypocrisy and partisan trickery of this two-faced Jason of Tory politics.

In pursuance of these tactics, the Ottawa correspondent of the local French Tory organ entirely distorts the facts in order to make it appear that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is responsible for the conscription law which Premier Borden is now proposing to put into force. It is declared that Borden is merely enforcing the act which Laurier put on the books in 1904. Laurier, the correspondent continues, enlarged the scope of the previous law of Georges Etienne Cartier in order to allow troops to be sent overseas.

This is absolutely contrary to the facts, as every student of Canadian political history knows. The Act passed by Georges Etienne Cartier allowed the conscription of troops for service outside of Canada for any purpose, when it was believed advisable. Laurier, on the other hand, limited the action of this broad measure, when in 1904 he replaced it by the present Act, which explicitly states that troops can only be used outside of Canada for the defence of this country. In passing this Act in the House of Commons, Sir Wilfrid Laurier carefully pointed out that the object of his law was to limit that of Georges Etienne Cartier, so that troops could be sent, beyond the borders of Canada, only for our own defence.

There are the facts. They may be verified from Hansard, and from the Statute Book. It is then manifestly unfair to adopt such tactics as those employed by the French correspondent of the Tory organ. And when these declarations are placed beside the imperialistic invectives hurled at Sir Wilfrid by the English Tory press, it is more than unfair. It is absurd.

Indeed, this proposal is not only unfair, it is absurd.

Besides, the Government, in introducing a new Bill to complete the Militia Act and allow the sending of the Canadian troops overseas, has taken a stand which clearly demonstrates that the interpretation given to it by the Prime Minister is not justifiable and is contrary to the legislator's intention, since he has seen fit to compel Parliament to amend that Act in order to attain his ends. At this stage of the debate, it would perhaps not be proper to discuss the different paragraphs of the Bill. However, you might allow me to quote some of them in support of what I have just submitted and of what I intend to suggest in the course of my comments. Bill 75 is entitled "An Act respecting Military Service," and the preamble reads as follows:

An Act Respecting Military Service.

Whereas by section ten of the Militia Act, chapter forty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, it is enacted as follows:—

"All the male inhabitants of Canada, of the age of eighteen years and upwards, and under sixty, not exempt or disqualified by law, and being British subjects, shall be liable to service in the militia: Provided that the Governor General may require all the male inhabitants of Canada, capable of bearing arms, to serve in the case of a levée en masse."

And whereas by section sixty-nine of the said Act it is further enacted as follows:—

"The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency."

And whereas by the said Act it is further enacted that, if at any time enough men do not volunteer to complete the quota required, the men so liable to serve shall be drafted by ballot;

And whereas to maintain and support the Canadian Expeditionary Force now engaged in active service overseas for the defence and security of Canada, the preservation of the Empire and of human liberty, it is necessary to provide reinforcements for such Expeditionary Force;

And whereas enough men do not volunteer to provide such reinforcements;

And whereas, by reason of the large number of men who have already left agricultural and industrial pursuits in Canada to join such Expeditionary Force as volunteers, and of the necessity of sustaining under such conditions the productivity of the Dominion, it is expedient to secure the men still required, not by ballot as provided in the Militia Act, but by selective draft.

It contains, among other sections, section 2 which designates the persons liable for service, to wit:

2. (1) Every male British subject who comes within one of the classes described in section three of this Act, and who,—

(a) is ordinarily resident in Canada; or

(b) has been at any time since the fourth day of August, 1914, resident in Canada,

shall be liable to be called out as hereinafter provided on active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force for the defence of Canada, either in or beyond Canada, unless he

(a) comes within the exceptions set out in the schedule; or

(b) reaches the age of forty-five before the class or subclass to which he belongs, as described in section three, is called out.

Such service shall be for the duration of the present war and of demobilization after the conclusion of the war.

(2) Nothing in this Act shall prevent any man from voluntarily enlisting in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, so long as voluntary enlistment in such force is authorized.

Sections 5, 6, 7 and 10 provide for the establishment of three kinds of tribunals to put into operation this famous conscrip-

tion: (1) the organization of local tribunals; (2) appeal tribunals, and (3) a central appeal judge, as section 11 prescribes and gives the grounds of exemption from compulsory military service and reads as follows: Section 11 of the Bill:

Exemptions.

11. (1) At any time before a date to be fixed in the proclamation mentioned in section four, an application may be made, by or in respect of any man in the class or subclass called out by such proclamation to a local tribunal established in the province in which such man ordinarily resides, for a certificate of exemption on any of the following grounds:

(a) That it is expedient in the national interest that the man should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he is habitually engaged;

(b) That it is expedient in the national interest that the man should, instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he wishes to be engaged and for which he has special qualifications;

(c) That it is expedient in the national interest that, instead of being employed in military service, he should continue to be educated or trained for any work for which he is then being educated or trained;

(d) That serious hardship would ensue, if the man were placed on active service, owing to his exceptional financial or business obligations or domestic position;

(e) Ill health or infirmity;

(f) That he conscientiously objects to the undertaking of combatant service and is prohibited from so doing by the tenets and articles of faith, in effect at the date of the passing of this Act, of any organized religious denomination existing and well recognized in Canada at such date, and to which he in good faith belongs;

and if any of the grounds of such application be established, a certificate of exemption shall be granted to such man.

The hon. Minister of Labour, the other day took to task the hon. member for Edmonton, as well as the hon. members opposed to this Bill, for being content with criticising its principle without suggesting any remedy to improve the situation. I have not the required authority to give advice to the right hon. Prime Minister, in so serious a matter; but I will take the liberty of giving my personal opinion. In the first place, I am against any compulsory military service under whatever shape or manner it may be presented, against any coalition movement at the present time, and against the extension of Parliament; and if military conscription must be imposed, it should be general and be applied to all men having the required age and fitness for service, without any exception or exemption. It should be proportioned to the population of each province, divided into districts.

Every citizen called into military service should be so conscripted by drawing lots; and, in this manner, the rich as well as the poor man, millionaire and labourer, professional and workingman, Catholic priest and Protestant minister; in a word, all the naturalized or British-born subjects would contribute in a just and fair measure to fill the roster of the Canadian army.

Why have selective conscription? Would the object be to protect a certain class of society to the other's prejudice, and these local and appeal tribunals which the law requires, will they not be in the hands and at the discretion of Government dependents and a source of injustice and of favouritism for the benefit of a few and to the detriment of the great majority of the people? If only the Act provided under what delay the appeal should be made and decided, but no, the term is indefinite, and provided one has the cash and is in a position to retain the services of an able and cunning lawyer, of the Conservative party, to suspend the local tribunal's decision and maintain the appeal in abeyance until the war is over, and the trick will be played.

Here is wherein I find that, in its very application, this Act is unjust, besides being unconstitutional. And even admitting for the sake of that conscription had become necessary, why to-day rather than when war was declared? Would it be because the Prime Minister had, on January 1, 1915, in a moment of imperialistic enthusiasm or aberration, on his own responsibility, sent the Canadian people his New Year's best wishes and as a gift, the promise made to England of sending her 500,000 men?

The Parliament and the Canadian people are nowise bound by this inconsiderate and irrational declaration. And have not the Prime Minister himself and his ministers, from August 4, until May 18, 1917, stated that conscription would never be decreed? Has he not openly asserted, to obtain, in 1916, the extension of Parliament, and to induce the Canadian people to answer the insidious and deceitful list of questions of the National Service cards, that the present Act would never be introduced into Parliament?

The soldiers at the front, says the Prime Minister, ask for reinforcements, the Canadian army's rosters must be filled. I have promised 500,000 men, I need 100,000 more, says he, to make good our aid to England and the promise I made to her, I must have conscription, compulsory military service.

Would it not be on the part of the Government a simple political manœuvre? I am prone to believe it in view of the state-

ment made by the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Long, published by the Associated Press of June 21 inst., and which reads as follows:

London, June 21.—The Canadian Associated Press is authorized to say that the attention of Honourable Walter Long, Colonial Secretary, having been called to a suggestion in newspaper despatches that Sir Robert Borden had proposed conscription in Canada because he was urged to do so in the Imperial War Cabinet, he states there is not the smallest foundation for the suggestion that Premier Borden was urged to introduce conscription either in the Imperial War Cabinet or the conference. The matter was never even mentioned and the last thing the members of the home government would do is to interfere in the matter which is entirely one for Canada. Mr. Long further adds he saw Sir Robert Borden frequently up to the last day he was here and had no idea when he left he was going to propose the introduction of conscription on his return to Canada.

What happened then to the Prime Minister on returning to Canada? Did the spectre of general elections so distract him as to imagine the conscription of blood for the elections, as stated by the hon. member for Rouville?

Mr. Speaker, the reason of that promise of 500,000 men is nothing but a pretext.

But, from all that has been said and written upon the subject, one might conclude that conscription had become necessary to punish the province of Quebec, by pretending she has not done her duty through voluntary recruitment, and I would call this conscription, the conscription of racial and religious prejudices exacted by some Ontario jingoes who, to serve their hatred for everything that is French Canadian and Catholic, do not even hesitate to endanger the fabric of Confedertion and the national unity.

I find evidence of this in the statement of the hon. member for North York, who had the audacity to proclaim from the floor of this House, and before the whole country, that he would be ready to break the Confederation compact and to tear its pages, in order to attain his own ends; such language is worthy of the Huns who have mutilated, plundered and devastated heroic Belgium, in spite of international treaties and agreements and the law of nations. I also find the same evidence in the abusive, insulting and scurrilous speech of the member for Parry Sound against the French Canadians.

And it is after such indulging in such outrageous references, not to say more, that they join in saying that the province of Quebec has not done her full duty.

It is also with sentences like the following that they believe the province of Quebec is going to submit without protest and to uselessly sacrifice herself. The French Canadian members must have received under envelope, post-paid and through His Majesty's postal service, the gratuitious and anonymous insult upon card-board, to wit:

"War Cry: No priest of the Church of Rome shall levy any tax, tithe or toll in any of His Britannic Majesty's Dominions."

Can there be anything baser, more vile and a more outrageous affront cast in the face of the whole Catholic population of the Dominion? And that is the war cry of these people who are crying everywhere "Win the war." If it is with that infamous motto they believe in promoting recruitment in the province of Quebec, they are greatly mistaken.

I will cite another example on the same lines, published in La Patrie of June 20 instant. The Anglican Synod of Huron, after an address by Bishop Williams, has immediately adopted, yesterday, a resolution endorsing any selective conscription measure and demanding that it be put into operation as soon as possible. In his speech, Bishop Williams proposed that the Government undertake, if necessary, the task of enforcing compulsory service among the French Canadians.

"Should the rest of Canada, in their policy, submit to the domination of the faltering province of Quebec"? asked the bishop.

And to go still further, when every one in this House is striving—and I believe they are all honest about it—when every one is striving, do I say, to try and draw closer the ties that should unite us, on the eve of Confederation's fiftieth anniversary, whilst large preparations are being made throughout the country to duly celebrate that compact of 1867; here in the city of Ottawa, in the capital of the Dominion, we have a newspaper, taking advantage of the position it occupies in the press gallery, through its representative, to publish this evening, in the Journal, two pictures, illustrative of yesterday's debate: The picture of Mr. Alphonse Verville, M.P., and that of Mr. W. Weichel, M.P., with the following headline: "A French Canadian and a German Canadian."

On one side, below the picture of the hon. member for Maissoneuve (Mr. Verville) as a heading: "The Threat; I say that organized labour will do all it can against conscription. I want this House and the people of this country to know what that means; it means a general strike." On the other side, under the picture of the

hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel), as a heading: "The reply; suppose the boys in the trenches organized a strike, and refused to fight because we refused to send them help? They want their representatives to stand up in a manly way and not support—shall I call it sedition"? No comments. On the one hand, the threat, do they insinuate.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve makes no threat in the remarks he makes as labour representative. He simply states, he simply gives an advice and a notice to the Prime Minister and to his Government; he notifies them that a strike may perhaps ensue, and in so doing, the member for Maisonneuve is faithful to his traditions, to the traditions of his family, of his race and of his origin.

The German Canadian on the other side of the House, who has just been commenting upon the remarks of the hon. member for Maisonneuve as bordering upon sedition, has, by that very statement, foresworn his ancestry.

To the man who betrays his origin and his ancestry I prefer the man who loves the land of his forefathers and its traditions.

Happily, Sir, among Anglo-Saxons there are to be found fair, impartial, broad-minded men who have vindicated the honour and loyalty of the French Canadians. And to the demagogues whose dangerous outbursts I have just referred to, let me quote the suggestion and sound advice given by the Reverend Johnson, who has protested, in a sermon delivered in the American Presbyterian Church at Montreal, against the campaign of vituperation and abuse carried on by our fellow-citizens of Ontario against the province of Quebec:

> Invectives and insults do not make for the maintenance of peace between the two races which compose the large majority of the people of Canada; on the contrary, an honest and sympathetic endeavour on the part of every member of the community to understand the feelings and ideals of his fellow-citizen is much more conducive to peace. For us now is the opportune time of recalling to mind the splendid history of Quebec, the bravery of her pioneers, the self-sacrifice of her first missionaries. Let the press and the clergy of Ontario put forth a serious effort to understand their French-speaking fellow-countrymen and they will thereby do more good than by exhibiting such a spirit as they are now displaying.

I should like to put on Hansard an expression of opinion from Mr. A. P. Willis, president of the large piano manufacturing concern. On the 27th instant he said:

> As most of our employees are French Canadians, I happen to know better than any one else the good feelings and the loyalty of the French Canadians. To those feelings of loyalty Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself gave expression the other day, at Ottawa, before Mr. Balfour, when he said:
>
> "The hearty welcome extended to Mr. Balfour, especially in this country, is not due alone to his great name and personality, but is associated with an even greater name, the name of England, the champion of liberty, the mother of living nations. All misunderstandings will disappear and Canadians, irrespective of their origin, English, French, Irish or Scotch, all Canadians, I say, will forget that they did not entertain the same opinion during the war. I know well the French Canadians. I know that they belong to a noble and proud race, and it would be an egregious mistake to believe that the war is going to set them at variance with their English-speaking fellow-countrymen.
>
> I should not even be surprised if, during the present war, we were to witness the alliance, the entente cordiale of the two great races which live in this country. For that purpose what is wanted is a great man who would spring up from the crowd and who would give it to understand to all Canadians that they are all equal, that they are here to stay and therefore they have to understand one another.
>
> And should we fail to find that man who will unite us during the war, we shall find, when peace is concluded, a common ground of understanding. Our French Canadian soldiers as well as our English Canadian soldiers, when they return from the battlefields, covered with glory, will co-operate with us and have us understand that those who did not go to war ought to be as united as those who have fought the battles of their country.

This frank and sincere statement formally gives the lie to the threats uttered by the Prime Minister, to the effect that, after the war, when the soldiers return to Canada, with fierce resentment and even rage in their hearts, they would resort to reprisals, if the required reinforcements for filling the gaps in their ranks be not forthcoming; in short, if the Conscription Bill were not passed.

Yes, Sir, we are loyal to the British Crown; we are just as loyal as are the Australian people who, for all that, rejected conscription; we are just as loyal as those colonels and lieutenant-colonels who were created and ushered into the military world under the regime of the former Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), and who are now strutting about in the King's uniform, and parading through the streets of Ottawa, Montreal and London, and drawing, without fighting, or working, a pay which might best be devoted to the pay of our brave soldiers who are fighting at the front and in the trenches.

Was the province of Quebec disloyal when she raised 20,000 recruits and sent her most gallant sons to the firing line, as a contribution to the war which the Mother Country and the Allies are waging?

Did the province of Quebec prove disloyal when, at the inception of the war, she sent to the Allies, through the medium of her Prime Minister, Sir Lomer Gouin, $1,000,000 worth of cheese; when her towns and cities provided for and defrayed the cost of 1,300 beds for the wounded soldiers in the hospital at St. Cloud; when she sent cargoes of linen and clothes for the relief of our soldiers and for the martyrs of Belgium, through the medium of the committee "France-Amérique"; when she subscribed millions of dollars to the Patriotic Fund; when she procured for the Red Cross her best doctors, field hospital orderlies and her generous and heroic nurses? No, Sir, the French Canadian's heart is in the right place; and to him the motto of former days, "I remember," is no empty word, no mere catchword.

We have been branded as slackers by Ontario newspapers. Happily, that cowardly cry has been re-echoed nowhere else than in the mind of that pack of snarlers, and here again we have found a champion in the person of an eminent newspaper man of Toronto, who, by the way, is recognized as a warm conscriptionist, and who could not forbear from protesting against the unwarranted campaign of vituperation and abuse carried on against the province of Quebec. On June 20, he expressed himself at Niagara Falls as follows:

Above all considerations which demand that ignoble partisanship should be checked, bayoneted and buried stands the necessity of keeping the door open to harmony when the war is over. To make of the war in the Flanders a prelude to the war in Canada would be the most disastrous issue in Canadian history. It were folly to smile when one hears of civil war from the very people who were living in discord before the war started and fostering a race antagonism which is contrary to the larger development of the British ideal. Unfortunately, sooner or later war brings to the surface difficulties which heretofore had given rise to irritation and friction.

True, the change of heart of the Prime Minister in favour of conscription did precipitate a crisis which is more widespread and more intense in Quebec than in the other provinces and the utmost anxiety as to the complete mobilization of man-power is felt on account of Quebec.

With regard to that state of things, it is necessary to keep in sight certain considerations appealing to our dignity and patriotism.

1. The Prime Minister himself has proposed conscription only after having paid a visit to the scene of war and having received such information as are wanting to his fellow-countrymen.

2. The knowing ones who have endorsed the views of the conscriptionists ought to be wise enough not to denounce as disloyal the man who takes an attitude adopted by themselves, not so very long ago.

[Mr. Ethier.]

3. The Government has carried on no education campaign in Quebec, although it had become evident, from the very outset, that matters were decidedly taking an undesirable turn.

4. At the last general elections in Quebec, the leaders of the present Administration encouraged a campaign in that province which gave the Prime Minister now in power twenty followers, and in which the people were warned that a day should come when they would be conscripted to go and fight the battles of England. The Government now want to conscript those citizens for a war in which the Canadian army has been placed under the command of English generals whose nomination is in no way under the control of Canada and about whom we know very little, as shown by the facts in connection with the resignation of Sir Julian Byng. In Quebec they say: "We are only colonials fighting for England, our men being in the British army without Canada having its say in the matter and without being able to reach the men who may culpably sacrifice Canadian lives."

6. The assurance given by the Prime Minister to the hierarchy and to the labour leaders that the National Service cards were not meant to lead to conscription nor to the introduction of a conscription measure without the people being consulted.

The failure in certain English-speaking districts to have an enlistment in proportion to the number of available men makes it desirable that Ontario should deal with Ontario before devoting her attentions to a neighbouring province. When the Ontario-born shall have supplied as many men for the defence of Ontario as the British-born have supplied to Ontario and when the thousands of Ontario slackers who, according to the statements made by the Government have gone over to the United States, shall have been brought back to Canada, it may then perhaps be more reasonable to throw out insinuations against Quebec.

The fact which Ontario should consider is that for a whole year voluntary recruiting has been a failure, and that the Government is responsible for it.

No, Sir, the French Canadians are no slackers; and a proof conclusive, if proof were needed, is their attitude in December and January last, when the National Service was created. Neither did the clergy of the province of Quebec prove recreant to their duty, for they have taken the lead in that connection, as witness the following letter sent out by His Grace the Archbishop of Montreal, which I wish to put on Hansard:

Archbishop's Palace,

January 3, 1917.

Dearly beloved Brethren:

The newspapers have already informed you of the direction which we felt we should give to the clergy and members of the various religious institutes of our diocese, in regard to the question styled "The National Service."

We wish to give you the same direction, convinced that, in taking this line of conduct, we are acting in the best interests of our entire population. "This is not a question of politics." Nor is it either a question of conscription. For weighty and very wise reasons,

which have been approved by eminent men, independent of all parties, the Government wishes to make, as is were, an inventory of all the forces, of all the resources which our country can command, from a commercial, agricultural and industrial standpoint.

The information which the Government solicits will be of great service during the war; it will be available after the war is over. For this reason a certain number of questions are put to citizens between the ages of sixteen and sixty-five. It is highly fitting that we should answer them. The answers from the country and cities will give an idea of family and social conditions in our province of Quebec which will redound to our credit. You will write these answers, very dear brethren, in all liberty, sincerely and loyally.

It is not necessary to ask yourselves what will be done in other parts of the country.

Let us set an example. Let us prove that we are actuated by an enlightened patriotism, and conformably to the teaching and traditions of the Catholic Church. Let us show respectful deference towards the civil authority within its rights.

Confident, my dear brethren, that you will fully follow our counsel, we reiterate the assurance of our affection and devotion.

(Signed) Paul,
Archbishop of Montreal.

Archbishop's Palace, January 3, 1917.

Is that the language of a slacker, of a disloyal man? The slackers, the impostors are those members of the Administration who did not scruple to deceive the Canadian hierarchy by inducing them, under false representations, to issue such a letter.

Now, what we have done in this war, to quote the words uttered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier on May 12, as recorded in Hansard:

What we have done, we have done for the cause of freedom, that cause for which France has already borne such a heavy burden and made such heavy sacrifices. I am proud to say to Mr. Viviani that what we have done we have done willingly, freely, voluntarily, and through no sense of compulsion. It was, indeed, the belief in many parts of the old world where the virtue of British institutions was not understood, that as soon as England became engaged in a war the result would be very different from what actually happened when this war broke out. It was the calculation of the German Emperor, of the German militarists, and of the German people, that if England became engaged in a war there would forthwith be civil war in Ireland, insurrection in India, and the British colonies would seize the opportunity to sever their connection with the Mother Country. Sir, we are not surprised that those views were entertained in Germany, because the German people have never understood the spirit of liberty. Contrary to all their calculations this paradox of an empire of free peoples has become a living thing under British institutions.

Mr. Viviani has also expressed to us the thanks and gratitude of the French people for the part borne by our soldiers on the battlefield.

That testimony of gratitude we accept; we accept it for our noble boys who have done their part in a manner to do credit to themselves and bring glory to their country. When we faced the thought of war, there may have been those amongst us who were apprehensive as to what might be the conduct of our young soldiers, soldiers not enured to war, not previously trained for military life, and for whom the first shock of battle might be a severe ordeal. Thank the Lord, we know to-day, and it is our pride to know, that they have borne themselves in a manner which proves that the blood in their veins has not degenerated.

Let us, therefore, begin by sending back to England all the blokes, all the slackers who have come over here to escape conscription in the Homeland, and who are now falling over each other and overcrowding the departments in Ottawa, more particularly the Militia Department, and who are depriving of employment our workingmen in the manufactories and in munitions factories.

Let me ask you, Sir, when the National Service was created, where the slackers and the cowards were to be found? At Detroit, to mention only one point at the frontier, English-speaking young men, for fear lest the National Service should lead to compulsory service, crossed the United States border to escape conscription. And did not the loyal Minister of Inland Revenue and his colleague the hon. Secretary of State encourage their fellow-countrymen in Dorchester county to step across the 45th line, to escape military service?

For what purpose does the Act provide for the compulsory selective service of manhood? It merely tends to discriminate in favour of the privileged class.

What is needed above all is conscription in intensive farming, in production, and in munitions, such as advocated by Lord Shaughnessy, and lastly, conscription of wealth.

Our soldiers protest against the disbanding of their regiments; they want their units to retain their identity overseas; they want good equipment, good rifles, good food, and protection at the hands of their officers. What the Allies want is not so much manpower as food to win the war, and in confirmation of my statement, I could quote no better authority than that of Mr. Hanna, who has just been appointed food controller by the Government:

The outstanding fact of the food situation, which it is imperative that every citizen of Canada should realize at once is that Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium and their European allies are wholly unable to supply the allied armies at the front and on the way. For nearly three years their man power has been engaged in the direct work of war and in some cases large areas of their most productive lands have been overrun by the enemy. Their food shortage and the food to supply the armies of Canada and the United States must be wholly provided from this side of the Atlantic. The supply must also be sufficient to cover losses

at sea. Australia, New Zealand, the Argentine Republic and other countries are not now available to relieve the situation because of their remoteness, and the shortage of tonnage.

Obligation on Every one.

The crop of storable foods grown in Canada and the United States suitable for shipment overseas threatens to be entirely inadequate to meet the demand unless the whole people determine by every means in their power to make up the shortage. Every individual is under a direct obligation to assist in rationing the allied forces. There must be national self-denial and national co-operation to provide the necessary supplies.

Time and investigation will be required to determine the best means of assuring adequate rations for the Canadian divisions and the allied nations and armies. But there are some measures that are so obviously right that we ask that they be adopted at once and that the men and women of the Dominion pledge themselves to their observance. They include:

Measures Necessary.

Maximum production.

The largest possible consumption of perishable foodstuffs in order to liberate the storable foods for transportation.

The adoption of war menus.

The prevention of food waste.

The utilization and creation of organized volunteer bodies to assist the food controller in increasing and conserving food supplies.

Use of perishable foods.

The restriction of ocean tonnage makes increased production and consumption of perishable foodstuffs at home imperative if the more easily transported commodities are to be released for export. The food problem of the Dominion is not measured by the domestic market, but by the needs of the Allied armies and nations. They require tremendous supplies of wheat, meats, fish, cheese, beans, canned and evaporated foods and other commodities. They cannot be rationed unless the Dominion saves such foodstuffs for export. Additional production of perishable products will be necessary to fill domestic wants. These can be met and waste prevented by national consumption of perishable foodstuffs. Fruits and vegetables in their seasons, should be the country's foods to the greatest possible extent.

Grave wastage.

Food is being wasted in the stores, hotels, restaurants, clubs and homes of the Dominion. It is the duty of every citizen dealing in or preparing and serving food to adopt measures which will eliminate waste entirely.

The adoption of war menus is a national duty if the country is to do its share in the provision of food essential to the successful prosecution of the war. There must be immediate voluntary action to curtail table excesses. The soldier lives simply. He is not given a choice of many dishes and delicacies.

Invites all assistance.

The efforts of the Dominion and Provincial Departments of Agriculture, other governmental organizations and the voluntary associations already at work are greatly appreciated. Their further assistance is earnestly invited. All organized bodies and every citizen should study means of conserving the non-perishable foods. There is equal need for increased production of perishable products. Where the work or organization has not already been done, we suggest that the mayors and reeves of urban communities take action at once, so that all available labour in the municipalities may be put at the service of those who need it, preference being given in every instance to those whose sons or husbands have gone to the front. There are many men in towns and villages who have had farm experience, whose services will be of great value in this connection.

Public realization of the true food position is imperative. We make an earnest appeal to the churches of the Dominion to lay the facts and the needs of the situation strongly before their congregations.

The soldiers at the front expect the men and women of Canada to do their share in providing the necessary food. They must not be disappointed. They will not be disappointed unless they are betrayed by the people at home. Any self-denial practiced in the homes of the Dominion will be insignificant in comparison with that of the Canadian and Allied armies or with the privations which millions of people in Belgium and Serbia continually suffer. Food conservation is essential to win the war.

What we need is a sound and honest Administration; what we want is a fresh mandate from the people, because the renewal of our mandate, which had expired a year ago, was obtained under false representations, and this Parliament exists none the less on sufferance.

The conscription of manhood we are asked to pass into law would spell the economic ruin of Canada, the loss of our national and political liberties, the dislocation and downfall of Confederation. I will go further, Sir, and say that it would be an act of treason towards England and towards the Allies to deprive them of the needed assistance and necessary means to bear the burden of war. And the people do not want to be a party to such treason.

The national debt now stands at $900,000,000, while it stood only at $336,000,000 when the war started, and at the end of the present year, it will have reached the enormous figure of $1,300,000,000.

To what extent shall that debt soon have piled up, if we keep pursuing such an extravagant policy as we are now carrying on, which will ultimately plunge the country into bankruptcy?

How I ask, are we going to provide for our returned soldiers and veterans, for the widows of the soldiers who died in battle, for our disabled soldiers, for our cripples, our invalids if we leave our young country depleted, and our immense territory undeveloped and untilled, and if we heap upon the shoulders of the future generations such a stupendous debt they will not be able to stand the strain. That is a post-war problem, that the Government should carefully work out, and then I do not think that this conscription of manhood will help

them solve the problem. Hon. gentlemen are astonished at the stand taken by some Liberal members whose views do not tally with the opinions entertained by the right hon. leader of the Opposition on this question, and they rush to the conclusion that those Liberal members are endorsing the Conservative cause. And yet, every one of these hon. gentlemen, with the exception of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has explained his attitude in no equivocal way, and the future will tell the hon. gentlemen that the Liberals have absolute and supreme confidence in the honesty, integrity, loyalty and uprightness of the great man who has led the party for the last 30 years, and under his leadership, they will once more be able "to drive the thieves from the temple."

Now, Sir, I wonder what do the hon. gentlemen who sit behind this Government think of the resignation of the former Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) and the expression of opinion contained in his letter to the right hon. Prime Minister on date of June 5 in which he says in part what follows:

> I have always thought, and do yet think, that the best interests of Canada make it a duty for this country to give to the cause of the allies its most generous support. But to do this, I cannot concur in any measure which in my estimation imperils national unity. The proposed law, I have every reason to fear, threatens to destroy this unity, and to give rise throughout the country to deep internal divisions of long duration, and even detrimental to the needs of the present moment. Indeed it is better to keep the country united in the present effort than to attempt a mightier one at the cost of national disruption.
>
> I, therefore, find myself unable to approve of the proposed law, and the only course open to me is to offer my resignation as a minister of the Crown.

I can only congratulate the ex-Secretary of State for the dignified tone of his letter. I could not say as much of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny). It seems to me that, by following the example of his elder, he would have been of better service to his country and to his compatriots. Time will assign to each his real worth.

The leader of the Opposition in Quebec, Mr. Arthur Sauvé, has himself also declared, at St. Benoit and at St. Rose, in terms just as strong, that, having formerly opposed imperialism, under the form of military co-operation, he could not now declare himself in favour of compulsion.

I will cite the language he used at St. Benoit:

> In my humble opinion, the desirability of conscription not having yet been demonstrated, I cannot approve it, and I am still convinced that its application would be most difficult, not to say impossible, and that it might exasperate our population, paralyze our initiative, throw perturbation into our economic domain and create disastrous disturbances.

Now, here is what he said at Ste. Rose:

> Canada has done her duty and the necessity for the new sacrifices which the Federal Government calls for has not yet been demonstrated. I am convinced that a referendum would prove that conscription is not more popular in the other provinces than it is in Quebec.

And he added:

> Canada has done enough.
>
> Canada has received many a token of admiration from the foreign countries and the intensity of her effort as well as the efficacy of her co-operation have been unanimously acknowledged. Considering this evidence, it must be admitted that Canada has done enough and that it is time for her to think of her own future if she does not wish to be ruined.
>
> Besides England does not oblige us to have conscription, such a measure pledging her to concede us later on inevitable sacrifices.

I rejoice at finding that, in spite of divergent views and past differences, Mr. Sauvé and I can meet on the same ground upon that vital question of conscription. I have nothing but praise for his noble attitude and his strong declarations upon this question.

Organized labour and the working man, individually, are also opposed to the measure. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) has dealt with that side of the question in a masterly way. I will not therefore take up any time to discuss it. I wish, however, to have inserted in the Hansard some of the labour unions' resolutions expressing their disapproval and the reasons they give for it.

At the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, held in Ottawa from June 1 to June 4 instant, and at which more than eighty unions were represented, several questions relating to labour problems were discussed and among these was that of conscription. Resolutions, which had been adopted in all the different parts of the Dominion, were laid before the congress. After a seven hours' debate, among other resolution the following was adopted:

> Believing that the workers of Canada are looking for a lead on the attitude that should be assumed by them toward the proposed scheme of conscription, we recommend that the following conclusions be sent broadcast throughout Canada:
>
> On December 27, 1916, Premier Borden informed the executive of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, that if conscription should prove the only effective method to preserve the existence of the State and of the institutions and liberties which we enjoy, I should not hesitate to act accordingly.

We are positively of the opinion that this situation has not arrived.

The necessities for the effective conduct of the war are: Food, munitions, shipping, and military man power, and Canada is geographically well situated to supply the first named three essentials, and can do much to assist in winning the war by developing her production in these essentials to her fullest extent.

We are strongly of the opinion that this is the best service that Canada, with her small population, can render.

We declare ourselves as most emphatically opposed to the proposed conscription measure, and we urge the workers of Canada to oppose by every means in their power the enactment of such legislation.

This resolution was adopted as submitted by the entire delegation, with the exception of five votes in favour of conscription of men, but on condition that conscription of wealth would be included in the provisions of the same Act.

The Labour Federation of British Columbia have also entered their protest against conscription; they have addressed to the right hon. Prime Minister, to the leader of the Opposition and to the members of both sides of the House a copy of their resolution, dated June 8 inst., and which reads as follows:

1. That military or industrial conscription is the imposition of a form of servitude which is obnoxious to a so-called free people.

2. That militarism is the curse of present civilization, and a result of trade jeaousies between nations.

3. That military autocracy in Germany or any other country cannot be defeated by the establishment of the same form of autocracy in countries which have been free from them.

4. That the only people that can defeat so-called Prussianism is the people of Germany, and the adoption of a like system in this country only extends the evils of a Prussian military system to a people who have been free from such servitude, and who resent the attempt, "under any pretext," to foist upon them conscriptive measures, military or industrial, which would inevitably bring about a similar situation in this country, to that which obtains in countries cursed by compulsory military service.

5. Measures of this nature imposed upon a people under the guise of temporary necessity, have invariably become permanent institutions.

We ask that due consideration be given to our opposition, and would conclude by stating that it is the intention to use all the force at our command to resist conscription in any form.

On behalf of the Executive,

A. S. Wells, Secretary-Treasurer.
J. Naylor, President.

Attention should also be paid to the stand taken by the Trades and Labour Council of Calgary. On the 27th instant, it was decided to ask all the unions to take part on the scheme of a general strike which would be called as a means of protesting against conscription.

Will the Government, in the face of all these protests from all the parts of the Dominion, and from all classes of society, persist in imposing their military service law? I am confident of the contrary. Will the Prime Minister assume the risk and the responsibility of all the consequences that may follow, if those I have mentioned and of others even more serious which threaten us, especially that strike considered by organized labour? Will he provoke such a strike that will bring us dearth and famine and even, perhaps, revolution? I do not wish it, Mr. Speaker, far from me such a thought!

The only way to prevent the misfortunes which threaten us is, as hae been pointed out by the hon. leader of the Opposition: a referendum or else an appeal to the people by means of a general election.

I beg the hon. Prime Minister to reconsider his decision of May 18, as he has already done so more than once since August 4, 1914, upon this same question of conscription. I am satisfied that, after having duly considered and accepted the suggestion of Dr. L. G. Bland, of the Winnipeg Methodist Church, who wants the Prime Minister to convene in Ottawa representatives of all the public and religious bodies, of all the legal and medical associations, of the boards of trade all over the country, and of the labour organizations, to discuss the conscription issue, he will acknowledge his error, the fairness and appropriateness of the stand taken by the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

Before concluding, Mr. Speaker, I cannot pass over in silence the additional amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette) without giving my reason for opposing it. In my humble opinion it is a snare very badly set, a shift very poorly conceived, a commonplace trick inspired and prompted, if not by the Government, undoubtedly by one of its ministers, artist, musician and gentleman farmer. Like his leader, the member for Berthier can alter his opinion. On this June 6, 1916, he wrote to his electors the following:

Allow me, Mr. Secretary to repeat to you the statement I made last fall in Berthierville, in the presence of 6,000 electors of my county and of the surrounding country, when I stated that I was completely opposed to conscription. This year, on the very Sunday following the declaration made by the Prime Minister of Canada, I again stated before my fellow parishioners that I was entirely opposed to this measure of the Government. I was then doing a

free act of my own, knowing that I was doing it for the best interest of my constituents.

I do hope that this statement will cheer the hearts of all the good French Canadians of my county and of my province.

Please accept, my dear friend, the expression of my most distinguished sentiments and believe me,

Yours most truly,

J. A. Barrette.

In the meantime he has found out that he requires six months to meditate and change his stand of June, 1917.

O tempora, o mores!

To sum up, I shall vote against the Barrette amendment to the amendment, for the Laurier amendment and against the second reading of the Bill imposing conscription; and, in so doing, I am following the dictates of my conscience, without any mental reservation, frankly and honest'y, and I believe I am in agreement with the views of the Canadian people, who wish to be consulted, either through a referendum or, better still, through a general election.

Mr. H. ACHIM (Labelle) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) and I am happy to state that, beside all the qualities I know him to possess, he showed he was endowed with still another one, when he made a confession. It is a confession which the province of Quebec has been awaiting for almost six years. Of course, the hon. member for Two Mountains took occasion to state that all the members of this House are without a mandate. We, of the province of Quebec, have been satisfied for six years that the hon. member for Two Mountains was sitting here without a mandate. As a matter of fact, considering that the little incident I refer to is about six years old and that the member for Two Mountains has been occupying his seat in this House close on to six years without interruption, it may be assumed that he sits here by prescription, but I will not press the matter any further just now.

Being radically opposed to the principle of conscription, to the principle of the Bill now before this House, I shall not follow the hon. member for Two Mountains through the deep and detailed study he has made of it, section by section.

However, as the hon. member for Two Mountains has spoken at a certain length, what happens to long-winded orators was his lot: he has not remained throughout consistent with himself, as I shall show presently. But before so doing, let me state, Mr. Speaker, that I hold no mandate to defend the Bill, nor the Government, as the rest of my speech will prove later on. Speaking upon the Bill, the hon. member for Two Mountains exclaims that he is completely opposed to this selective conscription measure and he asks himself what selective conscription means and, in an outburst of eloquence of no uncertain breadth, he exclaims: "I will not have selective conscription, I want every one to go to the front, since conscription is needed."

He enumerates the different kinds of people who should go to the front and he ends by saying, with much generosity, that he wants to send overseas the "curés" as well as the Protestant ministers; but, a little further in his speech, he cries out: "What the Allies need is production and still more production."

Well, I repeat it, I have no mandate to defend the Bill, but I will say this: That selective conscription means that there are persons whose presence in this country is more essential than that of others. For instance, the presence of a farmer is of more consequence to the country than that of a bar-tender or of a store-clerk.

That is exactly the view of my hon. friend, the member for Two Mountains, and I will not offend his legal sense or his sense of the present responsibilities by believing that he is actually ignorant of what selective conscription means. Besides this, the hon. member for Two Mountains having taken the liberty of making an assertion which, to my mind, reflects on the Bench of this country, I think it is my duty, as a member of this House, to look up the matter. It is when he says that there is some distrust against that section of the Bill which provides for the appointment of two persons in order to choose among those who will be sent to the front and those who shall remain at home.

It is most evident that one of these two appointees, if I understand the Bill, should be designated by the Parliament of Canada or by the Minister of Justice and the other one—and that is where I find a guarantee of impartiality—by one of the district judges.

The hon. member for Two Mountains is, like myself, a country lawyer and he knows that we can most assuredly rely upon the impartiality of our magistrates who preside over the administration of justice in our districts.

There is another reference, made by the hon. member for Two Mountains, which concerns me in a particular way. Not that I hold a brief to defend the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. P. E. Blondin) who is now in active service, or the hon. minister of In-

land Revenue (Mr. Sevigny), because they are members of a Conservative Cabinet, but simply because they are both personal friends of mine. It is when he says that the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, during the Dorchester election, last winter, would have advised the electors of Dorchester, were conscription voted, to run away, to cross over the lines and go to the United States.

The hon. Secretary of State has made in this House a declaration to that effect, a declaration which, if I rightly understand Parliamentary procedure, must be accepted, which I have myself accepted, which the hon. members on the other side of this House have accepted, and which the hon. member for Two Mountains has no right to call in question.

In the absence of the hon. Secretary of State, I think I should defend him against such attacks, and as for the Minister of Inland Revenue, I do not believe he has ever mentioned such a thing in his speeches and he has not been accused, as far as I know, of having given any such advice to the electors of Dorchester.

I would be assuming too much, at this advanced stage of the debate, if I flattered myself with the thought of adding any new fact to the mass of information already supplied by the best speakers representing the three main conflicting views. Far from being able to aduce new facts, I believe is most difficult even to evolve from a further consideration of them arguments and conclusions different from those already stated in this House. But, coming from a province where the Bill we are now discussing has created, I shall not say more anxiety than elsewhere, but a commotion which has expressed itself more violently on the surface and made it the object of aspersions on the part of some hon. members, I believe it is my duty to say a few words which may help to dispel, if possible, the prejudices of those honourable gentlemen. My name having been mentioned as a seconder of the motion for the six months hoist, I think I should claim the attention of this House for a few minutes.

I have listened closely to all the speeches made heretofore, from the most important down, considering that no opinion is unimportant under such exceptional circumstances—I have even read them carefully over and you will perhaps allow me to interest myself more particularly to one of these which is not the less remarkable, both

[Mr. Achim.]

in its substance and in its form, that of my hon. friend the minister of Inland Revenue.

My congratulations to him in the first place for having remembered that the two party leaders have pledged themselves from the very start, in their own name and that of their followers, according to the very words of the leader of the Opposition: "That the discussion of this measure would bear the stamp of impartiality and moderation, that is would be free from all acrimony and bitterness."

While I think of it, Mr. Speaker, I may improve the opportunity to say a few words about the charges which have been made against me by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) and by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). These honourable gentlemen have thought fit to have this House amuse itself at my expense; the latter upbraids me for still being in this country, though an officer of the Canadian voluntary militia, I mean the 54th of Sherbrooke, an honour which I share with the hon. member for Berthier. There is a great difference between a volunteer officer and a conscript. It is true the hon. member for Frontenac is not an officer, but nothing prevents him from enlisting if he feels like it. The difierence there is between him and me is this he remains very quietly with his family and would compel all others to enlist, while I am also quietly at home, but without trying to force any one into active service.

I also wish to refer to some remarks emanating from the hon. member for Frontenac, concerning the honour I have had, some years ago, of seconding the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

The hon. member for Frontenac has no right to represent my conduct on that occasion as being inconsistent with the one I take to-day. When I accepted that honour, I did not suspect that the military craze which has taken hold of our country would impose upon us an effort out of proportion with our strength and our resources. I also said that I was in favour of Canada's participation in the war, on the condition that the Constitution be respected and that the constitutional status which binds us to Great Britain would not be violated. I was justified in taking such a stand at the time, but at the present moment, as the Bill introduced into this House tears into shreds the Canadian constitution, I propose to oppose it, and to do so as strenuously as I possibly can. If as a member I cannot approve of the views of the hon. minister, I am proud, as a friend, to acknowledge that he has succeeded in replacing the debate on a level where both leaders wished

it to remain, above the range of political meanness to which certain members had lowered it.

If elevation of thought and beauty of expression were the equivalent of correctness of views, my hon. friend would have made the speech of his life.

Far from me the idea of crossing swords with the hon. minister—I have neither the inclination nor the capacity—but his stand upon this Bill being directly contrary to mine, one of us two must be wrong, and I will surprise no one by admitting that I do not believe it is your humble servant.

Were I as eloquent as my hon. friend, I would try to persuade him that the fault is on his side.

His whole speech leaves the impression that his attitude is inspired by the most disinterested sentiments, and I hasten to say that I believe him entirely sincere, although I attribute such sentiments to false ideas.

Here is what the minister says at page 2747 of Hansard, unrevised edition.

> Why should our minority be isolated on this continent of America, where we are surrounded by English provinces and by the American nation with her hundred million inhabitants?

This is a sincere feeling of concern; I admit that I have myself been a prey to it and that it has caused me long hesitation in deciding what policy I shall follow.

But considering the facts, was this disquiet justifiable? in fact, is our province isolated, when the whole Liberal party has the same ideas and is ready to give the same vote as the representatives of the province of Quebec?

I do not see that the Quebec delegation is in such bad company, when it follows the leader of the Opposition, a man in whom English Canada as well as French Canada, from coast to coast, have had entire confidence during fifteen years.

Is the province of Quebec isolated when it is in such company as that of the hon. member for St. John; the hon. member for Edmonton, and the hon. member for Pictou?

Is the province of Quebec isolated when it seems admitted that it is of one mind with the Maritime Provinces?

If such be isolation, allow me to say, Sir, that it is a splendid isolation.

No doubt the leader of the Opposition has seen leaving him talented men whom he held dear and who could render invaluable service for the defence of his ideas. But there is still around him a solid following of English members, and after hearing the speeches of both sides, I think that the first have sacrificed reason to sentiment, while the others have held to principles and sound doctrine.

With this theory of isolation, is it not to be assumed, after all, that outside of this House the majority of the electorate is in favour of conscription?

That is a gratuitous assumption, which the facts do not justify and which the hon. member for South Wellington admits to be false. Could I not answer it by the no less gratuitous but more probable statement that the great majority of the electors of the other provinces, including those of the ultra-loyal Ontario are opposed to conscription or at least in favour of a referendum?

As my opinion is well worth that of anyone else, whence he may come, I shall hold to it till the Government has had the courage to consult the people, the only one interested—the people who labour, who weep and who die in this war. No; I repeat again that the French Canadians are not alone in favour of a referendum.

Everyone outside of this House is loudly calling for it, and the voice of a whole people, whatever is done to smother it, will at last be heard.

Hon. Mr. SEVIGNY: Will my hon. friend allow me a question?

Mr. ACHIM: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. SEVIGNY: Concerning the isolation of which my hon. friend has just spoken does he think that it would be a boon for the French Canadians to have no more representation in the Government?

Mr. ACHIM: My hon. friend puts an exceedingly delicate question to which I could with difficulty reply without hurting his present feelings and without taking explicit exception to the course he has chosen to adopt. Much would have I preferred it had my hon. friend not raised the issue, but since he has, I have no option but to tell him that in my opinion it would be better.

Should ever a disruption occur in this country, Mr. Speaker, I say that it will not take place between the province of Quebec and the remainder of Canada, but between the province of Ontario and the rest of the Dominion. Yes Ontario, where the capitalists are attempting to crush the freedom of labour, Ontario whose manufacturers are attempting to restrain the freedom of trade, Ontario whose jingoes are trying to strangle freedom of conscience. I do say that if ever there is a disruption, that will be it, and the sooner the better perhaps.

Mr. Speaker, I am grieved beyond expression to have to utter such words and I pray you to believe that before bringing myself to utter them, many doleful hours have I gone through; I feel that old bonds are being severed which I had hoped would be permanent. In brief, Mr. Speaker, I must declare that in this House I shall vote on this question with the Liberal party; that at the next elections I shall vote for the anti-conscriptionist candidate, that I resign as conservative candidate in the county of Labelle and that in the province of Quebec I shall speak in favour of the Liberal party.

The Minister of Inland Revenue labours under another delusion which I should like to dispel. He gives the result of the Dorchester election as a verdict in favour of compulsory service. And such is my hon. friend's appreciation of his constituents that he argues—I epitomize—" What is the good of a referendum? We held one in Dorchester and Dorchester has spoken the verdict of all the electors of Canada. When Augustus had imbibed, Poland was full " " Quand Auguste avait bu, la Pologne était ivre ". The argument is more creditable to the electors of Dorchester than to the Minister's powers of interpretation. The part of his speech to which I refer is to be found at page 2497 of unrevised Hansard and reads as follows:

> What does the vote given at this election mean from a constitutional point of view? Does it not mean that the war policy of the Government was approved, as it has been approved by the members for the past three years, and has not this policy of the Government been to make every sacrifice to carry the war to a successful end, as far as conscription if necessary.

I agree with the whole paragraph save the following words: " As far as conscription if necessary ". To that statement I take the most strenuous objection, because those who did cast their votes for my hon. friend had in their minds not the statement made by the Prime Minister in his letter to workmen dated December 27, 1916, but the one he made long ago on the floor of this House, which was quoted by the right hon. leader of the Opposition and which may be found at page 2497 of unrevised Hansard:

> 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.

If my hon. friend insinuates that the electors of Dorchester by their vote, wished to approve of conscription, I must tell him that he would not be sitting on the treasury benches if at the election he had so declared himself.

In all justice however I must say that in the whole splendid campaign wherein I had the honour and pleasure of accompanying him, I never heard the minister, publicly or privately, oppose conscription. That is a tribute I owe to his sincerity. But my mandate is much less recent than that of the minister. I cannot oppose the principle of the referendum. My election, as that of most of the other members of this House, dates so far back that its mandate might after all be forgotten; but electors sometimes have a clearer memory that their representatives and my electors seem to stick to the motto of their province: " Ils se souviennent ", " They remember ".

I do not claim as many do that I know why I have been elected; I am no partisan of the doctrine that a member must in all things and ever do the will of his constituents, even if he realizes that it is founded on unjustifiable motives. My idea is that in 1911 my electors did not place in my hands a blank which I could fill as I cared.

What I do know is that, had I in 1911 stated I was in favour of conscription without the people being consulted, I should not have the privilege of a seat in this House. Now that the people's verdict has sent me here, I will not take advantage of it to rivet irons around the ankles of those who have elected me as the champion of their constitutional liberties.

For freedom, for democracy, for their brothers left behind, Canadians have equalled the very bravest at Givenchy, Langemarck, Courcelette and Vimy. They form a bulwark to our institutions those heroes of ours who live the cruel life of the trenches, writhe on a sick bed, or sleep the last sleep in the knolls of Flanders. The happy vision of a nation whose freedom and self-respect they have helped to maintain is to some a balm to their wounds and was to the others a solace at their last hour.

And that valued freedom, the freedom that inspires heroes, you now want to kill, while those young lives are sacrificing themselves for its sake; it is unreasonable and I will not be a party to it.

Mr. Speaker, I stated at the beginning of my remarks that I would take advantage of my seconding the amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Berthier in order to say a few words on the subject. Allow me, Sir, first to express my surprise at the meaning which my hon. friends of the Opposition seem to give to this

second amendment, taking it for granted that the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe has been a true interpreter of their common opinion. Howsoever it be, the mouthpiece of the Liberal party in Montreal does not hesitate to state that obviously a trap is being set for the Liberals which they are not such fools as to step into.

The best-intentioned give credit to the hon. member for Berthier and myself for a cleverness in tactics which neither of us ever dreamt we possessed. But others there are, whose opinion it would be safer to take, who do think that we are not men who would steer between two courses, but that we are perfectly sincere, honestly believing that we express the opinion of the people of this country in this matter. Every one is free to choose whichever of those two opinions he cares, but I side with frankness leaving to my hon. friends of the Opposition any pretense at astuteness. I wish to add, as the hon. member for Berthier has done, that in seconding this amendment I have not yielded to any outside influence either from the Government or otherwise. After hearing the statements made by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe I did long waver as to making my mind to follow him in the mud into which he floundered; but I deemed the present crisis too acute, the present contest to bloody to ridicule a man whose shoulders are weighted under so many burdens. In any case has he not taken upon himself the task of our vengeance by branding himself with the words everybody knows and which put him in the rank of the very lowest demagogues. But let him beware, the crisis will pass and people who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

Our amendment is put forward in such a spirit of loyalty, and is so devoid of partisanship that it should, meseems, rally all members who are good-intentioned and sincere and I must say that whatever be the position taken by the right hon. leader of the Opposition towards our motion, I shall nevertheless vote in favor of the amendment he has moved and so will do the hon. member for Berthier. Although the amendment to the amendment has a much greater bearing on the bill than the Laurier amendment and practically means its doom, I must state that not a member of this House is prouder than I am of being a British subject and appreciates more than I do the blessing of living under the British flag and that I am not yet forgetful that the English colonial system tolerates every freedom and fosters all ideals. My present position, whatever may be thought of it elsewhere, is that of a true Canadian.

Mr. HERMENEGILDE BOULAY (Rimouski) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It being so late it seems to me that we ought to be at least twenty to listen to such a good speaker as the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Lanctot).

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie) having risen to speak:

Mr. HERMENEGILDE BOULAY (Rimouski) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. At this late hour the hon. member for Laprairie rises to speak, and he is such a fine orator it seems to me there should be at least a quorum of twenty members to listen to him. I call your attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. SPEAKER: I find that the point of order is well taken.

And a count having been taken, it was found that a quorum was not in the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is not a quorum present. This House stands adjourned until Tuesday afternoon at three o'clock.

Accordingly, the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m. until Tuesday, July 3, at 3 o'clock.

Tuesday, July 3, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

MOTION TO REINSTATE ORDER LAPSED FOR WANT OF A QUORUM.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): In consequence of the House having failed to maintain a quorum on Friday evening, it becomes necessary for me to move, seconded by hon. Mr. Cochrane:

That the order of the day for "resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Robert Borden for the second reading of Bill No. 75, an Act respecting Military Service, the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto, and the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barrette," having lapsed by reason of the House being declared adjourned for want of a quorum on the 29th ultimo, when the said order was under consideration be revived and placed on the Order Paper for consideration this day.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (St. John): No notice of this motion has been made by

word of mouth, nor does it appear upon the Order Paper that this motion would be moved. I would submit, therefore, that it cannot be passed except by the unanimous consent of the House. I feel myself personally constrained to raise an objection to the motion and to urge that the rules of the House should be adhered to. On Friday last, when the Bill was under consideration, there was not a quorum in the House; there were only some eighteen members present. Perhaps it is not out of place to call attention to the fact that during the last week there was scarcely a day when, if any hon. member on this side of the House had taken the point of order that there was not a quorum, the House would have been counted out. On Friday evening, however, the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay), an hon. member ordinarily supporting the Government, raised the objection that there was not a quorum. At that time there were only four members—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is the hon. member speaking to a point of order or on the motion?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am stating my objections to the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion of itself does not permit of debate, but I would have no objection to a very limited discussion on the point of order. I hope the hon. member for St. John will confine his remarks strictly to the point of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will confine my remarks to the point of order, but I thought it would not be out of place to state the reason which induced me to insist upon the point of order being ruled upon by Your Honour. The undoubted result of the House being counted out on Friday is that the second reading of the Bill is a dropped order. I call Your Honour's attention to Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, page 323:

> A "count out" will always supersede any question that is before the House; and if an order of the day for Supply, or for the reading or committal of a Bill, be under consideration at the time, and there is no quorum present, the House must be asked at a subsequent sitting to revive the question that may have lapsed in this way.

There are a number of authorities cited in the notes:

> 131 English Com. J. 391, 329; Forfeiture Relief Bill, ordered to be considered on a future day. 235 English Hansard, (3), 203; 131 English Com. J. 282-3, Committee of Supply. 137 Ib. 18, 297, 306, 483.

I would also call Your Honour's attention to May's Parliamentary Practice, page 263. I need not direct Your Honour's attention to the fact that wherever the Canadian rules do not specially provide, the English procedure, prior to Confederation, is made to apply. On page 263, May says:

> When an order of the day has been read, the proceedings thereon may be cut short by the adjournment of the House whilst those proceedings are in course of transaction. An order of the day, in such a case, or if, when the order is read, no day is appointed for its future consideration, drops off the notice paper, as the House has made no order thereon; and in committee the same result may be produced, either by a failure of a quorum of the House, or by resolution direct the Chairman to leave the Chair. To replace a dropped order of the day upon the notice paper, a motion is made before the commencement, or after the close, of public business, to appoint the order for a subsequent day.

It was quite open for a member of the Government on Friday evening to place upon the Order Paper a notice of motion fixing to-day for the revival of the discussion of this Bill. In that case, it would have appeared properly upon the Order Paper to-day, and hon. members intending to take part in the debate, seeing the notice on the Order Paper, would naturally be present to discharge their duty. As a matter of fact, I believe the hon. member who was speaking at the time the House was counted out, is not present because it was assumed that the discussion would not be resumed to-day by reason of the Bill having been dropped. May says:

> To replace a dropped order of the day upon the notice paper, a motion is made before the commencement, or after the close, of public business, to appoint the order for a subsequent day; and these motions are made without notice.

A member of the Government might on Friday night have placed upon the Order Paper a motion for consideration to-day. May goes on:

> If on such order of the day procedure had been commenced and interrupted, the proceeding thus revived is set down for resumption at the position indicated by the last decision of the House entered upon the Votes and Proceedings. If, however, it is essential that proceedings on an order of the day, cut short by an unexpected adjournment, should be resumed at the next sitting, to obtain that object a notice of motion is placed for that purpose, in the name of a minister of the Crown, upon the notice paper for the next sitting, at the commencement of public business, and the dropped order is placed, printed in italics, at the head of the list of the orders of the day.

Then there is another authority which is referred to in Bourinot as authority for the statement that such a motion may be made

without notice, but a reference to the authority will show that it is simply a confirmation of the practice as laid down in May's Parliamentary Practice. The authority referred to is Blackmore's Speakers' Decisions, page 69:

"Count out. Effect of." If the House is counted out in any stage of a Bill the Bill becomes a dropped order. Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education) Bill. Observations. Vol. 249, pages 987-8. August 14, 1879.

Then further under the heading of "dropped order, revival of consideration," Blackmore says:

In the event of a Bill becoming a dropped order it is competent on a subsequent day, without notice, to move to fix a day for its being again considered.

So that my right hon. friend would be quite in order in moving to-day without notice to fix a subsequent day, such as tomorrow or the day after, as he might desire, for the Bill being again considered. Under these authorities, I believe, this motion cannot pass except by unanimous consent of the House; and I deem it my duty to raise the objection I do.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as our practice is concerned, it is laid down in Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, page 538:

If a Bill becomes a dropped order by the counting out of the House it is competent for a member to revive it on a subsequent day without notice.

Mr. PUGSLEY: From which edition is the Prime Minister quoting?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The last edition, I think.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, I think not.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Page 538 is the page given me by the Clerk of the House. As a matter of fact it has been the universal practice of our House when an Order of the Day lapses, to revive it at once. On many occasions, I myself have seen this. When Mr. Fielding was Minister of Finance, I have seen an amendment to the motion that the Speaker do now leave the Chair accepted by the Government of the day. The passing of such an amendment means that the order is superseded and becomes virtually a dropped order. The practice was to move immediately that the House do now resolve itself into Committee of Supply, without notice, and supply was taken up on the same day. A notable instance of the same character is found in the proceedings of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of 22nd and 25th June, 1877. There was a motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of Supply. An hon. member proposed an amendment. At twenty minutes past nine on Friday the House was counted out, and on the following Monday the Chancellor of the Exchequer moved that the House do immediately resolve itself into Committee of Supply. After some debate as to the regularity of the motion, the Speaker declared it in order and it was accepted. The motion followed: "That the Speaker do now leave the Chair." On that motion being proposed, an hon. member moved an amendment. After considerable debate, the amendment was carried, and for the second time on the same day, the order that the House should resolve itself into Committee of Supply became a lapsed order. Whereupon the Chancellor of the Exchequer moved, for the second time on the same day, "That the House do immediately resolve itself into Committee of Supply." The motion was carried. It was then moved, "That the Speaker do now leave the Chair." A further amendment was proposed, and a debate took place. The amendment was defeated, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

I venture to think that the authority of Bourinot and the illustrations I have given from our own practice and from the British parliamentary practice are amply sufficient to sustain the regularity of the motion I have made.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My reply to my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) shall be very brief. He referred to the practice in England, having reference to the House being counted out, in the evening. There is I believe a special rule that between eight and nine it is not necessary that a quorum should be present. Was the case to which the right hon. gentleman refers between eight and nine?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was at twenty minutes after nine.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In that case any remark based upon the rule to which I have referred would not be applicable. It seems to me that where my right hon. friend is in error is in relying upon the text of Bourinot without having regard to the case cited by him. The authority upon which Bourinot relies is Blackmore's Speakers' Decisions, page 69, to which I have called attention already, the question that arose on the di-

cussion of the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland) Bill. The decision in that case was that:

> In the event of a Bill becoming a dropped order it is competent on a subsequent day, without notice, to move to fix a day for its being again considered.

That must be a day subsequent.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It does not say so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it is undoubtedly so. The alternative method is given by May, as follows:

> If, however, it is essential that proceedings on an order of the day, cut short by an unexpected adjournment, should be resumed at the next sitting, to obtain that object a notice of motion is placed for that purpose, in the name of a minister of the Crown, upon the notice paper for the next sitting, at the commencement of public business; and the dropped order is placed, printed in italics, at the head of the list of the orders of the day.

I think it is very clear under these authorities that my right hon. friend has no right to move that the Bill be again placed on the Order Paper without having given notice, which, under the old rule, would be oral notice, but now means notice printed in the Order Paper. This ought to have been done, and the proposed departure from the established practice can only be taken by unanimous concent.

Mr. SPEAKER: Bourinot, 4th Edition, at page 538, says:

> If a Bill becomes a dropped order by the counting out of the House, it is competent for a member to revive it on a subsequent day without notice.

"Subsequent day" is a day after the day on which the order lapses, which lapse is caused by reason of a quorum not being present. That, I think, is the weight to be given to the word "subsequent," the word "subsequent" not having reference to a notice of motion. Also, I direct the attention of the House to May, 12th Edition, page 219:

> Certain formal motions which are necessary for the due transaction of business are also made without notice, before the commencement, or after the close of public business, such as motions for the first readings of bills received from the House of Lords; for the consideration of Lord's amendments forthwith, or upon a future day; for the postponement, the discharge, or the revival of an order of the day.

The question is arguable as to whether it is competent to proceed with this motion. But I point out to the House that we are in this respect breaking new ground, as the question has not before arisen in this House. That being so, the consideration that guides me is that there is no prejudice to the public business or to the public interest by reason of this motion being dealt with. On the other hand, if a motion of this character should require even a day's notice, it might so happen that the public interest would be prejudiced. Having anticipated that this discussion might arise, I have considered the question, and I am very clear in my opinion that the motion of the Prime Minister is in order, and that it is competent for the House to proceed with the order if the motion should carry.

Motion agreed to.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

COMMITTEE NAMED TO CONSIDER CORRECTNESS OF AN ENTRY IN THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the last sitting of the House the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin) raised a point of order with respect to a motion in amendment to an amendment submitted by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette). In considering the point I discovered on examining the said amendment to the amendment as it appeared in the Votes and Proceedings that the entry is not a correct transcription of the motion placed in my hands by the hon. member for Berthier. If an error, or a wrong entry, is discovered immediately, it would appear to be competent for the Clerk of the House to have a correction made by entering an erratum; but where some time elapses before the error is discovered, such a correction could only be made by order of the House.

It is not only important that the records of the House should be exact, but there is the further consideration that a member ought not to be prejudiced by an act of an official of the House. To submit a motion that such correction be made, without proper evidence, might involve a debate without advantage. In my judgment, the matter is of sufficient importance to call for an inquiry by a select committee, which could be appointed forthwith, with permission to sit during the sessions of the House, and to which instructions should be given to report at the next sitting of the House, recommending an alteration in accordance with the facts. I have therefore placed a motion in the hands of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden).

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of any discrepancy between

the motion as proposed and the record of it in the Votes and Proceedings. When you mentioned the matter to me, I suggested that you should submit the question to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as to the best course to be pursued. The motion which has been placed in my hands and which I move, seconded by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, if he has no objection, is:

That a special committee of five members, to be named by Mr. Speaker, be appointed to inquire into the correctness of the entry of the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Berthier to the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917 as entered in the Votes and Proceedings of June 20; that the said special committee have leave to sit during the time the House is in session, with power to send for persons and papers; that it be instructed to recommend such alterations in the Votes and Proceedings as the facts may warrant; and that it be further instructed to report at the next sitting of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I second the motion.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I name Messrs. Northrup, Boys, Barnard, Pugsley and Boivin to constitute this committee, and I would ask Mr. Northrup to convene the committee at the earliest possible moment this afternoon.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Consideration of the motion of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto, and on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barrette, resumed from Friday, June 29

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that the hon. member for Guysborough will resume the debate. I would like to suggest to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that the House might fairly consent to the hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Lanctot) resuming his speech, which was interrupted by the sudden counting out of the House. He is not here to-day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly, that would go without saying. Of course, it would be most unfair to place any obstacle in the way of his speech.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It would seem to the onlooker that this conscription proposal is not very popular with the supporters of this Government; otherwise, the House would not have been counted out for want of a quorum at the session on Friday night. Even the ministers themselves appear to have given up all hope of passing this Bill, or, apparently, they have lost interest in it; otherwise they would have prevented that catastrophe happening. We have about fourteen members of the Cabinet, and we have, I do not know how many, under secretaries besides; so that if we had had a full meeting of the Cabinet on Friday night, as we ought to have had when a vital question of this kind is before the country, the disaster would not have happened. But, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that they have rallied and that there is a better attendance here this afternoon. It looks to me as if, notwithstanding what happened on Friday night, the Government may still be able to carry on.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is in compliment to my hon. friend.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am glad to hear it. It is quite true that this debate has already occupied a considerable time, but in dealing with a great question such as the one which is now before the House, it is proper and desirable that each member should state the reasons for the vote he intends to give. I may say frankly, to begin with, that I intend to support the amendment moved by my leader. I do not take this course for the purpose of defeating this Bill, but for the purpose of making it more effective. Hon. members will agree with me that an important measure of this kind should not be enacted by a moribund Government without some kind of an appeal to the people. It should not be enacted unless we have behind it a strong body of public opinion. If we do enact it without that it will necessarily be a dead letter. Let us make no mistake; in the present state of public opinion, especially in the province of Quebec, this measure cannot be enforced. Hon. gentlemen opposite, and some of my hon. friends on this side, talk glibly about forcing the people to fight. We have no machinery in this country to force men to fight. We are not equipped, as they are in Germany, for that purpose. The Kaiser can make a law this morning, he can have it printed by the imperial press this afternoon, and to-morrow morning he can place it in the hands of the Prussian Guards and ask them to en-

force it at the point of the bayonet. We have no such system in this country. We have no standing army to perform services of that kind. Macaulay once used the following language:—

I know of only two ways by which society can be governed—by public opinion and by the sword.

My leader is making a sincere attempt by this amendment to reconcile contending interests and parties and to govern this country by public opinion, and so far as this amendment is concerned I intend to stand by him. If the amendment carries, if it should be accepted by the Government, it will become part of the Bill. If on the other hand, the amendment is defeated, I do not intend to offer any opposition to the Bill going to committee. There are some important objections that I have to certain clauses of this Bill, and I hold myself free, when the Bill is in committee and on the third reading, to give such a vote and to take such a course as in my judgment will be in the public interest.

I may say further that, if the sub-amendment moved by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette) is voted on, I will vote against it. I was somewhat surprised to see the six months' hoist to a Government Bill moved by an hon. gentleman who is such an enthusiastic supporter of this Government as is the hon. member for Berthier. There is an added reason for this surprise when we remember that the mover and the seconder of this motion were both recently honoured with commissions in His Majesty's forces by the present Government. There is reason to believe, however, that the action of these two hon. gentlemen will not in the least disturb the entente cordiale which has existed between the two wings of the Conservative party ever since the alliance between the Prime Minister and the leader of the Nationalist party in 1911.

I find it somewhat hard to understand the attitude of this Government in regard to consulting the people. Why should we not consult the people? Surely the people of this country are as loyal and as anxious to win this war as the Government is or as hon. gentlemen on this side or the other side of the House are. I was brought up under a different school. I learned my lessons from men who had learned their lessons on democracy at the feet of the late Hon. Joseph Howe. In the province of Nova Scotia, Howe was known as the tribune of the people. In the early days of the past century Howe found the province of Nova Scotia under the control of an oligarchy not unlike the present Administration and he determined that he would free the province from that rule. The fight was long and fierce, but he won out and he gave to the province of Nova Scotia the boon of responsible government. The motto of Howe during that conflict and the motto of the Liberal party in the province of Nova Scotia ever since that day has been: Let the people rule——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. SINCLAIR—and it is their motto to-day. I believe that Nova Scotia was the first province in Canada to gain this boon of responsible government; but the gospel spread to other provinces, the good work was taken up by such men as Baldwin, Lafontaine and Brown, and after a time all the provinces of Canada secured and now enjoy the great boon of responsible government. It looks to me now as if we would have to fight all this battle over again. Will any man say that we are to-day living under responsible government in this country? We are not, we are living under a government of party bosses that, in secret conclave and behind closed doors, decide what we shall have or shall not have, and it seems to me that it is our first duty to restore in this country responsible government. Do not imagine that the people of Canada do not prize the privilege of being consulted upon their own affairs. For one hundred years the Canadian people have striven to win the rights of a free democracy, and they have succeeded and what they have they will hold. I say that no far reaching measure like this should be enacted without some kind of an appeal to the people. I find it hard to understand the attitude of some hon. gentlemen on my own side of the House. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) seems to hold the view that a majority of the people of Canada are opposed to this measure, and that if we submitted it to them they would defeat it. That is what he said. I differ from my hon friend. I believe, Sir, that if this question was submitted to the people of Canada in a right manner, by the leaders of both parties, that it would not be defeated. But, in any case, what right have we to dictate to the people of Canada? Who are we that we should force our opinions and our will upon the people of this country against their will? Have we, Sir, some sort of divine right like that which is claimed by the Kaiser of Germany or by the late King of Greece?

A great deal has been said about the solid vote that would be given in Quebec against the referendum. If the principle of this Bill is defeated on a referendum in this country, it will not be by Quebec, because Quebec has not enough votes to defeat it. The blue-books show that the total registered vote in the Dominion in 1911, in all the provinces, was 1,820,742. The total registered vote in Quebec was only 455,288, or less than one-quarter of the whole registered vote of Canada, so that even if every elector in Quebec voted against conscription, which of course would not occur, you would still have 1,365,454 electors in the other parts of Canada to deal with. The total vote in Quebec, after all, is only about equal to the soldiers' vote, and everybody says that the soldiers are in favour of conscription. Thus the soldiers' vote, if taken, would offset the total vote of Quebec, and if it be true that we could not carry this measure by the majority of the rest of Canada, then, if you did pass it, it would be an absolutely dead letter, and so it should not be passed. It has been said that there would be difficulties about taking the votes of the soldiers, and that argument appeals to me. The soldiers ought to have an opportunity of voting upon this question. There would be no difficulty in taking the soldiers' vote in Canada or in England; but there are over 100,000 soldiers in France where there might be difficulty in taking their votes. I would propose, and I think it is a reasonable proposal and one that should be accepted, that it would be fair, if the Government decided to refer this matter to the people, to insert a clause in the Bill providing that the votes of soldiers on active service whose votes could not be conveniently taken at the front, should be counted as in favour of conscription. I make that proposal and I think it a fair one that could not be objected to by members of this House on either side, although I am only speaking for myself.

Then the delay that would be involved in taking a referendum has been dwelt upon. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) himself has settled that question because he has made a proposal that we should pass this Bill with a rider saying that it should not come into force until after a general election. If there is time for a general election—the Prime Minister knows more about the circumstances than anybody else—I submit that there is time for a referendum. The press supporting the Government and some hon. gentlemen also have tried to put forward the idea that our soldiers at the front are crying out for support, that they are in great straits, and that if we do not send them support, they will be overwhelmed at the front. Do you think, Sir, that this is true, or is that cry raised for political effect? I submit that there is no evidence on which to base such a statement. Do you think that, with a total battle line extending over five hundred miles, defended by six or seven millions of the best fighting men and the biggest guns in the world, our little bunch of four divisions are feeling anxious about their support?

Why, Sir, the statement is not true, and if it were true, it would be a very severe reflection on the British command. Such statements as that should not be made, because they are mischievous and tend to do harm. Surely our case for recruits is strong enough, without indulging in an exaggeration of that kind. Let it not be said that there is danger of Canadian soldiers being left to their fate, and being denied the necessary support by the British and French high commands at the front, for such is not the case. There is not the slightest danger, and there never was any danger, of our soldiers being deserted in that way.

Mr. CURRIE: How is it the Canadians had to hold their lines for nearly twelve days, without support, at the battle of Ypres? I was there and I know.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It could not have been that there were no reinforcements. If it be true that the hon. member was there he should have stayed there. But that is not the point. There is a reason, however, and a much better reason than that, why we should supply recruits. Every Canadian who has pride in his country, and red blood in his veins, wants to see the gaps filled by Canadians and our four divisions at the front kept up to full fighting strength. I trust we all agree that this must be done, and, if it cannot be done by voluntary enlistment, it must be done by conscription. I quite realize that this is a question on which there may be very strong differences of opinion, even among those who are anxious to arrive at the very best conclusion. I do not say that because a man does not agree with me his views are wrong, or that his conduct is improper. This is a free country. It is freedom we are fighting for, and the best way to deal with this question is to have a free and open dis-

cussion, and each man to say what he thinks. It is results we are after, and we cannot get results by quarrelling among ourselves. The way to get results is to keep cool, and to cultivate a spirit of unity and toleration. My honoured leader has spent the greater part of a long and useful life in a sincere effort to weld together the two great races in this country, and to create a vigorous Canadian sentiment, not only in the province of Quebec, but in the other provinces. Seven or eight years ago we all thought that he had succeeded, but a change came for the worst. An enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat. The enemy that sowed the tares was the Bourassas, Lavergnes, the Blondins and the Sevignys, at the time of the election in Drummond-Arthabaska, and I am sorry to say that the evil seed was blessed by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he gave voice to the slogan: "Anything to beat Laurier."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I wish my hon. friend would give us the ipsissima verba of that blessing. I have asked for it before, but I could never get it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend should remember that himself. I do not want to be too hard on my hon. friend. I have a great deal of respect for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He has had a very long, and, in many respects, a worthy career. He has had a varied experience in what Mr. Dooley calls the great university of this wicked world. No doubt, like other great men, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has made mistakes. We, on this side of the House, would not wish to be too hard on him. We would feel like forgiving him for these mistakes if he would show signs of repentance. I do not says that he has made too many mistakes. He once built a Canadian navy on wind. It looked fine. It looked trim and good and apparently fit to sail the seven seas, but within two or three years he blew it on the rocks with more wind, and it is now high and dry, and a total wreck. But the most regrettable incident of a long and distinguished career was his conduct, in a moment of weakness, I suppose, at the time of the election in Drummond-Arthabaska, but it did not end there. The evil seed was watered by the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), and by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane). In 1911 the fertilizer was paid for by the member for Ste. Antoine Division, Montreal (Sir Herbert Ames), and we are now reaping the harvest, and a fine mess it is. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this country will place the responsibility for that mess where it properly belongs, at the door of the present Administration. Sir, we are told by the Prime Minister that voluntary recruiting has failed, and that we must resort to compulsion. That statement has been disputed by many hon. members of this House, especially by my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll), who told the House that voluntary enlistment had not failed in Nova Scotia. The evidence before the House on this point is not very clear. The statement of the Prime Minister may be true, and I am not going to say it is not true, but if the Prime Minister or the Minister of Militia would state the policy of the Government in regard to this matter, we would be better prepared to form an opinion. Is it our policy to send all the men we can to the front, or is it our policy to maintain four divisions at the front? We do not know. From the information we have we cannot tell what the policy of the Government is on that question. The Prime Minister of Australia has stated frankly that the Australian people are attempting to hold five divisions at the front, and to supply the recruits necessary to fill the gaps in those five divisions by voluntary enlistment, but we have no idea what we are attempting in Canada. I submit, Sir, that the House is entitled to more information on this question than we have yet received. The hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Smith) a few days ago asked the following question:

1. What has been the total number of casualties in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces since June, 1916, to date?

Here is the answer:

Total number of casualties in Canadian Expeditionary Force from the 30th June, 1916, to June 5, 1917, is as follows:

Officers	2,957
Other ranks	62,592
Total	65,549

The second question is as follows:

2. What has been the total number of recruits enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces from June, 1916, to date?

The answer to that question is as follows:

The number of recruits enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force from June 30, 1916, to May 31, 1917, was 74,510.

If you subtract one of these from the other, you find the excess of recruits over casualties during the past year is 8,961 I

do not place much dependence upon these figures, because there is the wildest confusion in connection with all the information that we get on this question of recruiting. I could show you returns, Sir, which have been placed on the table of this House by the Government which prove that 70,000 men have disappeared altogether. They have enlisted, but they have not been killed; they are not wounded, they are not in the hospitals. They are not prisoners; they are not on the other side of the Atlantic, and they are not on this side of the Atlantic. They have disappeared as completely as the army of Sennacherib referred to in Bible story and the Lord knows where they are. That is an illustration of the kind of information that we are getting from the Militia Department.

The whole matter of getting men comes down to a question of method. Speaking for myself, I do not like compulsion. It may be necessary; if it is necessary I am going to support it, but I prefer the voluntary system. A similar preference prevails among the people of Australia—even among the soldiers of Australia, I am told; as was evidenced by their vote some months ago on the question of a referendum. The gaps in the ranks of the immortal Anzacs have so far been filled and will be filled by voluntary recruiting and no one will say they are not doing well. There is not much glory in fighting for King and country when you have to at the point of a bayonet. Napoleon Bonaparte is credited with saying that one volunteer is worth three conscripts, and I believe that he was right. A few days ago I read a report in the press that a Canadian soldier somewhere in France had captured seventeen armed Germans in a trench or dug-out and single-handed drove them into camp as prisoners. I do not know whether or not the story is true, but very likely it is. Does the Minister of Militia suppose that one German could capture seventeen Canadians?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why? Because the Canadian soldier is a volunteer, while the German is a conscript. A few days ago a friend of mine was good enough to send me a thrilling story of the bravery of a Highland piper from Nova Scotia, who, amid the hail of shot and shell, climbed Vimy Ridge at the head of his company, playing the march of the Cameron men, with the Nova Scotia boys shouting and yelling behind him. Could an incident like this occur in an army of conscripts? I submit that it could not.

It is not force that we want in Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that force will never succeed in this country. What we want is enthusiasm; what we want more than anything else at the present time is a Peter the Hermit who will travel this country from end to end and fire the blood and arouse the martial spirit of the people. The voluntary system has not had a fair trial. Recruiting could not be handled worse than it was handled in the province from which I come. The young men of Nova Scotia did splendidly, but whatever success we had in recruiting in that province was due to private enterprise and not to anything done by this Government. In many cases recruiting officers were selected through political influence, not on account of their merits. They were sent out to hold meetings in places where they had never been before, and to speak to people who had never heard of them, while local men who could have had some influence were totally ignored. Such a campaign as that could not succeed; the wonder is that the results were as good as they were.

But this mismanagement was not confined to Nova Scotia; it seems to have been widespread. The province of Quebec, we are told, fared even worse than Nova Scotia. For two years I have listened to the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) urging the Government to send Major-General Lessard, or some such man, to the province of Quebec to take charge of recruiting. Why was Major-General Lessard not sent? Because he was not acceptable to the Government. It was not until the 29th of March of this year that the Government yielded, and then they sent Major-General Lessard under the wing of the Post-

4 p.m. master-General (Hon. P. E. Blondin). This was enough to damn the efforts of any man who attempted to perform the duties of a recruiting officer in the province of Quebec. In an interview given to the Montreal Gazette on May 21, the Postmaster-General himself said that if the province of Quebec had been properly organized under the direction of an officer like Major-General Lessard and the recruiting properly handled, the French-Canadians would have enlisted en masse. Why was the province of Quebec not properly organized? Who is to blame? The Postmaster-General himself was a member of the Government that failed to

do its duty; my courageous friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Albert Sévigny) was also a member of the Government.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman knows that Major-General Lessard was Inspector-General in Quebec during all that time, and that he had the whole thing in his hands, just as the Inspector-Generals in the West had in their own districts.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not know anything of the kind. He had no authority before March 29. I never heard that excuse given by the Government until this moment.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not know whether it is an excuse or not. It is a fact, however, that Major-General Lessard was placed in charge of the eastern districts and Major-Genertl Steele of those in the west. That was immediately after the war broke out. Major-General Lessard is still Inspector-General in the Quebec district.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Inspector-General without instructions to act. I have no doubt that when my hon. friend speaks he will attempt to justify the placing of a Methodist clergyman at the head of recruiting in the province of Quebec. That is how the Government dealt with this matter. I have no objection to a Methodist clergyman being put in any responsible position, but my hon. friend will agree that it was an indiscreet appointment, to say the least, to place recruiting in the province of Quebec under the control of a Methodist clergyman. The member for Rouville put the case very well when he asked what would have happened if the Superior of the Jesuit Order had been placed in charge of recruiting in Ontario.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I made a very full explanation regarding Rev. Mr. Williams' appointment. He did not direct his efforts amongst the French-Canadian people. His efforts were directed entirely amongst the English-speaking people of the province, among whom there was a tremendous enlistment.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Still he was the chief recruiting officer for the province. I am not very familiar with these matters. I am quite willing to accept the statement of the minister.

May I suggest that there is no good reason why we should not follow the example of Australia? Australia plans to keep five divisions up to full strength by raising 7,000 recruits a month under the voluntary system. No later than yesterday I read the following despatch from Sydney, New South Wales. It is dated July 2, and is as follows:

> Contrary to general expectations, Premier Hughes has not announced another conscription referendum. He said the Government put forward its proposals last year for compulsory service on the basis that 16,500 troops per month were required to keep five Australian divisions at full fighting strength. Later experience happily proved the British War Office estimate too high. The Government now appealed to Australia to raise at least 7,000 recruits monthly voluntarily. It also desired to secure such an additional number of recruits as would enable leave to be given to the remaining members of the first division so that they may return to Australia for a rest.
>
> Premier Hughes was sure that if all sections worked harmoniously and the voices of the conscriptionists and anti-conscriptionists alike were silent, men would rally to the colours and honor Australia. The Government would apply forthwith to the policy of preference of employment for returned soldiers.

We raised 6,520 recruits in May under the voluntary system, without, so far as I can learn, making any effort at all. It would seem that if Australia can supply the wastage of five divisions with 7,000 recruits a month, we in Canada ought to be able to supply the wastage of four divisions.

Mr. CURRIE: I suppose the hon. member knows that the Australian militia is in training all the time, and that those recruits are volunteers from that body. The militia are called out by the Premier, according to categories, for training.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not think that affects my argument in any case. Mr. Speaker why do we find ourselves in the confusion in which we are to-day? Why was National Service a failure? Why was home defence a failure? Why was voluntary recruiting a failure, if indeed it has been a failure? I submit that all these failures can be traced to the same cause. These attempts to accomplish something were abortive very largely on account of the patronage system that is being adhered to by the present Administration. Let us look, for example, at the case of Sir Thomas Tait. When he was appointed head of the National Service Commission, his appointment was hailed with pleasure by every man in Canada, irrespective of party. What happened? Within three weeks we heard that Sir Thomas Tait had resigned his appointment. Why? Because he was interfered with, because he would not submit to party dictation, why, Sir, he was not permitted even to appoint his own secretary. His

resignation was accepted and an extreme partisan put in his place.

There is another phase of this matter that I want to refer to shortly. I wish to lay down the principle that a measure so vital as this, involving the lives and hopes and fortunes of 100,000 young Canadians, should not be administered by a partisan Government. But hon. members opposite will say: We offered you a coalition. I do not wish to doubt the sincerity of the Prime Minister in regard to that offer, but if he really wanted a coalition, he took an extraordinary method of bringing it about. The courtship, to say the least, was a very clumsy affair. The Prime Minister told the public all about it before he spoke to the leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker I understand that you, Sir, have had some experience in these matters, and I will put it to you. Would any respectable young lady have anything to do with a fellow who first hired a hall and announced his intentions at a public meeting and then came to her with his proposal?

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the leader of the Opposition sustain the argument being indulged in by the hon. member?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I cannot say. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister must have done better than that in his domestic affairs. Had he not, he would not have succeeded as well as he has done. A coalition can be brought about only by "give and take." In this case it was "all take". If the Prime Minister really wanted a coalition, on his return from England, he should have sent for the leader of the Opposition and should have asked him to sit down at the table and talk the matter over and see if they could arrive at any common ground on which they could come together. But he did not do that. He throws the proposal down on the table of the House with a flourish and his supporters begin to cheer, and the Conservative press begin to wave the flag and to denounce the Grits and the French. The labour conventions protest against the proposal and an indignation meeting is called in the city of Montreal. After all this has happened, my right hon. friend comes to the leader of the Opposition with a cast-iron proposal—take it or leave it. Let us look for a moment at the proposal of the Prime Minister. The first thing is to form a coalition Government, then to pass the Conscription Bill and then to appeal to the country on the Conscription Bill. Under that proposal what opportunity would the country have to express any opinion? It would be the duty of the Prime Minister, if that agreement was carried out, to notify my opponent, provided I supported the coalition Government, to withdraw, and so with all the others. It would be the duty of the leader of the Opposition to ask all the Liberals throughout the country that are opposing Conservative candidates to withdraw. The result would be that this moribund Parliament would be elected by acclamation, and instead of one year's extension, we would have five years' extension.

Mr. BURNHAM: Do you exclude the people from nominating somebody?

Mr. SINCLAIR: No, but they would have to break away and form a new party. Is not that true?

Mr. BURNHAM: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is certainly true because I assume that if the leaders went into a proposal of this kind, they would do so in good faith and would stand by one another. Would it not be better to be frank and above board and to extend Parliament at once for five years than to pretend to consult the people by a pre-arranged scheme that would absolutely prevent the people from expressing any opinion whatever? Is it any wonder that the leader of the Opposition, who believes in responsible government and not in junkerdom, should reject such a proposal as that? Notwithstanding all that my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) said, with a flourish of his arm, that such a proposal was magnificent.

Mr. BURNHAM: He said it was magnanimous.

Mr. SINCLAIR: According to Hansard he said magnificent. All I have to say about that is "every man to his taste, as the old woman said when she kissed her cow." Besides the leader of the Government knew that no coalition was possible with the Minister of Public Works as a member of the Government. I think I have a right to assume, that fact from the attitude of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and that my leader would not become a member of a government of which the Minister of Public Works was a member. What happened? We find by the correspondence that has been placed upon Hansard that during the very time that the coalition proposal was before the two leaders, the Prime Minister was conducting other correspondence ostensibly for the

purpose of whitewashing the Minister of Public Works and retaining him in the Cabinet. Do you ask me how I know that? I know it by the dates in Hansard. It was announced in the press that the two leaders held their meetings after the 24th of May. The final meeting berween the leaders, according to a letter published in Hansard, took place on the 6th day of June. We also know from the correspondence that has been placed on Hansard that on the 28th of May the Minister of Public Works wrote to the Prime Minister asking for a new trial on the Galt charges, and on the 30th of May, two days later, the Prime Minister gave a favourable reply. Therefore, at the very date that the Prime Minister was pretending to carry on negotiations with the leader of the Opposition for a coalition, he was, behind the back of the leader of the Opposition, carrying on a secret correspondence, ostensibly for the purpose of whitewashing the Minister of Public Works, and retaining him in the Cabinet, knowing all the time that there could be no coalition with the Minister of Public Works a member of the new Government. I am not opposed to coalition. I regret very much the failure of the attempt of the two parties to get together. I am firmly convinced that a national government organized on broad lines representing all parties in this country, including labour, is the best solution of our present difficulties. Let me express the hope that if my leader is returned to power, as I believe he will be in the case of an election coming on, he will adopt this view and give this country a government in which, providing the war is going on, all parties will have confidence.

Hon. gentlemen have been emphasizing the necessity for more recruits. I have no doubt that recruits can be used to advantage. I am of the opinion that if every able-bodied man in Canada was enlisted and sent over to France, there would be plenty of work for them to do and they would be welcome there.

But there is something more important to this country, and that is honest, vigorous and efficient administration of our military affairs. If we are to succeed, if we are to do our part properly to win this war, three things are essential. The first is administration, the second money, and the third men. In my judgment, administration is the vital thing. You may have abundance of money, you may have a large army of courageous and devoted fighting men, but if the money is stolen or squandered, and the army mismanaged, you will end in failure, and the chances are you will end in disaster.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, you will not think that I am over-critical in my speech, for I do not desire to be. I recognize that this Government have had a gigantic task to perform, and I am quite willing to give them credit where credit is due. But I am not here to indulge in flattery or palaver. I think that in a serious time like this, plainness of speech is a duty, and I regard it as my duty, as a member of this House, to criticise and offer suggestions. That is the custom followed in the British House of Commons. In that House they call a spade a spade, and have done so ever since the war began. They discuss Cabinet changes, and even military mistakes, in the open. The British policy is to let the people know the truth and the whole truth. Only last week the details of the blunders in Mesopotamia were exposed to the public gaze. And I submit the British practice is the right practice. They have not much use over there for rubber-heeled statesmen, who either keep silent altogether or administer praise when they ought to criticise. In my opinion such men are not performing their proper functions as members of Parliament, I do not care on which side of the House they may sit. Therefore, before I sit down, I desire very respectfully to point out to the Prime Minister that there are certain other things besides the conscription of men that this Government can do, and ought to do, in order to help win this war. Two years ago the Prime Minister made an able, eloquent and stirring speech, in which he declared that "We should consecrate the whole wealth and resources of the nation towards the winning of this war." The announcement was well received by the people; it was head-lined in the press throughout the country. But the consecration never took place, or, if it did, it was but an empty ceremony. What is the use of "consecrating" our wealth if we still keep our money in our pockets? I propose that even at this late date we should decide to make a real consecration of our wealth to this purpose, even if in doing so we have to invade this House and extract some shekels from the pockets of the millionaires, who sit on the first and second rows of the Government benches—and, of course, if we have any millionaires on this side they must pay too; but I do not think we have; we are all poor but honest on this side of the House. And I propose that

we should devote a part of the money so obtained to an increase in the soldier's pay. Is it reasonable that the man who cuts the grass in your garden, or digs in the street, should get $2.50 or $3 a day, and that the worker in a munition factory should get from $5 to $8 a day; and that the soldier, who works long hours, endures hardship, and exposes himself and risks his life, should be paid $1.10 a day and found? I know very well the soldiers are not fighting for money. But that is no reason why we should not do them justice.

Then, we should prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. There was small reason for the existence of this traffic at the time the war broke out, and there is none at all now.

Again, we should either dispense with or force into some useful or productive occupation, the thousands of Government favourites who are now strutting about in the King's uniform and drawing the King's pay, but who neither fight nor work. My hon. friend from Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs), I understand, is a military critic. He is also a supporter of the Administration. He made a statement in the House which, I think, was intended as a reflection on the French Canadians, but which turns out to be an indictment of the Government he is supporting. He said that when he was in England he found a whole battalion composed chiefly of officers and non-commissioned officers, with very few private soldiers. What does that mean? It means that the Minister of Militia, the department, and the Government, have been so lavish in appointing their friends to positions, that to get rid of them they had to send them out of the country and across the water in whole battalions. I do not know as much about war as does my hon. friend from Parry Sound, but I know this much—you cannot carry on a war without some fighting men; and if you have a battalion that is composed almost altogether of officers and with few fighting men, about the only thing that that battalion can do is to mark time and draw their pay. If the Government wish to continue such a battalion, instead of "win the war" their slogan should be "win the jobs."

We should also open the gates of promotion equally to men of both political parties. Another suggestion: Let the Government stop indulging in Highway Bills and other election dodges in the most critical period of the great war. Let them punish, and completely suppress, any newspaper, French or English, that devotes its pages to preventing recruiting, or to kindling the flames of hatred between the two great races of this country. Let us impartially and honestly enforce the principle of equal service all around. If we do that the young men in Canada will see that we are in earnest and will respond to the call.

And one thing more. We should adopt a more liberal pension scale than we now have, and we should do it at once. I am informed that there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of widows and orphans who are depending on the cold charity of this country, who are not as well off to-day as they were when they had their husbands and fathers with them before the war. It is not sentimental speeches about the brave manner in which their husbands and fathers died that is wanted, but something to fill the cupboard.

And now as a last word: Let me appeal to the Prime Minister to throw himself upon the judgment of the people of this country by accepting the proposition of the leader of the Opposition. To my mind it is the only escape; it is the only way open to us to reconcile the province of Quebec. The leader of the Opposition has given his word that if we can secure a popular majority for this proposal the province of Quebec will submit. I have read, and reread, and pondered over his words, and I believe he is absolutely sincere and that he has taken this course because there is no other course open, and because he believes in his heart that it is in the best interests of Canada that he should take this course. Let me quote the pledge which he has made. Referring to the proposed referendum, he says:

> 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. When the consultation with the people has been had, when the verdict has been pronounced, I pledge my word, my reputation, that to the verdict, such as it is, every man will have to submit, and I claim to speak at least so far as is concerned for the province from which I come.
>
> Is that an unfair situation, is that an unfair appeal? Can any one say that it is not in accordance with true democratic principles? This I leave to the consideration of those whom I see before me.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the offer. The issue in this debate is clear. We must choose

between force and conciliation. The Prime Minister in effect says: There are certain people in this country, notably in the province of Quebec, who are not doing their duty; we will compel them to do their duty even if we have to do so at the point of the bayonet. The leader of the Opposition says: No, you have no authority to do that; first get authority; submit this matter to the electors of the country by a referendum; if the electors decide that this should be done, I will submit, and, in so far as I can speak for my province, they will submit, and both races will work together to carry out the will of the people. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility of the Prime Minister is heavy if he rejects that offer. If he accepts that offer there opens before us a vision of a united Canada, of the people of both great races standing shoulder to shoulder and striking their sturdiest blows in the cause of freedom. If, on the other hand, the proposal is rejected, we see a different picture. We have a vision of a country split in two, torn by internal strife and laying up a legacy of discord and hate for our children's children. Mr. Speaker, we are at the forks of the road, each of us must choose his path, and with these two pictures before my mind, I deem it my duty to vote for the amendment.

Hon. F. B. McCURDY (Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) does not correctly reflect public opinion in the province of Nova Scotia on this occasion. His views are not the views of the people of that province. In fact he does not even speak for the Liberal party in Nova Scotia. The hon. member spoke with pride of the source of his political inspiration; he said that he had sat at the feet of that great tribune of the people, Joseph Howe. I wish to remind the House that in the years when that distinguished statesman wielded his greatest influence in his native province, he occupied the editor's chair of the Nova Scotian, now the Halifax Morning Chronicle. His precepts and teachings have been consistently followed by that steadfast and doughty Liberal newspaper. No one has ever accused it of being other than true to that party's traditions, and competent to speak with authority for the Liberal party in that province. Well, I notice that in the Chronicle of June 28, in a leading editorial entitled "Steady, Boys, Steady," it says:

The Morning Chronicle shares Mr. Maclean's beliefs.

And Mr. A. K. Maclean is opposed to a referendum, opposed to the policy supported by my hon. friend from Guysborough. So that my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) is quite out of step, even with the recognized exponent of Liberal thought in my native province.

Very rarely since the war broke out has the progress of this Parliament been delayed by remarks from me, and if at this time, when the call of the nation is for action rather than debate, I am impelled to speak, it is only because the information acquired in the prosecution of official duties has so impressed me that I feel it would be wrong to be silent.

I wish to say in the most positive manner that it is my conviction that the need for reinforcements is so pressing and urgent that the man who stands in the way of such being provided at the earliest possible moment is assuming a responsibility of the gravest possible character.

The importance of the outcome of the present struggle does not need to be emphasized. No one more eloquently than the leader of the Opposition himself has pointed out the extreme gravity of the crisis. Speaking on February 8, 1916, in this House, Hansard page 632, the right hon. gentleman used these words:

> "Sir, who talks of Empire to-day? There are other things greater even than the Empire, great as it is. Civilization is greater than the Empire, and civilization is the issue. . . . Who can doubt but that if Germany were to win it would be the end of all we hold sacred. For my own part I re-echo the words lately spoken by that workman of the docks of Liverpool, who discussing compulsion in England put an end to all doubts by exclaiming, "If Germany should win, nothing on God's earth would matter." I speak my whole soul and heart when I say that if Germany were to win I would be thankful that Providence should close my eyes before I saw the sun rising on such a day.

The unanimous applause which greeted these statements when uttered measured the approval of all members of this House in the sentiments expressed.

But within the past few days the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) questioned the expediency of Canada continuing to exert her strongest efforts. I think the hon. gentleman contended that Canada's effort should be modified because of the entrance of the United States into the war. If the words which I have quoted from the speech of the leader of the

Opposition still represent the feeling of this House, as they reflected it when these words were uttered, it would have been more logical, and it would certainly have been more in line with the best opinion of this country if the hon. member for St. John had drawn the analogy between Canada's effort and that of Great Britain, rather than United States.

With every indication of sincerity, the hon. gentleman compared our population with that of United States, and argued that "because this war is as much their struggle as ours" the contribution of that country to the war should exceed 6,000,000 men. Could not the hon. gentleman quite as aptly have argued that, inasmuch as this struggle is as much ours as it is that of the Mother Country, our contribution of men should be as great relatively as that of Great Britain. Is he aware that more than 17 per cent of the total population of Great Britain, or almost 7,000,000 men, have enlisted for military service, and if Canada were to participate to the same relative extent, the Canadian Expeditionary Force would number not 421,767 as it stood on June 15, but 1,224,820. In suggesting that Canada so limit its efforts the hon. member may be speaking for a section of the population of this country, but if such a section exists in the part of Canada from which he and I come, then all I have to say is that it is a section of the population who keep their views very much to themselves, unless perchance they have communicated them to the hon. member for St. John. If the fine old loyalist city of St. John is correctly represented in this House by these expressions, then I am sure that my surprise that it be so will be shared by many members of the House.

The great question and the ominous one that faces us is "What is to be the decision in the present struggle of opposing forces on the field of battle.

We can win if all the Allies bring the whole of their strength to bear. There is the possibility that the Allies could win, and lives and property in Canada be kept safe, even without Canada exerting its full strength. But because there is such a possibility does such a prospect appeal to any full-blooded Canadian?

I am sure that the hon. gentleman who advises us to sit down and calculate to a nicety just how many of our liabilities we can shuffle over to our southern neighbours and just how little effort we can get off with does not correctly interpret the real temper of this country. The correct sentiment of the Canadian people was surely understood by the right hon. the Prime Minister when at the beginning of the war he decided to place Canada with all her resources on the side of right. He appreciated, with the best thought of Canada, what principles and issues were involved in the struggle. While other and larger nations hesitated and waited to inevitably drift in, Canada under his guidance found her place without a moment's hesitancy or delay.

It is, I am sure, a matter of gratification to every Canadian that the first offer of co-operation to reach the Mother Country from overseas came, as was fitting, from the oldest and strongest Dominion in the Empire. Before war had been declared and even before it was known to be inevitable, England had received by cable from Premier Borden the assurance of Canadian support. Hostilities had not been in progress sixty days before the largest fleet of transports and the biggest body of troops ever previously despatched at one time for overseas service in the history of the world had been mobilized, equipped and sent forward for service. Further reinforcements have continued to go forward, and in the words of the Prime Minister, so long as he is entrusted with the control of the destinies of Canada "What remains to be done will be measured only by Britain's need."

With the knowledge that has been gained of our great adversary and his methods; his cruelty, his barbarism, his duplicity, his total disregard of all the rights of any one, friend or foe, that stands in his way, his slaughter of innocent women and children, his murders on the high seas,—does any true Canadian regret the decision of August, 1914?

And having put our hand to the plough, shall we now turn back? Shall we with an increasing realization of the magnitude of our task now weaken or falter? Shall we fail to give our gallant boys at the front the support and reinforcements they imperiously ask for, and have the right to receive? To all such question the best spirit of Canada gives only one answer.

Canadian troops have been given a position of honour in the field. When I had the opportunity of visiting the armies in France in January last, they were undertaking to hold eleven miles of front along the Vimy Ridge. That name, then little known in this country, has since become a glorious tradition owing to the exploits of our men. They have defended the position at Vimy Ridge successfully and gloriously.

To hold this front required four divisions containing, among other arms of the service, approximately 52,000 infantry. A chain is as strong only as its weakest link; our attention must be riveted on our supply of infantry; that is the link we must watch. Furthermore, all other branches of our arms are subsidiary or complementary to it. The wastage in this arm of the service is figured at 15 per cent monthly. The actual wastage, of course, varies, but in operations such as are now progressing in France 15 per cent is under rather than over the real losses. We, therefore, at the present time require reinforcements of infantry to the number of 7,800 monthly. On May 14 according to the statement given to the House by the Minister of Militia, we had in England of class "A1" men immediately ready for the trenches, that is physically fit and with their training sufficiently advanced, and including those embodied in the 5th Division, 14,720 men of "A 1" class, or something less than two months reinforcements. There were also at the same time in England, other infantry whose training was not sufficiently far advanced or who were recovering from wounds or sickness, and men over 18 and not yet 19 years of age to the number of 22,460. There is only one other class of infantry reserves in England and those are part of the men mentioned in category "D" which contains infantry to the number of 9,476, which category is described as "men temporarily unfit for "A" "B" and "C" categories, but likely to be fit within 6 months." So that if all the men in classes 2 and 3 of category "A" and those over 18 but under 19 as well as "those who are temporarily unfit, but who are likely to be fit for service in 6 months" are included, we have as total reserves actual and prospective for the infantry in England 46,656. But these men will not all be fit within that time. Many who have been wounded, and become temporarily unfit for "A" "B" and "C" categories, will not be ready within that time.

Mr. KNOWLES: Could the hon. member give us any definite information as to when the 22,460 men will be available?

Mr. McCURDY: Supposing, for the sake of argument, that they could all be relied on to be fit within that period, then we have, on June 1, less than six months reinforcements in England for our infantry, and it must be remembered that in this calculation are included those who are not at the present moment sufficiently trained, or not in sufficiently fit physical condition for the trenches.

I have taken no account of the normal wastage among troops overseas but not actually in the trenches; such wastage, of course, exists, but, to the extent that it does exist, it further emphasizes the necessity for more men. And, as I have pointed out, we had at May 14 in England less than two months reinforcements of infantry ready for the trenches. So that, with less than 6 months infantry reinforcements of all classes in England on May 14, we turn to Canada to see what reserves are available here. At the end of May the infantry strength in Canada was, including troops embarked for overseas during May, less than 10,500. Even if all these were category "A1" men, they would represent less than six weeks reinforcements of wastage at the front, and they are not fit, and will not be for many months to come, owing to their training not being sufficiently advanced.

Furthermore, voluntary enlistments for infantry since January 1 have been on a meagre scale, so much so that when we deduct wastage in Canada, the number of such recruits enlisted since January 1 gives us no net result at all. For five months past this has been the condition prevailing. Under such circumstances, what course shall we follow? Shall we refuse to support the men who have gone to fight our battles? Shall we abandon them to their fate? Shall we refuse reinforcements to our forces?

Canada's forces must be considered as a unit. It is idle to talk of them being reinforced from or protected by, as the hon. member for St. John suggests, the armies of Britain, the United States, or any other allied country. To refill their thinning lines, to replace their fallen comrades, our gallant men turn not to the United States but to us who sent them forth. The proposition is put fairly to us: Shall we keep faith with them or desert them? There is no side-stepping the issue and time is swiftly passing. If the Act were to go into force at once, we could barely secure, before the end of the year, the necessary infantry reinforcements. It takes time to mobilize, train, equip and send the troops forward, and it seems to me that this Bill affords the only solution whereby these reinforcements can be provided.

That Canada has done admirably under the voluntary system is patent. We hear that expression constantly both at home and abroad. Perhaps its reiteration in Canada

may have engendered too much complacency, and adversely affected further recruiting. That Canada has under the voluntary system done better than was expected is quite true. I remember distinctly a conversation that, just after the outbreak of war, I had with some of our most active and experienced militia officers. Their unanimous opinion was that Canada's total contribution of men could not exceed 75,000. Yet, already, over five and one-half times that number have joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and almost five times that number have already proceeded overseas.

The hon. member for St. John paid a well-deserved tribute to the work done by the Canadian artillery. This branch of the service has established a reputation which is second to none in the armies in the field. Artillery work naturally attracts young men of ambition, ingenuity and force, but our position overseas with regard to artillery is much better than it is for infantry. The overseas authorities advise that they have sufficient artillery reserves for the next twelve months. The conditions in England were such that it became necessary to make transfers from that branch to the infantry. While, of course, recruits signed up are attested for any branch of the service, yet on enlistment they have expected to choose the branch of their own preference, and if they are transferred to another later on, necessarily disappointment is occasioned. For these reasons, recruiting for artillery has temporarily stopped. Not that artillery reinforcements are needed less, but that infantry reinforcements are needed more, explains the temporary discontinuance of artillery recruiting.

In any event what should be the measure of Canada's effort? It seems to me the answer is simple. If we agree with the right hon. leader of the Opposition that we are fighting for all that makes life worth living, our national spirit will be content with nothing less than the utmost we can do. It may suit some nations and peoples to shelter themselves behind the defence and sacrifice of others, but that is not the Canadian spirit.

I am the last to fail to appreciate the greatness of Canada's magnificent effort up to date, but a study of statistics of the combatting armies in this titanic struggle proves that all ideas of war effort previous to Armageddon are obsolete and have to be discarded.

The liability to military service is as fundamental as the liability to obey any laws of the land. Our system of democracy implies an obligation on the part of the state to protect the citizen, but also implies the obligation on the part of the citizen to protect the state.

It has been stated emphatically by speakers taking part in this debate, both by those in favour of the Bill and those against it, that compulsory service should have been inaugurated at the beginning of the war. Even the hon. member for St. John, whose sympathetic nature is so stirred by the prospect of the anguish and bitter tears and broken hearts to be caused by the enforcement of compulsory service at this stage, is nevertheless emphatic in his assertion that a course should have been adopted at the beginning of the war which would have had the effect of inaugurating these miseries three years ago. His feelings are harrowed by the thought that under this measure "men will be taken from their mothers, their fathers, their sisters, their sweethearts and their wives and sent across the sea."

Does not my hon. friend appreciate that these same hardships and partings are and have been endured under our voluntary system? Do men who have voluntarily enlisted from a high sense of duty have no regrets over leaving loved ones at home? Would my hon. friend contend that the feelings of the man who is compelled by legislation to enlist are any more susceptible, sensitive, or worthy of consideration than those of the man whose compulsion comes only from his conscience and a sense of honour and duty? And does he contend that those gallant men who have voluntarily gone out are less dear to those they leave behind them than are those who will come under the operation of this Act?

This Act will, of course, entail suffering and heartaches. Since this war began the whole earth has been drenched with tears and rent with anguish, but we believe that the tears that have been shed and the anguish that has been suffered are destined to save from those very horrors the generations who will come after us and for whom we are trustees.

I fully agree with those who say, in the light of the knowledge we have to-day, that it would be better to have had compulsory service from the beginning. But who, I ask, expected at the beginning of the war that the conflict would be of such long duration,

and that such sacrifices as have been called for would be demanded? In Great Britain, which is much nearer the scene of conflict, and where the contest can be better visualized, it was long after the beginning of the war before any suggestion of compulsory service was considered. The British authorities reckoned, as did many people in this country, that a few months would bring the defeat of the enemy, and, Anglo-Saxon-like, they took what now proves to have been only feeble steps to meet the danger. Finding their plans totally insufficient to insure victory, in the more threatening conditions which ensued, they revised them—as we must revise ours. Better, you say, compulsory service at the beginning; to which my reply is, better late than never.

If all the members of the House were to see the need as I see it, and as I believe the large majority do see it, they would not hesitate to take any action towards increasing the strength of Canadian arms, no matter how distasteful such action might be to portions of our population.

If our Allies held back—conforming with the advice of the hon. member for St. John, who suggests that we hold back—the result would certainly be disastrous. We, in common with our Allies, are fighting an enemy organized down to the minute. In this contest we cannot set the pace; we must give blow for blow. As he fights, as he is organized, so must we fight and organize. There is no other way to win. With the same effort, with the same organization as is used by the enemy, but with our greater numbers, our superior resources, and the justice of our cause, our ultimate triumph is certain.

Nothing, unfortunately, can take the place of man power in the firing line. Our other resources must and will be mobilized in the most effective manner, but the need of the moment is the provision of requisite manpower.

It has been said that volunteers give far better results on the field than an army which goes under some form of compulsion. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) this afternoon quoted the century-old opinion of Napoleon Bonaparte that one volunteer was worth three conscripts. Much to the satisfaction of the House, I am sure, he reinforced that opinion with his own. But any one who has followed the operations of the French army in the field and observed their record of achievement in the present war will experience difficulty in subscribing unqualifiedly to that view.

[Mr. McCurdy]

The outcome of this conflict is, in a material sense, the business of the State. If, with the consent of all parties, the future of the country has been pledged in the sum of upwards of a billion dollars, can it be said with any reason that the issue is a matter of local and individual concern, to be supported on the field only by those who choose to go out? Rather, it is the concern of the State to decide who can with the least economic loss be spared for military service.

5 p.m.

While the voluntary system has been wasteful, and while it has resulted in many going out whose places at the front could have been filled with less economic loss by others who have stayed behind, yet no doubt on sentimental grounds many will regret that its abandonment has been rendered necessary. I am convinced, however, that the continuance of this system under the present circumstances is not good business. All belligerent countries have realized this, and nearly all have long since come under a compulsory plan. The whole future of this country is clearly involved, and the time has come, in my opinion, for action in the interest of the State, regardless of personal considerations.

The present is a time of emergency, because of the necessity for obtaining infantry reinforcements. The amendment of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition is calculated, even under the most favourable circumstances, to consume much valuable time. How much time, even under the most favourable circumstances, would be lost?

Let us see what would happen if a majority of the members of this House were to vote for the amendment. Supposing it carried; what would happen? A new government would be formed. The organization of the new Administration would take time. That Government would then be bound to put the referendum to the people. In all decency, arrangements would have to be made to take such votes of soldiers in England and at the front as could be polled. Overseas transport to-day is, at best, slow and uncertain. I venture to say that this operation alone would consume at least three months. Then, supposing that the country, by referendum, approved of compulsory military service. The leader of the new Administration would proceed to enforce conscription. Before reinforcements could be secured to any extent, and while these political moves were being made, an overburdening load would be placed on our decimated forces at the front. Before effective reinforcements could reach France, the

Canadian force would have disgracefully dwindled and Canada would, after four years of war, find herself where the United States was at the end of the first four weeks of the war.

And what would happen if the referendum showed a majority against compulsory military service? Such a result could only come from lack of information on the part of the people. Under such circumstances, is the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) wrong when he considers it the duty of this Parliament to give the country a lead? With the experience which I have necessarily acquired in the prosecution of official duties, I naturally know more about the operations of the military forces of Canada than I did a year ago. For the same reason I should know more about the need than do the majority of the voters in this country, and I will take the responsibility of voting for the measure, and I earnestly pray that it will be put into effect with the least possible delay.

What the occasion demands is not debate, not discussion, but action, decisive, unanimous action on the part of this Parliament. To use a quotation not unfamiliar in this House, "We cannot wait because time will not wait."

In introducing a proposal of a purely domestic and business nature, the right hon. leader of the Opposition, as reported in Hansard, 1903, page 7659, was moved to use these impassioned words:

> To those who urge upon us the policy of to-morrow and to-morrow, and to-morrow; to those who tell us, wait, wait, wait; to those who advise us to pause, to consider, to reflect, to calculate and to inquire, our answer is: No, this is not a time for deliberation, this is a time for action. The flood of tide is upon us that leads on to fortune; if we let it pass it may never recur again. If we let it pass the voyage of our national life, bright as it is to-day, will be bound in shallows. We cannot wait, because time does not wait; we cannot wait because, in these days of wonderful development time lost is doubly lost; we cannot wait because at this moment there is a transformation going on in the conditions of our national life which it would be folly to ignore and a crime to overlook; we cannot wait, because the prairies of the Northwest, which for countless ages have been roamed over by the wild herds of the bison or by the scarcely less wild tribes of red men, are now invaded from all sides by the white race. . . . Such is our duty; it is immediate and imperative. It is not of to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour, and of this minute. Heaven grant that it is not already too late!

Mr. Speaker, may I ask in this momentous crisis, when the destiny not only of Canada but of human liberty itself hangs trembling in the balance, is haste less imperative, is delay less dangerous?

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): Mr. Speaker, a large number of hon. members have already spoken on the subject now before the House, and those of us who are speaking before the close of the debate, are able to congratulate our predecessors, generally speaking, because their words have been moderate and their speeches on the whole have been free from taunt and from objectionable remarks. There is a time for bitter controversy in a party sense, and there is a time when bitter controversy is not the happiest thing, and my view is that in this debate those who have excluded from their remarks taunting observations and factional, partisan statements, have been the happier for doing so. While I am not very strong in that regard, I will endeavour to leave out of my remarks what is factional and partisan, and when a weaker brother attempts to achieve some of the accomplishments of the stronger brother, I trust he will receive some encouragement. I say this in all seriousness, because I believe that the present juncture is one which every man, in casting his vote, must ask himself whether he is doing so in the best interest of the military operations which are now being carried on. I do not believe any hon. gentleman, seriously considering the questions now being discussed in this Chamber, would, in the last resort, cast his vote from any other wish than that of the best interest of his country. No man would think seriously of casting a vote that, while it might help his party, might do so at the expense of his country.

It is wonderful how all the countries whom we call Allies, and ourselves, are in this war voluntarily because we believe it is right for us to be in this war. I like to go back to the day when Serbia refused the arrogant, impudent ultimatum of Austria. Serbia had before her the opportunity of following a path in which there would be no suffering, no sacrifice, no bloodshed, no death, no devastation. All that Serbia had to do was to accede to that insolent ultimatum, and she might have gone on her way in quietness and peace. Serbia knew what war meant; Serbia had only lately been through the Balkan wars; but even Serbia, composed of a people from whom we might not think we could learn much, taught us a lesson that before she would renounce her nationhood, she would pay all the price she might be called upon to

pay and she would stand firm to her ideals as a nation. Serbia chose voluntarily the way of self-sacrifice.

What shall I say of Belgium? Hon. members will recall the way in which Belgium voluntarily entered this war. They will remember the request which the Kaiser sent to Belgium, that the people of Belgium might peaceably allow the forces of Germany to pass through their country, and his statement that he would pay the Belgians for all the damage done by his soldiers, and that no wanton damage would be done. But what would that have meant to Belgium? It would have meant the giving up of her nationhood, the sacrificing of her ideals. On the other hand, if she refused that offer, it meant the standing by her nationhood and the paying of the terrible price that we have seen Belgium pay. The people of Belgium, through their cabinet, never wavered. They said: Cost what it may, let the devastation be never so great; let the fire and the bloodshed and the sword come, yet we will be true to our national honour, and we will in no way violate our neutrality. Belgium has shown us the way of sacrifice and of honour.

May we not say the same thing of England above all others? We speak, almost ad nauseam, of how well Canada has done in this war. Canada has done nothing compared with what old England has done, neither financially, nor so far as female work is concerned, nor in the sacrifice of men. The Parliamentary Secretary for Military Affairs (Mr. McCurdy) told us a moment ago that in Great Britain they had given 17 per cent of their manhood, whereas we have given only about 3 per cent. What reason have we to pat ourselves on the back as though we had done wonderful things? In this country we have not learned to sacrifice ourselves in the voluntary way that the people of Great Britain have done. This whole war is filled with the lesson of voluntary service. We have voluntary conscription, if you will, each man conscripting himself. This war is to me like a crusade, with all these nations voluntarily marching out to fight for an ideal, for a sentiment, if you like to call it so. Great Britain did not have to go into this war. She might easily have remained outside of that bloody conflict had she wished, and not have paid the terrible price she has had to pay. She might have made millions of dollars out of this war had she so desired. But Great Britain had her traditions, and she knew that if she did not enter this war on the side of right, of principle; if she did not voluntarily throw herself into the great conflict, her shame would ring down through the centuries to come. We, in Canada, went into the war in the same way. The Prime Minister very properly at the commencement of this war, as expressing the view of the people of Canada irrespective of party, sent across the water the message that in this conflict that seemed then to be settling down upon Europe, this young nation wished it to be understood that we too were in this conflict for the preservation of civilization, and that we too were behind Great Britain to the last of our resources. Undoubtedly, this war has been full of lessons to us as to the strength of voluntary sacrifice and devotion to duty.

There is no question that the need for men is very great. We know that from what we read in the papers, from what we hear from returned soldiers and from what we gather from the memoranda that has been brought down in this House. We know it from a message which we had from Sir Arthur Currie. There is also no doubt that if the issue of this war should be unfavourable to our side, we would then bid farewell to all that we hold precious. On that subject there can be no debate.

At this juncture it is of the utmost importance that we should not leave undone anything that will increase our military power. Therefore, we come to the question: in handling of the situation now before us, by which means are we going to attain the maximum military power of which we are capable? The Prime Minister said that we should send half a million men. Without meaning the slightest offence, I take little stock in that statement. It is not a matter of sending half a million men, but of sending as many men as we can. If we can supply 700,000 men, there is no reason why we should send only 500,000; but if we can send only 400,000, then let it be that number—we shall have done our duty. The only rule to be observed is to obtain from the people of Canada the utmost possible military energy and power for the carrying on of the war, and how much that may be we cannot say in advance. Much will depend upon the prolongation of the war. If the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) did say that we should withhold our contributions and stay our hands because the United States had come into the war,—I am not aware that he did say that—I can only say that I entertain the same view with regard to that utterance as was ex-

pressed by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy). In my opinion, the fact that the United States has come into the contest should stimulate us more than ever to do our utmost for the carrying on of the war. So, the question to be considered, as I have said, is: How are you going to get the maximum fighting force?

The Government's answer to that question is to bring down this Bill. I am not now going into the record of the Government in this war—this is not the time for it; a time will come for us to express our views on that subject. The Prime Minister comes from the Old Country, and tells us that after visiting Great Britain he has decided that he wants conscription. And the only reason that I can gather from his statement on the subject—and I have carefully studied his speech—is that the boys at the front have sent a message that they want reinforcements. That is the argument, and the conclusion arrived at is that conscription is the best way. The boys at the front may have said that they want reinforcements; and they may need reinforcements; but it does not necessarily follow from this that we must have conscription. I should like to have heard some closer reasoning on this subject; I have not noticed that any of those who have spoken on this subject have addressed themselves to this hiatus in the reasoning. There is no argument about the need of reinforcements. It is mere waste of time for us to say that we want to win the war. After we have declared that we want to win the war it does not necessarily follow that we can win it better by means of conscription than by means of toleration and mediation. It is easy to say: "the boys at the front want reinforcements, therefore vote for conscription." That is easy, because it seems most popular; it wins the greatest applause; the man who says that can flatter himself that his name will go thundering down the centuries as that of a great patriot. But, as I have said, there seems to me something absent in the reasoning. I want to be shown why conscription will give us the best military results as opposed to every other possible way. If it could be shown that the boys in the trenches will have other Canadians by their side and fighting with them, and will have those men there sooner and in greater numbers by means of conscription than by any other means there would be no hesitation on my part in supporting conscription.

I am going to give the reasons why the policy of the Government does not commend itself to me, why the speeches made in support of that policy have not convinced me that conscription is going to result in giving us the greatest military power that is possible for us. If I am wrong in that let it be shown that I am wrong, and I shall be very glad to support conscription. Conscription is a beautiful thing when linked up with the idea of helping the boys in the trenches. Nobody questions our duty to those who are fighting for us. I agree that our nation will be judged by the way we have used the boys who have gone to fight our battles; there will be the real test of our manhood. I agree that it is not possible to do too much for our soldiers. It is for that very reason that I do not approve all that has been done with regard to that. I find, for instance, that in Moosejaw, when I got a man to trim my hedge, I pay him $3.50 a day—35 cents an hour. But the man in the trenches who risks his life in our defence is given $1.10 a day. That is not fair. We are told that other nations are not paying their men even as well as we do. I do not care about that; I believe there should be more of the fifty-fifty basis in the compensation for the sacrifices these men have made. So, I agree that we can do nothing that is too good for the boys in the trenches. But still I require to be shown that conscription is the way by which they can be most benefited.

Logically, and in principle, conscription is a method with which I can find no fault. It seems to me the same as with woman suffrage—there is no argument against it. I heard Mrs Pankhurst speak once, and, having heard her, I said, and have said ever since, that the argument was unanswerable. So, I say that conscription is right. It is equitable, it is just. It seems to me nothing can be truer than this—that, as the state gives the citizen its protection, the citizen in return must give his services in protecting the existence of the state. That being true, the citizen should offer his services in the hour of emergency for the protection of the state which has protected him. Selective conscription, I have no quarrel with, because I think it is right. Still we come back to the question: Why pass this Bill; why send our soldiers throughout the Dominion armed with warrants to bring in men, living men? For that is what will be the result of this legislation. Will this proceeding result in increasing our military strength; will it give us our maximum fighting power in men to

send overseas? I am afraid it will not. And, speaking quite frankly, the trouble is, as we all know, in the province of Quebec. I am not going to say a word in defence of Quebec, nor a word against Quebec. This is a British country, a country of free men, and each man must use his own judgment in this free country. But that is not the question. The question is, what result will follow the physical enforcement of this law? That is what catches me. You send out your recruiting officers—is that what you are to call them—with warrants to go to Quebec and to bring in men to be trained as soldiers. I have not heard any person in this debate tell us how you are going to compel the men to come from the province of Quebec without sending more soldiers there to fetch them than they will bring with them. It is all very well to talk about getting even with Quebec; about putting Quebec in her place, and letting her know where she stands and all that kind of thing. I have heard both Liberals and Conservatives talk that way. In my opinion, the man who says that to-day is the best day to settle our troubles with Quebec has made up his mind without thinking the matter out; or, if he has thought it out, he wants to press our fighting power not against Germany, but against Quebec.

It will be a very hollow victory if you do overcome the people of the province of Quebec. It will do you no good if you do put Quebec where she belongs. It will not do one bit of good, even if all the Orangemen in Ontario should have their hearts set on seeing Quebec brought to her knees. We are not after Quebec; we are after Germany. One war is enough at a time, and one enemy is sufficient for the proper manipulation of the war. Can any person show us—no person has up to the present—how we can force the people of Quebec to accept this measure? What I say not only applies to Quebec but to the labouring organizations throughout the country, because they are against this Bill also. If anybody can show me how you are going to enforce this measure against public opinion in Quebec, and against the will of the labour organizations, I will be very pleased to be so convinced.

The matter will just resolve itself into this: We will take the French-speaking parishes of Quebec, the people having their own view and as individuals not being afraid of anybody. Nobody has ever questioned the honour or bravery of the French Canadian people. I do not know that I would ever think of suggesting it. The French Canadian will hold his own with the Ontario Orangeman any day as far as bravery goes. It is not that. But, you have men down there—two-legged men—and you want to get at those who are not willing to obey the law.

Mr. FRIPP: Why do you think they will not obey the law as well as anybody else?

Mr. KNOWLES: I think there is grave danger that it will result in an outbreak throughout the country.

Mr. BEST: The people of Quebec are not as loyal and as anxious to defend the Empire, as are the Orangemen of Ontario.

Mr. KNOWLES: Possibly the hon. gentleman (Mr. Best) is right. I would not care, for the purposes of this argument, if the people of Quebec were the worst traitors in the world; we want to combat Germany and we do not want to have a war with Quebec.

Mr. BEST: I do not think it is fair to try and stir up racial strife in that way. I think that remarks like those which the hon. gentleman has uttered will raise more strife than anything that the Orangemen of Ontario could say or do.

Mr. KNOWLES: That may be and I said at the outset that I was not going to raise any contentious matters or questions that were likely to disturb the harmony. Therefore, I will let the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) have his way and get along with my address. Then, the question I ask is: How are you going to enforce this law, once it is passed, in the province of Quebec? Let my honourable friend answer that when he speaks. Are you going to send soldiers to do it? Are you going to send them into the parishes of Quebec? You will want to get as many recruits as are necessary to make up the 500,000. The soldiers that you will send into Quebec to do this will be English-speaking soldiers because you could not get French-speaking soldiers to do it. If they are sent into the remote parishes they will not know the language of the people or the geography of the country and there will be no registration of the men who should enlist. What results can you expect from sending English-speaking soldiers into a strange country and amongst a strange and hostile people? You will find that it will take more than one English-speaking soldier

for every single recruit you will bring out of Quebec. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Fripp) asks me how I know that the people of Quebec are not willing to co-operate in the carrying out of this Act. I do not say that they are going to fight the law but I do say that they will not harmoniously co-operate in enforcing the law. I think the hon. member for Dufferin will agree with the opinions expressed by a newspaper called the Sentinel and I think possibly the hon. member for Ottawa will also. I purpose to quote from the Sentinel to show the feeling and opinion, which, according to the Sentinel, exist in Quebec. I am not in all approving of that feeling, but if all the people in Quebec were traitors to-day that would not alter my view one bit. There never could be a more inopportune time to settle our troubles with Quebec than now because we have not sufficient fighting forces at our command to enable us to coerce Quebec. The Sentinel says:

> The Sentinel has pointed to the declarations by French leaders of their ambition to erect a French Canadian republic, the pacifist press and party have treated such statements as without foundation, and having their origin in a superheated brain. To-day, we find the outstanding clerical organ in Quebec openly advocating secession. La Croix, which speaks for the clergy of Quebec says: "How sweet it would be, in fact, to live in a Lower Canada separated from Upper Canada, yet subject as at present to the British Crown, administered by a French Canadian majority."

And it goes on to say that the time has come when they should seek to bring about that condition. The same paper, the issue of June 28, goes on as follows with reference to the plan of campaign:

> It should show the political social and religious disaster of Confederation on the one part, and on the other part the advantages Great Britain would obtain in according a political constitution which would give us a closer connection with the British Crown.

The Sentinel goes on:

> To remain under the authority of the British Crown, as indicated in this outline of the French ambition, is merely a veil drawn over their ultimate purpose of complete separation from Imperial control. The first step is to separate from the Dominion, and having accomplished that, when the disturbance incidental to it had passed, a demand would be made for independence, just as the Sinn Feiners in Ireland are doing to-day.

Then, later on it says:

> Three times in the history of Canada we have had civil war, and on every occasion, 1837, 1870, and in 1885, it was fomented by men of the French race. That they will give effect to these threats made in the face of the Prime Minister upon the floor of Parliament, is possible.

Again:

> Like the German Kaiser, they have been preparing for generations to accomplish a purpose which involves the destruction of Confederation.

So, it runs throughout the whole argument. When you have declarations made by gentlemen from the province of Quebec, that the people will not co-operate in the enforcement of this law, when you have had riots in the province of Quebec already, and when we all have information in a general way that there is an announced intention on the part of the people of Quebec to refuse to accept this measure, I fear that the passing of this Bill will not result in recruitment in that province. You will not force the people of Quebec to come forward in this way. Some hon. gentlemen say that the people will back down if you pass this Bill and call their bluff. I am afraid that is not true. You must remember that backing down in this case means backing down into the trenches, a more dangerous place than where they are now. Notwithstanding all this talk, I believe you could not call their bluff at this juncture. I fear that this Bill will not bring practical results and before I sit down I shall suggest what I believe to be the proper way of appealing to the law-abiding citizens of the province of Quebec who are all right if they are left alone by the agitators in that province. If the Nationalist agitators do not get hold of them they are as fine citizens as we have anywhere in Canada. The point I am making therefore is that at the present time the proper attitude to take with the province of Quebec is one of reasonable and manly conciliation and not one of bullying compulsion or force of any kind.

There is one thing that we need, I think hon. gentlemen will agree, and that is a united nation. You cannot successfully proceed with the war as a divided nation. If you have people in this country quarrelling amongst themselves, to that extent do you take away from your power to deal with the common enemy. Let us suppose that this Bill goes into force and let us look a year ahead; we will find our neighbour to the south of us, the United States, advancing successfully in the carrying on of the war with money, infantry, cavalry, aeroplanes and every thing else; we will find that others of our Allies have developed their fighting strength, as we trust they will, while we instead of developing our fighting strength and calling out our resources to the last man and the last dollar, within twelve months will find ourselves a quar-

relling and divided country, the people of one province seeking to get even with the people of another province. We will when it is too late see the evils of this Bill.

It is only fear that such a condition may come to pass that makes me support the submission of this measure to the people of Canada in order that we may have their expression upon it. And, after all, do we not all get tired of this eternal wrangling and jangling between Ontario and Quebec? I think you will bear me out, Mr. Speaker, that in your province and in the Maritime Provinces generally—and I can speak for the western provinces—we are strangers to this bitter feeling. It is getting to be a tiresome thing in this House, this bitterness and wrangling and chewing the rag between Ontario and Quebec, each suspicious of the other, each trying to put the other in a false light. When I read an article such as I have read from the Sentinel, and realize that this kind of campaign is being carried on by a great wing of the Conservative party that wants to help the British Empire in its unity, I grow discouraged for the unity of the Dominion of Canada. So, I say, I believe that the best way to promote unity on this matter of conscription is by a referendum. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, from Quebec without exception, have pledged themselves that if a referendum is submitted to the people their constituents will abide hy the result. I do not think that a referendum is at all an obnoxious thing. Since when were we afraid to consult the people? Is there any reason why we should believe that we on this side of he House or hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are possessed of more knowledge than their constituents? Will any one of us go back to his constituency and say: I know more than my electors? I am sure my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best) would not take that tack with his people, and I am sure that if he did they would not believe him; nor would mine believe me if I said that I had more knowledge than they. We are here and are what we are because we are supposed to represent faithfully the views of our constituents, and, I ask, since when have we possessed greater knowledge than our people, and since when is it against British principles that the will of the people should govern and rule on any great question that may come up for decision?

The labour people have also expressed themselves very strongly against the enactment of this Bill without a referendum. I have here a resolution sent to me in March last by the Trades and Labour Council of Moosejaw, a very important organization, because it has many allied labour activities associated with it. The resolution reads:

> That conscription be not put into effect until it has been submitted to a referendum vote of the people of Canada, and that the executive is hereby instructed to utilize all possible means of publicity and education to this end.

I have stated that personally I am in favour of conscription in its principle and in favour of referring the matter to the people at this juncture, thinking that this would conduce to unity and harmony much more than going ahead with the Bill in a drastic and compulsory way. If this is submitted to the people by a referendum I, as a citizen and not as a member, shall do all I can to see the principle carried, because I am in favour of conscription in principle.

We have heard hon. gentlemen on this side give reasons why they oppose a referendum. But it is remarkable, on reading the speeches of these hon. gentlemen that, without exception, they seem to come back to something different from the Bill and different from the Government's policy. I take, for example, the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) who says distinctly that he supports the Bill, but he supports it with the thought in his mind that there must be a general election, evidently to ratify the Bill, but certainly a general election; and I presume that what he has in mind is that at a general election the Bill will be ratified. The Prime Minister said that, had a coalition Government accepted the Bill, he would have then submitted it to the people by means of a general election. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) says that he would ask that the Bill be not put into effect until one great, last, big appeal had been made to the people of Canada by way of voluntary enlistment. And, last of all, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) distinctly says that this Bill will lead you to nowhere under a party Government. Why should he say that he will support a Bill that will lead to nowhere? He says this Bill will lead you nowhere and that it cannot be successfully administered by one party; and then he goes on to describe a coalition Government, with which I have no quarrel. But if the hon. member for Wellington is right in his logic and right in his belief that this Bill will not attain any results for you, why, in the name of Heaven, divide the

people of Canada over a thing that is going to do no good whatever? If I thought this Bill would get for us the soldiers we want, I would not care if it drove Quebec out of Confederation, if it drove the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) out of public life, if it drove the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) out of public life—I would call the breaking up of our Confederation a small thing if this Bill was going to be the means of winning this war for us. I would pay the price; I would say that the quid pro quo was such that it ought to be bought at any price; we ought to pay any price to win the war. But I am not going to throw my whole support behind a measure that I believe will not bring any results, that I believe in the main will tie our hands and handicap our efforts, and, instead of being an aid to us in a military sense, will take away from our real fighting force; and it is because I think this that I cannot see my way clear to support the Bill. The hon. member for South Wellington says that it will lead you nowhere. He says that the Bill cannot be successfully administered by a single party. If that is so, then why should we put such a Bill on the statute-book? Perhaps, as has been suggested, it will never be administered. Then I am against it because I am not in favour of placing measures on the statute-book with some suppressed, secret motive. I do not accuse the Government of anything of that kind, but if it is their intention never to put the Bill in force, I am against it, because I am opposed to voting for Bills which have any other object than that which appears on their face. I cannot support it without a referendum, because it will bring only schism and division and strife in the Dominion of Canada.

It has been declared in this House time and time again, and in the newspapers, that every man who leaves his party on this matter is a sort of hero and is a great follower of conviction, whose name will go down in history, and all that, because he is so sincere as to leave his party. I am not going to say anything direct or indirect about hon. gentlemen who have left the Liberal party. It is a very small matter to me compared with winning the war, and their grief at leaving the party is of smaller concern still. There is so much to grieve about in connection with the war that it is not a matter of national concern that certain men feel like crying because they are leaving the Liberal party. Nor is it of great importance what they say about their grief at withdrawing their support from my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). They talk of how they love him. We all love him, but there is no use talking about it, and I do not think the House is much concerned about these sentimental things anyway. But there may be two ways of looking at this thing. It does not necessarily follow that because a man leaves his party and goes the way he thinks his constituents will go, when there is a general election in sight, is any more a hero than the one who stays with his party. To leave his party when that party may be right is just as wrong as to stay with it when it is wrong.

In this instance, there may be many of us who just as conscientiously believe that the decision arrived at by our right hon. leader on the question of referendum is a correct decision, as others believe it is not the correct decision. Do not let us have any false heroes floating around the country. If they are bona fide heroes, let them be made colonels or knights, and be done with it. If they are all spurious heroes, the sooner we recognize that, the better for us all.

I wish to refer to the question of coalition. The right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been much criticised because he did not accept what one speaker called the magnanimous offer of the Government. People make statements sometimes without thinking them out to their conclusion. The offer was made to the leader of the Opposition that he should go into a Cabinet which already had its policy outlined and its pathway defined. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister is a young and comparatively inexperienced statesman, compared with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but in saying that I am not reflecting on the Prime Minister. The leader of the Opposition has the advantage in the matter of experience and seniority. As I understand the coalition proposition, it was like a consultation between lawyers or doctors. One doctor says "This case is grave and serious, I am afraid of my patient. I will have a consultation." Did you ever hear of a doctor calling in another physician—unless the other doctor was just a joke—and saying, "This man has a bad sickness, and probably going to die. I have diagnosed the case and prescribed for the patient. I have the medicine right here, and I have settled

on what is going to be done, but you can come in and we will consult about it." Would a doctor listen to such a proposition? I suppose the only reason a doctor could be wanted in those circumstances, would be because he had a strong arm and could hold the patient while the medicine was being administered to him. No self-respecting doctor would be a party to such a consultation. Without being disrespectful to the Prime Minister, I may say it would seem to me like a mock proposition to ask Sir Wilfrid Laurier to go into the Cabinet, to hold a consultation on this problem when the Prime Minister had already decided what should be done. If I were to ask a man to come in and consult about some personal or political affair, which I considered a crisis and a grave problem, and said: "I want to talk it over, but I have decided it will be solved this way, and I do not want your opinion on it," who could say there could be any consultation between us in that case? I do not think the leader of the Opposition could give any other answer than the answer he did give to such a request. But there is another reason for his answer. We know the province of Quebec enters into this question. If the right hon. leader of the Opposition had gone into that Cabinet and endorsed conscription he would have done the greatest damage to the British Empire he could have done. I make that statement advisedly. We all know that the result of his acceptance of conscription would be that he would cease to be the leader in the province of Quebec, and to-morrow morning Henri Bourassa would hold the province of Quebec in the hollow of his hand, and such a state of affairs would be a menace to the British Empire. I make that statement without fear of contradiction. No person can seriously say that Sir Wilfrid could have led the people of Quebec to conscription. Anybody who knows public opinion in Quebec knows that no man living could lead them to it, and I say the result would be—and I only ask for fair consideration of this thought—that on the morning of the morrow Mr. Bourassa, the firebrand, the man that has taught these people, nursed them, and educated them in his anti-British school, would be the hero of the province of Quebec, and that would be a bad day for the British Empire. The men who talk so much about the British Empire, little as they may regard Sir Wilfrid Laurier, will have to agree with me that Quebec is safer under his leadership than in the hands of Henri Bourassa. I say that those who question the service of the right hon. leader of the Opposition to the Empire, and question his loyalty, as many are doing, have not given the matter much thought. I read in the newspapers that a gentleman stated in Knox Presbyterian church that Sir Wilfrid Laurier lacked patriotism in refusing the offer of coalition. I do not know who the gentleman is, but I say this statement and thousands of other utterances along similar lines are unjust, unfair and unworthy of Canadians, and render difficult the solution of the race problem in Canada. Our object in Canada is to have unity among the different races, and such statements render the accomplishment of that object more difficult. In the conduct of the war we require greater unity.

In closing, I want to say that, in my opinion, the Prime Minister's offer of coalition was right, but it should have been made before he announced that he was going to force conscription on the country. And, I would say that, better than referendum, better than compulsory service, the proper way to handle the subject is to revert to the condition of affairs before conscription was announced as the immediate policy of the Government. When the right hon. the Prime Minister came back from England he had full knowledge of the gravity of affairs. I say then and there he should have called the right hon. leader of the Opposition to assist him with his counsel, his wisdom, experience and undoubted loyalty to the Empire. Even now, there is nothing I wish for so much as this —although I do not suppose it will be done —that the Prime Minister should revert to the condition of affairs when he came from the Old Country—let conscription stand in abeyance, not abandon it, not renege upon it, but just say that conscription for the moment stands, and call Sir Wilfrid Laurier into a coalition Government, and if, under these conditions Sir Wilfrid Laurier will not coalesce with him, I for one, as a Liberal, say that I think the Liberal party will soon find a leader who will coalesce. But I believe that Sir Wilfrid Laurier acted rightly in refusing coalition under existing conditions, for the reasons which I have given. Let the Government begin de novo, Mr. Speaker, to discuss this matter, let both parties get together and see if, in real unity, they cannot get recruits. Let the French Canadian members go out among their people and see what they can do. They are not cowards. Nobody thinks that. They have been appealed to in the wrong

way. I am not going into that matter, because I said I would not be critical. Our object is to avoid schism and disunion in this country, and I believe the Prime Minister has the power in his hands, even if he passed the Bill, to say: "It will stand in abeyance till we have an opportunity to discuss it," and apart from conscription let the two leaders and all the members of the House go out to the different places where they would have influence. I believe if that be done the unity of Canada will be preserved, and that the fighting force of this country will be inestimably greater than it will be if we waste our strength quarrelling among ourselves.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 62, for the relief of Florence Amelia Kennedy.—Mr. Edwards.

Bill No. 94, to authorize the issue of a patent to James Wallace Tygard.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 80, respecting a certain patent of the Sharp Rotary Ash Receiver Company, Incorporated.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 85, to incorporate the Canadian Council of the Girl Guides Association. (Without amendment.)—Mr. Northrup.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, the debate on the second reading of this Bill has been proceeding for a considerable time, and consequently it is with much diffidence that I rise to address the House on this important measure. Several matters, however, impel me to make some remarks on the measure before the House.

In the first place, I am one of the members of this House who have had the honour of serving at the front and who know something about the conditions there, and one of the reasons why I desire to speak in favour of the Bill is that it was intimated to me that I was opposed to some of its principles. To remain silent would perhaps lead to a wrong construction being placed on my attitude. In the second place, there have been introduced, in connection with this measure some objections which, to my mind, have not yet been satisfactorily answered. Having a little time on my hands I took the trouble to look up the authorities, if possible, to controvert statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite.

This is one of the greatest questions that have occupied the attention of this House since Confederation. We have had many momentous questions under discussion, but we have never before had such a war as this one, and we have never before had to discuss the question of conscripting the manhood of the country for the purposes of the war.

The House must be complimented upon the moderate tone of the principal speeches that have been delivered on this question, and it is my intention to discuss this subject with similar moderation. After all, nothing is to be gained by abuse, strong language or threats, because there is a little too much cold spring water running in the veins of the average Canadian for him to allow anybody to bluff or scare him with loud talk. Whatever we are going to do here, we are going to do it, and the laws we shall pass here must be observed.

I wish to point out to the House first some matters in connection with the war. There is no use in feeling any bitterness nor in stirring up any dissension over things that have occurred. Human nature is not infallible; none of us is infallible; the Government is not infallible. Some very grave mistakes have been made by every Government concerned in this war. The British Government has made a number of almost vital mistakes. For instance, the mistake was made of ordering that only 150,000 men should be sent to Europe in this war. Other mistakes of a similar character have been made by almost all the Allies with the exception of the French who seem to have been prepared for every eventuality. The last great mistake was made by Russia, and the one previous to that by Rumania. Therefore, there is no use harping upon what this Government has done in the past, because the Government, according to its own light, has been intent upon bringing this war to a successfull conclusion. We have it on the authority of the greatest orator the world has yet produced that a man is not to be blamed if he should make a mistake in trying to do good, because it is better to make a mistake in trying to do good than to do nothing at all.

We all remember very well when the House met immediately after the opening of the war, how enthusiastically we pledged

our manhood to the service of the cause. The war at the front has continued, and our men have gone over there and have distinguished themselves above, I may say, all other armies to-day in the field. That is something we never expected they would do when they left this country. Our forces have been augmented from time to time as the occasion arose, various methods being adopted by different nations to raise their armies. We have raised our quota of 400,000 odd men so far by the voluntary system. When I returned to Canada, the voluntary system adopted was being used with great enthusiasm to raise a large force to take part in this war, and we were exceedingly successful. The methods of recruiting adopted then were common sense methods, and I am very sorry that they were departed from in any way, but circumstances always bring about changes. Members of Parliament and the business men of the country then joined together and formed recruiting committees and raised this great army which we have to-day at the front. Unfortunately, some people are anxious to get into the public eye, and there came then into the recruiting game certain elements that might very well have been left out. The matter was left in their weak hands, and the business men virtually departed from the scene to take up other lines of effort, and to-day we find that recruiting is not being carried on very successfully. There is no question, however, that Canada has no reason to be ashamed of the results achieved under the voluntary system. The greatest authorities on war, Clausewitz, Van der Goltz and other writers like Hambly, lay down the principle that if a country raises one in seventeen of its population for the purpose of a war, it is doing very well, and before this war in Europe, they did not expect any nation would raise any more than that proportion. Canada has if anything, exceeded that ratio. We have every reason to be proud of the efforts that have been put forth. Unfortunately the wastage of men is very great. Our troops are so gallant that they are used as shock troops, attacking troops, and they occasionally lose large numbers of men. They are, however, always successful, and this country has good reason to be proud that our troops have conquered the best troops that Europe has ever produce.

The fact remains that this war is lasting much longer than any of us expected. When I stated in this House about a year ago that this war would last another two years, an incredulous smile, as much as to say: "He does not know what he is talking about," appeared on the faces of most of the members, and some of them told me that the war would not last so long. We have only reached, in this war, a stage now where our troops are beginning to win. Every one who has been in the field knows exactly what the circumstances were when we went there first. We were too good, too true and too loyal to tell the people the great difficulties they laboured under. The British Government was hesitating what to do in the case, and no action could be got in any manner, shape or form by the late Administration under Mr. Asquith, who has been quoted so glibly by this House and who left his troops in France very much to their own resources. The great leader of the popular cause in England, Kitchener, whose works have lived after him, and whom history will place in the foremost rank of great Englishmen, stated that the war would last three years and the people did not believe him. He also stated that this war was one of attrition, that means a war of wearing down. We knew that when we went into the trenches, it did not take long to realize that the British were suffering most of the attrition. That time is now past, and we can now review the early course of the war without being under the ban of the censor. So far as attrition was concerned, we were losing from shell fire every day in the week during all the time we were there, three men to every one lost by the Germans. We felt the lack of guns, machine guns and ammunition. The first time a man went into the trenches and saw the German flares that were being thrown up by the thousands while the British had none, he realized what he was up against. Those days have gone by; we have secured the ascendancy now, but the more men we put into the field, the more men we shall have to fill up the gaps, and the sooner we will win. Even when our troops are not in action, two or three men on an average each day go down under shell fire, so that when a man has been in the trenches for seven months, it is understood that he is living on borrowed time.

We must raise more troops and we cannot wait until next year to raise them. It will take from six to nine months to train them, and they will be urgently needed about the beginning of next year. Are we to withdraw our troops? That would be universally regarded as a disgrace to our people. Consequently, the Government is compelled to adopt other methods than

the voluntary system in order to raise these troops. While the voluntary system had its advantages, any one who has served with men in the front line trenches must realize after a very few days' experience the unfairness of volunteering. Young men are with you there, the flower of our country. There are married men there, who have left in this country families of small children, men who should never have gone to the war at all. As commanding officer I have received letters—and I am only one of many—letters from children whose fathers were serving with me, asking and praying me to look after their "daddy" that he might be spared to come back home to them. One cannot but be touched by that, and cannot but realize the injustice of a system that takes the father of small children out to serve in the trenches for three or four years while leaving young men at home in the billiard and pool rooms of the country, who give no consideration to the war except that war times enables them to earn wages of four or five dollars a day. Take the case of the only son of a widowed mother. The boy feels called upon as a patriot to go and serve in the war. I have known of such young men being killed. To this day there is one mother who calls me up about once a week on the telephone to tell me that she thinks her son is still living, that she has seen a picture of prisoners in Germany and thinks her boy is one of them, and will come back home to her—when I know very well that he will never come back. These are things that appeal to our sense of justice, and make us feel that it is unfair that the willing ones should carry all the burden instead of having that burden distributed fairly among all concerned. Any one who has considered the French method of conscription must come to the conclusion that it is the right method.

So, the Government was face to face with the question of raising more men. No more can be got by the voluntary system. Some hon. members have asked that another campaign under the voluntary system should be carried on. The members from the province of Quebec have made that appeal. Will they assure us that inside of sixty days they can raise 25,000 troops by the voluntary system? If they will rise in their places and say that, I will be one to favour suspending the Bill until that course has been tried. But we have no absolute assurance that they will raise a single man more by the voluntary system in any part of the country. So the Government has come to the conclusion that some law must be put into force to bring forward another quota of men.

Face to face with the issue, there were four courses open to the choice of the Government. The first was a cowardly one—to fold their hands and do nothing. Thank goodness, the Government saw its duty in this matter. As well as I can see, the Government has been true to its duty from the beginning of the war, and under very difficult circumstances. Nothing has been done, good or bad, that has not been criticised in the most violent manner. Members supporting the Government have been compelled to sit back and take no part in politics. The most trying thing that troops have to undergo is to lie in the open and be subject to shell and rifle fire, and not return the fire. That is the position in which the supporters of the Government have been since the war began. We all know the difficulties we have had to contend with, the violence of the attacks made upon us, not only the members of the Government but those on this side of the House especially who have seen it their duty to take part in the war. But that is a matter that we can pass over. The Government has decided not to fold its hands and send no more men to the front. It has come forward determined to pass a measure of conscription. True, this measure has been before the House for some time. And it is a fortunate thing in my opinion that this measure has been before the House for a few weeks. The people have been reading about this Bill and trying to find out what objections there are to the principle of it, and no objections have been raised except imaginary ones. Not one single objection has been raised that could be backed up by authority or precedent, which are the great guides for the work of this House.

The second course open to the Government would be to assume the responsibility of conscription itself—that is, to enforce the Militia Act. There can be no doubt that a construction can be placed upon the Militia Act under which the Government would be authorized to raise the necessary quota without coming to Parliament. There is room under the clauses of that Act for the Government to make regulations and adopt methods of conscription. However, the Government has seen fit not to take that course, but to adopt the third method, which is to bring the question here and leave to Parliament the responsibility of conscripting the manhood of the country.

The fourth course is that proposed by

hon. gentlemen opposite, to refer the matter to the people in a referendum—some say an election.

The chief objection raised to the present course is one which has been mentioned again and again by speakers on the other side of the House, especially by those who speak in French. It is that we are breaking pledges or guarantees made with our compatriots in Quebec at the time of Confederation, to the effect that in case of war we would not have conscription and that they should not be compelled to send their quota to the war. We have been told again and again that we are worse than the Prussians, that we deal with treaties and solemn covenants as "scraps of paper." That point was raised by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Ernest Lapointe) and also by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). But not one of these hon. gentlemen has brought forward a single treaty, obligation, or scrap of paper, in the way of any compact before or after Confederation, that we are violating. I challenge them to bring forward a single line. On the other hand, I desire to point out that this very question was up at the time of Confederation. In 1862 a Militia Act was thrown out of the old Parliament of Upper and Lower Canada. The military force of the Crown was as urgent a matter to be dealt with at the time of Confederation as the union of the provinces. For the shadow of a great war was then over the country. We were threatened with invasion by the Fenians. We did not know at what moment fire and sword would be carried all over the provinces.

At that time, when Confederation was under discussion, four of the great men of this country, representing all parties and all races, were appointed by Parliament a delegation to go to England and discuss the terms of the Confederation compact. These men were George Brown, representing the Liberal party, the predecessor of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), Sir John Macdonald, the leader of the Conservative party; Sir George Etienne Cartier, the great French Canadian and Mr. Galt, who was the best financial authority of his time. These four gentlemen went to England and arrived at an agreement with the British Government upon the terms of Confederation. They embodied the agreement they made with the British Government in a report presented to the Parliament, which report may be found in the Confederation Papers. It is extremely important for us to know if at the time of that conference it was agreed that the people of Quebec were not liable to serve in case of war. Any pledge that was made to the Mother Country at that time we are entitled to carry out to its fullest extent, because this is the time when our obligations to the Mother Country must be carried out to the letter. I have before me a copy of that report. It will be found in the Sessional Papers of 1868, and it is No. 63. It is addressed to His Excellency the Honourable Viscount Monck, Governor General of British North America; it is signed by these four great fathers of Confederation, and it was presented to the Parliament that formed the union. It is signed by John A. Macdonald, George E. Cartier, George Brown and A. T. Galt, and the date of it is July 12, 1865. What have they to say on this particular question that we are discussing now? They say:

> The important question of the future military relations between the Mother Country and Canada received earnest and grave consideration. Before entering on the discussion of details, we referred to the recent debates in the Imperial Parliament on the subject of Canadian defences, and especially to the assertions confidently made by certain members of the House of Commons that Canada was incapable of efficient protection against invasion from her inland border.

Those statements were made in the British House of Commons at that time.

> We asked that a report on the whole subject of the defence of Canada, with plans and estimates, might be obtained from the highest military and naval authorities of Great Britain. Such a report was obtained and communicated to us confidentially—and we rejoice to say that it was calculated to remove all doubt as to the security of our country, so long as the hearts of our people remain firmly attached to the British flag, and the power of England is wielded in our defence.
>
> On the part of Canada—

Now, this is the pledge they gave on the part of Canada, and I would like hon. gentlemen to pay particular attention to that pledge:

> On the part of Canada we expressed the desire that this plan for the defence of all parts of the province should be taken as the basis of arrangement; and that a full and candid discussion should be had as to the share of the cost that ought to be borne respectively by the Imperial and Provincial Exchequers. We expressed the earnest wish of the people of Canada to perpetuate the happy existing connection with Great Britain, and their entire willingness to contribute to the defence of the Empire their full quota, according to their ability, of men and money.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the pledge that was made to the British Government and to

the British Crown. They did not say that we were going to use our quota and our money for the defence of Canada. They said for the defence of the Empire. Canada was to be prepared at all times to send its quota of men and money for the defence of the Empire. They did not say after a referendum was held they were going to decide whether they would send men and provide money for the defence of the Empire or anything of that kind. Therefore, I say that no other pledge was at or before that time made between the British Government and Canada. Everything we have done since Confederation agrees with that pledge. Sir George E. Cartier, representing the people of Quebec, did not say that they would not agree to that. In fact, no sooner had Confederation been accomplished than the Militia Act was passed. Sir George E. Cartier, in bringing in that Act, put in the very clause that provided that the quota should be permitted to serve in any part of the Empire. That is the reason for the clause that is now in the Militia Act. Therefore, I ask: Who is tearing treaties apart; who is tearing up a "scrap of paper"? Great Britain has gone into this war. What for?—for the maintenance of treaties and of scraps of paper. The French nation has gone into this war for the same reason. Belgium, on account of a "scrap of paper," a treaty, denied the Germans the right to march over her soil, which, if she had permitted, she might have escaped war. Thousands of men's lives have been sacrificed for a "scrap of paper." Yet, such treaties are no more sacred nor binding on these nations and peoples than they are on us, who, through our representatives, agreed to give our quota of men or money for the defence of the Empire. It is very late in the day for hon. gentlemen opposite to come into this House and say that this measure involves a breach of a treaty. It does nothing of the kind. It fulfils a treaty. In passing this law we are implementing our solemn obligations. When they can show any authority, treaty, letter, memorandum or statement by any prominent leader of their race that they were not to support the principle that they were not to take part in the defence of the country or the Empire, it will be time for us to give consideration to their remarks.

The next important question that arises in connection with this measure is that of the method by which the men are to be impressed and embodied. It is said by the leader of the Opposition that conscription is a new word in Britain. At page 2499 of Hansard we find that the right hon. gentleman said:

> "Conscription is a new word in Britain."

Again:

> But Sir, it is a principle now admitted that if any new question comes up during the regime of a parliament, a question that 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 upon it.

I must compliment the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) on the excellent moderation and tone of his speech, which, I think, had he not argued from false premises, would have been a very sound pronouncement indeed. But he did not know about this convention which was entered into between the representatives of Canada and the British Government, and therefore his reasoning was defective. This is what he said:

> I also oppose this Bill because it involves a radical and most serious change in our constitutional relations—

That does not sound very much like the quotation I gave to this House a few minutes ago.

> —and constitutes a departure from well-known principles agreed to by all parties as to the constitution of this Confederation.

I think I have obliterated that argument. I do not think that the hon. member for Kamouraska can deny the facts contained in the report presented to the Government and Parliament of Canada by Macdonald, Brown, Galt and Cartier as to our pledges to the Mother Country.

Now, Sir, let me enumerate the other points urged against the Bill by the speakers opposed to it.

(1) That conscription or the impressment of men to serve in the army is a new thing in British law.

(2) That to compel men so conscripted to serve outside their country is a new principle.

(3) That selective draft is a new method of taking a quota of men to serve in the army, and that this method might prove unreliable and unjust.

Of course there are a number of other petty arguments which are not aimed at the fundamental principles of this Bill.

This Bill is now at its second reading and there are undoubtedly some clauses in it that may be open for discussion; and I feel satisfied that the Government will be very glad to have it fairly criticised by

members opposite and by all the members of this House, so that the result may be a really good Bill which will be a great credit to Canada. Sir, this country should act in all things in a way worthy of the men who are fighting for it at the front. Let us hope that eventually we shall pass such a Bill that will be regarded by future generations as a credit to the members of this Parliament.

But, Sir, we must meet the arguments which are advanced. The only question we can discuss at this stage is the fundamental principle of the Bill which is the question now before the House. Possibly we may not agree on some of its minor provisions. Whilst some opposition may be raised to some of the clauses of the Bill, what we are now about to vote upon is the principle contained in it, which is that this House should pass a conscription law.

The first objection I have mentioned is that this is a new law in Great Britain. I have taken considerable trouble to look up the law of Britain on the subject. I am not a lawyer, and there are several branches of law about which I do not know much. Legal members of this House have to deal with the civil law, the criminal law, the Code and various other laws; but the majority of the legal members of this House have had no occasion to read up military law or to trouble themselves with it unless they are soldiers, because the military code is very simple and is enforced by officers who in most cases are not lawyers. I have had to read up the military law and to study it because I had to administer it not only in camp and in civilian communities but also in the field. So I have had to study the military code and to know something of its history. The hon. members who have advanced the argument that a conscription law is a new thing in Great Britain, have not quoted one statute, law, treaty or precedent to support their arguments. It has been assumed by the great majority of them that the voluntary system was the primary law of England and had always been the law, from time immemorial. In taking up the question I wish to quote the authorities, even although some of them may be rather dull. The authorities I have selected can be found in almost any public library. They are the following: Stubbs' Constitutional History, a very popular work; Hallam's Constitutional History, also a very well known work. Taswell Langmead's Constitutional History; Clode's Military Forces of the Crown; Grose's Military Antiquities; Scott's History of the British Army; Lingard's History of England; Prof. Oman's History of the Art of War; Howell's State Trials (Ship Money case); also the ancient and modern statutes and journals of the British House of Commons and documents relating to the early history of the British colonies in North America dealt with by Hertz, "The Old Colonial System," a Manchester university publication. References to the ancient military laws will also be found in Coke on Littleton, and also in Blackstone. When the hon. member who preceded me argued that the British subject, on account of receiving protection from the State, must also defend the State, he was only quoting principles laid down in Blackstone and all the ancient legal books that he no doubt studied. He did not know that that is today the law of England.

Turning to the history of English military forces, there is one military force that has always existed, and that is the general levy. Before the conquest, every man capable of bearing arms and of military age, when the King summoned him, should go to what was known as the fyrd or the gathering of his county, with his arms, and go out in defence of his country. That is a law dating back beyond any written record. At the time of the Norman kings that law was enforced, and a general levy existed alongside the feudal levy given by men in England that is military service for rent. The general levy was called out in Norman times on several occasions. The first time it was called out by William II at Hastings in 1094. He intended to cross over to France to carry on war, and summoned a general levy of the people to go and serve. They were dismissed, however, without going across. There is no question that the statutes I shall quote, covering the period down to the restoration, all deal with this general levy, and show that the general levy was called out again and again, and that the men served in the general levy to fight for the defence of their country. These are the statutes: 13 Edward I, chapter 6; 34 Edward I, chapter 2; 2 Edward II, chapter 3 and chapter 4; Edward IV, chapter 5, section 13; Edward III, chapter 6; 5 Henry IV, chapter 3; 3 Henry VIII, chapter 3; 4 and 5 Phillip and Mary, chapter 2; and 1 Elizabeth, chapter 16. All of those statutes laid down the rule that male inhabitants of England who are called out by general levy must assemble at a certain point to be mentioned in each county and must bring their arms there and be prepared

to serve their country under their sheriffs and officers. Not only were they brought together in a general levy again and again, but a quota was taken from this general levy and sent to serve in a foreign country. That was the law down to the Restoration of Charles II. I might say that the long Parliament dealt with this question, and since the Restoration there have been Acts dealing with this levy. For instance, in 1690, on the occasion of the French invasion, a general levy was called. During the rebellion of 1690 and the rebellion of 1745, in which my unfortunate Highland fellow countrymen took part, there were general levies. In 1757 a reorganization of the general levy was made on the basis of the ballot. That is, the ballot was instituted to make the selection of the quota from the general levy. In 1773 a motion was made in Parliament to suspend the ballot for the Militia. This was defeated. From 1815 on, the militia was allowed to fall into abeyance. Although the standing army was maintained the annual training of the levy was suspended. However, that old law is still continued in Great Britain annually by what is known as the Expiring Laws Continuance Act. I have here the latest copy of the Manual of the Military law of Britain, dated 1914, which I carried with me in the trenches. On page 164 of that manual there is a clause dealing with the general levy in which it says that:

> Although the feudal levy was abolished in 1660, the liability to serve in the general levy has never been extinguished, and remains not only in constitutional theory but also on the statutory, and practical form, of liability to serve both in the general and the local militia."

That is the law in England to-day, that is conscription so that conscription is not "a new word in Britain". The reason that, in England, they had to pass a conscription measure was that, about 1907, Lord Haldane, then Secretary for War, introduced and had passed through Parliament a law which provided for the reorganization of the army under what was known as the Territorial System. The militia battalions were embodied in this territorial system, and the Territorial Act, which is the Act now in force in England, contained a clause that the militia battalions of the territorial army should not have to serve abroad. When this war broke out a number of those battalions were called out. Some of the militia, and the yeomanry refused to volunteer to go abroad. The British Government laid down the law to these territorial battalions, and they said, "You will do either one of two things: you will volunteer for service in France, or you will disband" Those who volunteered to serve in France were accepted and embodied as Imperial battalions, and those who refused to serve abroad were disbanded. I may say, Sir, that, as far as this country is concerned, under the present Militia Act, certain regiments and certain men are sworn in, and if we accept the dictum laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite that men who are serving under the Militia Act are not entitled or cannot be compelled to serve abroad, then these militiamen will all escape service in France. I understand a number of men joined the Canadian defence force on the understanding that they would not serve abroad, and they can hold the Government to its contract.

The standing army of England was nearly always recruited by the voluntary system. That army was composed of paid men, and dates back to the time of the French wars when the Free Companies were recruited in Europe by certain individuals, and these men signed a contract to fight for certain individuals or countries. Every soldier that is enlisted to-day in the Canadian Expeditionary Force is a hired soldier. I might say that European conscripts affect to despise hired soldiers. The Germans call them mercenary. They say we are hired to kill. There is no doubt in the world that every soldier who has been enlisted in this country under the so-called voluntary system is a descendant of the mercenary or free companies. The contract is placed in his hand and it is called an "attestation paper." He swears to that contract, and he signs his name on it, and if he is brought before the court martial at the front, or in this country, if he wishes to deny the right of the commanding officer to try him he can say: "Produce the attestation paper," and they cannot try him by court martial or military law unless a copy of that contract is produced. The men who have enlisted in the standing army were always volunteers. That law only dates back a little over two hundred years. The voluntary system is thus a recent enactment as far as the army is concerned. It is a new system and it is not the fundamental basis of the English army. It was first adopted by the militia in 1758, and in that year a law was passed allowing a certain number of men to volunteer to serve in the militia or general levy. In 1810 volunteering was again allowed in the militia, and the volun-

teer system of 1852 was made the only system permissible under that Act as far as the militia of Great Britain is concerned. But the voluntary system is a new system, and for that reason, as far as we are concerned, we have nothing to do with the voluntary system, because we have never had any standing army based on the voluntary system as they have it in Great Britain. We have only had militia raised by volunteering or the ballot.

Another argument is raised against serving outside of the country. Whether troops are entitled to be impressed and taken out of the country is a question which has arisen, in connection with this bill and it is well for us to deal with that historically. The general levy of all the male population were compelled by law to serve out of the country. A quota fought at Cressy and at Agincourt. Objection was sometimes taken against the feudal levy serving outside the Kingdom, but there is no question that according to English law troops to serve abroad could be taken from the general levy. A quota from the general levy was taken abroad as early as the reign of Edward I. They called a general levy together, and they selected a number of men from the general levy, and sent them over to fight their battles in France. Again and again they were called together. In the reign of Elizabeth and the reign of Henry VIII the general levy had to furnish a quota for foreign wars. In the time of Queen Elizabeth it became an established prerogative of the British Crown that it was entitled to call a general levy and select or press a number of men to serve in the army and navy abroad. In fact, at the time of Charles I. the same question arose, and that was one of the difficulties mentioned in the Petition of Rights.

I come now to the question of the selective draft, and after I have dealt with that and shown you that that is a very old law indeed, you will see how it came about. The selective draft dates very far back. In Great Britain it was the original system of getting a quota of men for the army from the militia or general levy. The method was this: a certain number of gentlemen were commissioned in each county and each municipality by the Crown, and it was their duty to summon before them all those that should take up arms for the general levy, and they selected a certain number of these men who were supposed to serve in the army, and go and fight in the defence of their country, or go and fight abroad. This system of taking men became an abuse. These tribunals were called Commissions of a Array, they were subsequently called Commissions of Muster, and succeeding that, instead of having a number of men commissioned in each county, the king appointed one man called the Lord Lieutenant of the county. The Lord's Lieutenant of the county was after the Restoration appointed by Parliament. Any one who knows England knows who the Lord Lieutenant of the county is.

These Commissioners of Array formed a fruitful source of trouble for the Crown in those days. Shakespeare makes a reference to them, and Falstaff was apparently one of those commissioners. They would pick out a man and say to him: "You have to serve in the general levy." He would say, "I cannot leave my position," and they would say to him, "How much will you pay?" He would pay ten or twenty pounds to escape the levy, and during the reign of Charles I, not only were the men allowed to compound for service, but the counties and boroughs that were supposed to contribute so many men were allowed to compound to the Crown for so much money instead of furnishing the men. That was one of the methods of raising money without the consent of Parliament, and that procedure was petitioned against in the Petition of Right. Falstaff mentions this matter in one of Shakespeare's works, and whilst I am not saying it is the wrong method of raising men, still this House must realize that the selective system must be surrounded by a great many safeguards if we are going to see it carried out successfully, because there is no doubt that if a couple of men on a tribunal wish to be crooked in any part of the country they can release any number of men they wish in the neighbourhood from service in our army.

Before I proceed further with that, I might say that in choosing the method to select a quota the Government no doubt was influenced by two things. In the first place, they could, as provided in the Militia Act, select these men by a military tribunal. There is no doubt that a military tribunal as described by the hon. gentleman from Moosejaw in his speech today, going into a strange section of the country to pick out men would be a very disagreeable way of making the selection. That would have been the method under the old Militia Act. But the method chosen

here is also the method adopted by the United States, and no doubt adopted for the purpose of leaving the method of selecting the men in the hands of a civilian body, so that it would not be subject to the same objection as if they were selected by military tribunals. My own idea is that the military tribunal and any tribunal appointed for the purpose of selecting the men should only be allowed to recommend the exemption of conscripts. All the exemptions should be passed upon and confirmed by higher authority. This is what Falstaff says; evidently he himself was one of the Commissioners of Array. In those days the tribunals engaged in selecting men for the army were made up of pretty crooked men. In Henry IV, Act II, Falstaff says:

> I have misused the King's press damnably. I have got in exchange of one hundred and fifty soldiers, three hundred and odd pounds. I press me none but good householders, yeomans' sons, inquire me out contracted bachelors, such as had been twice asked in banns, such a commodity of warm slaves as had as leave hear the devil as a drum; such as fear the report of a Culverin worse than a struck deer or a hurt wood-fowl . . . and they have bought out their services, and now my whole charge consists of . . . such as indeed were never soldiers, but discarded unjust serving men, younger sons of younger brothers, revolted tapsters, and ostlers trade fallen; cankers of a calm world and a long peace. Ten times more dishonourably ragged than an old faced ancient. And such have I to fill up the room of them that have bought out their services, that you would think I had one hundred and fifty tattered prodigals lately come from swine keeping. Nay, and the villians march wide betwixt the legs as if they had gyves on, for indeed I had most of them out of prison.

So you see that there is very little new in the world. The Government will have its hands full when it endeavours to carry out any law in such a way as to meet all the circumstances of the case and at the same time please everybody.

In 1898 the English Militia Act was amended so as to allow the militia to serve outside of Great Britain. For about eighty years previous to that time, it was not allowed to do that. When we raise the point that the militia should not serve outside of this country, we are raising a question which never arose under conditions similar to those which prevail to-day. When England was at war she did not hesitate to levy on the whole male population to fight in France or in any part of Europe. She has done that now; it is the fundamental law.

The question may now be asked: have we any precedent for sending militia out of the country? Have we, it may be asked, precedent for sending the Canadian militia out of the country for the defence of the Empire, leaving out altogether the promise made by Sir George E. Cartier, Sir John A. Macdonald and all the great Canadian leaders of that day, that Canada would give her quota of men and money for the defence not of Canada, but of the Empire? "Quota" means the selection of men who are able to serve: it would be applied to the men called out to serve under this Act. Is there anything to show that the Colonial militia was ever employed outside of the colony concerned? Any one who reads the history of the Colonial provinces to the south before the great rebellion against English rule knows that those provinces sent their militia away to fight in Canada and elsewhere. When the British were besieging Carthagena in Central America, the colonial provinces—they were not then known as States—sent 4,000 men to fight under General Vernon to assist in siege and capture of that stronghold. Those who read history know that the Colonial militia was sent to take part in the siege of Louisburg. No one could argue that the militia sent out by the colonies in what is now the United States were only sent to fight in territory which was "contiguous" to the borders of their own country. The Virginia militia fought in Canada; Virginia was a sovereign province in those days, so was Pennsylvania, yet they sent men and spent money to fight not only in Canada but in Cape Breton as well. These are well known facts, so that we are not propounding a new principle or establishing a new law to say that the men of Canada should or could be conscripted to serve outside of Canada. But, Sir, that law was established at the time of Confederation. When the project of Confederation was being brought about, a pledge was given to the British Government by Brown, Macdonald, Cartier and Galt. Let me quote it again:

> We express the earnest wish of the people of Canada to perpetuate the happy existing connection with Great Britain and their entire willingness to contribute to the defence of the Empire their full quota, according to their ability of men and money.

Who can deny the right of this Parliament to conscript a quota to "contribute to the defence of the Empire," in view of this most solemn treaty and pledge ever given by any public men in this country? This was the pledge given by a committee representing the Parliament of Canada, a com-

mittee that said to the British Government: we are at all times prepared to give our quota of men and money for the defence of the Empire. Not for the defence of Canada, mark you: for the defence of the Empire. No public man, no state, and no Parliament has since endeavoured to change that pledge. It has never been repudiated. If I represented or spoke for any section of the community that did not desire to be bound by that pledge I would feel heartily ashamed of myself. But every section of the country was bound; Quebec was solemnly bound on that occasion by Sir George E. Cartier. This pledge was implemented by the Militia Act passed by Sir George E. Cartier after Confederation, which provided that Canada's quota should be 50,000 men. Canada was only a small country at that time. Great Britain promised Canada that if Canada were invaded she would come to her assistance. Even at that time Canada was threatened with invasion; a hostile force invaded her territory in the following year. There were some little Englanders in the British House of Commons at that time, who said: what is the use of defending a few acres of snow? What is the use of spending time and wasting money in the defence of Canada? Let it go! But the British Government gave their pledge that they would defend Canada, just as they had previously pledged themselves to defend Belgium. To-day they are fighting for Belgium in fulfilment of that pledge, and to-morrow they would fight for Canada in fulfilment of the pledge given to us. Should we, therefore, not carry out our pledge?

I have given all the authorities bearing on this phase of the matter. I have quoted the law, although I am not a lawyer, and I do not think any hon. gentleman opposite who oppose the Bill can show that the position they have taken is correct, according to law or precedent.

An hon. gentleman who sits on one of the front benches opposite—he is not here at present—wants to conscript the wealth of the country. Our Minister of Finance has given an example to all countries in the matter of enabling a country to carry lightly the burden of a great war. He has shown that with proper financial management and with proper guidance of the people we can finance our part in the war ourselves, and that our people are ready at all times to produce millions of money for the carrying on of the war.

Every one knows that the reason we succeeded in the war which we waged a hundred years ago against Napoleon was because Pitt made war pay, and when all other countries of Europe were starving for want of money and for lack of supplies, the English treasury was full of gold, and her supplies were ample. Her factories were never as busy as they were then, and never in the history of England was her business in such a fine state as it was at that time. Lloyd George has followed the example of the great Pitt in endeavouring to make this war pay, and since he took charge of the Government of Britain, a great change has taken place there. For about a week after the war started, the only bank in England that paid out gold for its obligations was the Bank of Montreal of Canada. The Bank of England and the other great English banks suspended gold payments, but neither before nor since the commencement of the war has the Bank of Montreal suspended gold payments, and that is a great compliment to the financial strength of this country. The Minister of Finance has carried on the business affairs of this country with a great deal of wisdom. But there are those who say: Oh, tax tax, more tax, let us have some more taxes. The more taxes you raise, the more money you will squander. All that is needed is enough money to pay for the obligations of the Government, and if we have other obligations later on, we shall bring more taxes forward.

Mr. BURNHAM: Why do that?

Mr. CURRIE: Do you want to starve people by taxing them to the limit?

Mr. BURNHAM: Why do you do it?

Mr. CURRIE: I am going to tell you, if you will wait a minute. One set of people cry out against the Government because they do not tax land. In the last resort we might have to tax land. At one time England had to tax land two shillings an acre, but how would the farmers throughout this country feel if this Government were to tax their land fifty cents an acre? You would have a rebellion, and not an hon. member here who would advocate that policy at the present time if the money was not wanted, would be re-elected. I am satisfied, however, that if the money was required for the war, that every farmer in this country would be willing to pay as much as a dollar an acre for the protection of the Empire. What is the need for such a tax? The Minister of Finance has not yet shown that his balance is on the wrong side. His surplus is ample. He has no deficit, nor is the country bankrupt.

On the contrary, he shows a large surplus that is capable of paying both the needed principal and the interest on all the obligations of the country every year, even during the war. Then why do hon. gentlemen want more taxes?

Another set of hon. members want an income tax. Some of us have read Sterne's Sentimental Journey, in which he says every little while: "Oh, they do things better or differently in France." Many hon. members in this country say: Oh, they do it better in England; they do it differently in England. We all acknowledge that an income tax is one method of raising a revenue; the question is whether such a method is expedient at the present time. At this time those who are entirely dependent upon their incomes need all their money because things were never so high in value as they are just now. Then why do hon. members want to impose a tax on those people now? Why not wait and see if this war lasts another year or another two years? We may have to come to an income tax, but there is time enough for that. Keep cool.

Other hon. members want to conscript wealth. Conscription of wealth is a fine expression. Do they want conscription of wealth to be by a general levy, or do they want a selective process? If they want a general levy, we have that already, because every one, if he wears clothes or buys anything that is brought into the country, is paying his particular tax at the present time; we are all equal before the law. Do they want selective conscription? Yes, they want selective conscription of wealth; they want the monied people to pay. I have been dabbling in history, and I have been looking up to see if conscription of wealth is a new thing. I find it is a very old thing; it dates back to the time of Henry VIII. At that time, they wanted to be select in their conscription of wealth, and they conscripted the wealth of the churches, and that gave them enough money to go on with; the Crown was satisfied. In France, they were face to face with bankruptcy when they called the Assembly of Louis XIV together. In that assembly there was a party headed by Robespierre, Marat and Danton, who were crying continually for the conscription of wealth. The great Mirabeau stood against that idea. In one of his greatest speeches he said that they had no right to select a rich man and to take everything he had and to cast him out in order that the State should have money with which to carry on its business to avoid bankruptcy. But he died, and what was the result? The others had their way; they erected a knife, the guillotine, and they took the rich and wealthy and beheaded them and seized their money. They conscripted the money and estates of the church first and in that way the State was able, under those beautiful Republican gentlemen, to carry on its business for a year or two longer. Is that the kind of conscription of wealth that is necessary here? There are, in this country, many very wealthy, religious institutions which are controlled by lovable religious gentlemen who have never contributed a cent of their own wealth. They have dreamed their lives away, doing good deeds and the very increment of time has made them controllers of the richest corporations in the country.

An hon. MEMBER: They do not pay taxes.

Mr. CURRIE: I do not know anything about that, but if hon. members are going to conscript wealth, they would be conscripted first. That is the cry of the Red Republicans. The Reds in Russia to-day want to conscript wealth, also in Mexico, the authorities are conscripting wealth, the wealth of the church, by the same method. The moment you acknowledge that principle and you do away with the constitutional safe-guards which Parliament throws around money and wealth and the property of every one in this country, in that moment you are going to have a breakdown of society and a reproduction of what I have described. Is that the condition of things hon. gentlemen want in the neighbouring province? That is the actual state of affairs that they may have to face when they conscript wealth.

A good deal has been said about conscripts, and one would think that under this measure we are not going to secure any conscripts from Quebec. I have had the pleasure of having a number of French Canadians serve under me in this war. I have seen them in action and in peace, and every one that I have yet had acquaintance with in this war has belied the slurs that have been cast upon French Canadians by hon. gentlemen opposite. Never on any occasion have I seen one of those men falter in the face of the most deadly peril. Never have I seen them anything but happy under the most terrible conditions of mud and climate. They never fail; they are brave fighters. Can you tell me that men of that

calibre are cowards and are going to refuse to serve their country if they are conscripted? That is unbelievable to me, and it is an insult to those people. According to Julius Caesar, when the call went forth for the Gaelic race, from which those men have sprung, to gather to the war, the last man who arrived on the scene was killed by his comrades for being late. Do you mean to tell me that people derived from that race are not capable of doing their duty and going to the war just the same as we are? It is an insult to them to say otherwise. I know that a few agitators in Quebec have been constantly grumbling and growling, saying that they should sever the British connection and making other statements of that nature, but they are men who have no standing in the country. There is a good deal of rich red blood in the veins of the people of Lower Canada. There is in that province a large element of cool-tempered, level-headed men just as there is in the neighbouring province of Ontario. The men from both those provinces have gone over the ridge at Vimy; they have never hesitated to go over the top, and when men of that breed are called upon to be conscripted, well, there may be small riots here and there, but they will serve. Why there was a riot at Camp Borden last year amongst the volunteers from Ontario who wanted to sit around the hotels in the cities instead of drilling and serving at the front. Those things occur, but the great body of the people of the two provinces are determined to carry out the pact which is the keystone of the edifice of Confederation. They occasionally have their quarrels just as a young wife and her husband sometimes have a little spat; sometimes an outcry arises in the house, but they do not want Bourassa as a divorce court lawyer; they are not having a divorce just yet, and this war will be finished and hon. gentlemen who have told us in this House that we are going to have internal strife, will feel heartily ashamed of themselves and of their speeches when they see them in future years in Hansard.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have had the example of men wanting to get the provinces into war before now. In Ontario they raised a row, about 1837. Great leaders went all over the country on horseback to call the people to arms against the Family Compact, and all that sort of thing. Very brave men, these politicians. At the same time a similar agitation was going on in Lower Canada. But I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that when the first gun went off, you could not see the heels of these politicians for dust. They all fled to the States, and it took about ten or fifteen years to rehabilitate them and attach any semblance of heroism to their deeds. But there is no United States to fly to now, gentlemen. There is only Iceland that these people can go to if they start a small war, and that is a great distance off. The common sense of Quebec, the influence of the men of Quebec who are doing their duty in the trenches is against this agitation; the men who represent the solid Quebec, pay no attention to it all. They have this agitation constantly with them. It is a phase of our era, just as we have it in the province of Ontario. Why, Sir, you would think to hear them, that the Liberal party was going to eat the whole Tory party of Ontario at one gulp—until there is an election, and then they go back and sit down for another six months. And it will be the same in Quebec.

A referendum is proposed. Once I voted in this House for a referendum. It was on the navy question. After studying the Confederation papers, after considering the terms of the contract between English and French Canada, I made up my mind that this Canadian navy question was a new question introduced into Parliament. Under the bargain made with the British Government the maritime defence of Canada was taken charge of by Great Britain, and we took charge of our own land defence. But if there was to be an independent navy in this country, and not a quota added to the British navy, the proper procedure, to my mind, was a referendum or an election. This question stirred up trouble because we were told even then that if the German navy came up the St. Lawrence it was a question whether the Canadian navy would fire on them or not. However, we let these little jokes pass. The proposal then before us, I thought, should go to a vote. But as to the Bill before this House, I have hunted up the authorities, and I do not find one instance, from the beginning of the British Parliament, in which a question of this kind was submitted to a referendum. Where are you going to find a precedent? In these matters Parliament has always governed, and we are only re-enacting here to-day laws that have been re-enacted again and again on the statute-books of England for over a thousand years. It has been an established principle that every man in England, or in the colonies, capable

of bearing arms should come to the gathering and be counted one of the men for the defence of his country. That is what we are re-enacting.

I wish to again emphasize the pledge that I have already read on the part of Canada's representatives to perpetuate the happy existing connection with Great Britain and our declaring our willingness to contribute to the defence of the Empire—not of Canada only—our full quota of men and money. The men of this country have had a referendum before them, under the voluntary system, for over two years. Every young man of military age who wished to vote and was in favour of the voluntary system as against conscription was free to volunteer. There is nothing to keep these young fellows from volunteering to-day. Another hon. member has asked: How can you go to the trenches with a referendum? He was quite correct. There are many good Canadians in France to-day with little white crosses over their heads. How are you going to get them to vote on this question. Do you not think they were entitled to have a say? I prefer to speak on behalf of these men from Canada who have died for the Empire, to give my vote on their behalf in favour of this Bill now—I will assume that responsibility.

Another says: Appeal for more volunteers But we have appealed for volunteers, and no person who has had experience with the voluntary system in the front line of trenches would say that it is a just system. I wish to repeat and emphasize that. There are men here at home who should be serving, and there are men in the trenches who get no respite from their labours. It has been denied that there is any necessity for men. The hon. member who proceded me quoted figures and said: You have to show me that there is this necessity for men. Another hon. gentleman said this afternoon that there is no necessity for more men in the trenches. I have seen Canadian troops holding lines for three days, and every hour they were told assistance was coming. And, while holding these positions they lost not only ten per cent, of their numbers, but twenty per cent, thirty, forty per cent, and the last men put in were the cooks and the orderlies, and still there were sixty per cent of casualties for our First Division in those first great days of the fight at St. Julien—over 9,000 casualties out of fourteen thousand bayonets. These casualties rolled up while these men were holding the lines and waiting for succour. At last a British division came up, composed of men who had never fired a shot in their lives. Tell me that we did not need more men! We need more men at the front to-day, because day after day men are going into the trenches who have gone there day after day since the First Division went over. In my old battalion there is a quartermaster-sergeant, now regimental quartermaster-sergeant, who has never failed since we went to the trenches to go up with food for his men. Men are fighting there who are not allowed to sleep. At night they are not permitted, and there are many men—even strong men—who are so constituted that they cannot sleep in the daytime. Their reason ultimately gives way. Do they need a rest, or reliefs? The other troops get their regular leave. Of the English troops, every man is given leave once in every so many months, that he may go back home and see his own people. The same is true of the French; the poilu goes home to kiss his mother and meet his loved ones at stated times. But the Canadian does not come back home; there is only one thing that sends him home and that is a wound that incapacitates him for further service, or a wooden cross. If the wound is severe enough it means that he stays in France forever. Is it right that this country should leave its men in that position? It is terrible! You want delay; that is what Germany wants you to do. I do not want conscription. If it comes to a matter of personal desire, there is no man in this House who knows better the horrible conditions to which we are committing men under conscription than I do. I have seen men torn to pieces; I have seen them writhing in their death agony, men with whom I was speaking but a moment before.

I myself would be against conscription but the necessity of the case demands that we must send men. Our first duty is to those who serve. Whatever my personal objections may be, I must cast these aside. I have every pity, every regard for the conscript. In France a conscript is regarded as a holy person. I consider a conscript a man who is consecrated for service to his country. He is worthy of all our sympathies. We should be kind to them. No one would think of subjecting men to conscription in this country were it not for the duty that we owe to our troops at the front. Day by day a man has to go into the trenches with nobody to relieve him. You heard the figures read here this afternoon by the Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia showing the need of troops at the front.

Somebody must go over and relieve these poor men who have been there since the beginning of the war. What are you going to do? Can you get men immediately by the voluntary system? No, the necessities of the case demand that we should apply the conscriptive principle. Canadians are sent into the trenches again and again until their reason often gives way, while the troops of other countries are relieved, Canadian soldiers are too proud to say that they want to come out to be relieved. I have seen a Canadian with his wounds bleeding run away from the hospital at London, go to Folkestone and cross to the assistance of his comrades.

That is the spirit that should animate the members of this House at this very minute. We should show that we are capable of some of the sacrifices of these men at the front who are consecrating their lives not only to the service of the Crown but of this country and to the carrying out of these very pledges which were made by the Fathers of Confederation. Let me conjure my friends from Quebec to forget their petty quarrels. There is no one in this country who should have any more personal feeling over the war than I should have about attacks and vile things said about me. Some people have been unkind enough to say something of this sort about the French Canadians. Let us settle all these petty, little things when the war is over. Let us unite now. Those who have served with the French Canadians know what they are worth and they want more of them. For this reason I say to those men in the province of Quebec: cease this agitation that is going to bring about so much unhappiness in this country. Let us not tear up this "scrap of paper," let us not be Prussians, and violate the pledge that was made at Confederation to the British people. Let me read once more this pledge:

> We expressed the earnest wish of the people of Canada to perpetuate the happy existing connection with Great Britain, and their entire willingness to contribute to the defence of the Empire their full quota, according to their ability, of men and money.

That pledge was given on behalf of Canada by Sir John Macdonald, Sir George E. Cartier, George Brown and A. T. Galt and the pledge has never been violated nor has it been rescinded from that day to this. Let this House and the people of this country now cease their quarrelling and fighting for the present and unite in a manly determination to carry out this pledge.

[Mr. Currie.]

Mr. LUCIEN T. PACAUD (Megantic): Mr. Speaker, I would surely consider myself lacking in a most solemn duty if I did not avail myself of this opportunity of expressing most frankly the views I entertain on what I consider the greatest measure ever presented to this Parliament. I appreciate, Sir, to the fullest the keen sense of responsibility which rests upon every hon. member of this House in dealing with a question which far surpasses in its consequences the course of our ordinary legislation. May this acknowledgment on my part be sufficient to assure the House that however strong may be my objections to this Bill no word of mine will intentionally at least carry with it the sting of bitterness or of passion. The words that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) uttered a few months ago in this House, in announcing to an unsuspecting people the intention of the Government to enact and enforce the conscription of man power in this country had barely fallen from his lips, when we were all of us witnesses of the intense excitement and deep feelings which these words and this new policy had aroused from one extremity of this country to the other. We heard the rising clamour of those who on the one hand gave expression of their views in favour of this measure. We heard the still more vigorous protests of those who on the other hand were strongly opposed to it. Through this issue, thrown so suddenly into our national arena, we clearly saw emerging from what was up to that time a united nation, the very keynote of our splendid efforts for three years, a national crisis not only acute in its present form but still more dangerous in its possibilities. This is the actual and unfortunate situation in which we find ourselves to-day. I do not wish to exaggerate its seriousness, nor do I wish to minimize its true meaning, but I feel that the hour is sufficiently grave to justify us in scrutinizing these events with an open eye and unprejudiced mind.

Were I to put in simple form what I conscientiously believe is at the very root of the present agitation throughout Canada, I would do so in these words: We are fighting for liberty abroad; we do not wish to surrender it at home. It is from this standpoint that I have endeavoured to form my judgment as to the merits of the Bill now before the House. Let us test it from that point of view. Canada has been at war for nearly three years. She entered into the struggle freely and willingly. From the very beginning she had a clear conception of what she was fighting for. A great power

had challenged the democracies of the world. There is considerable difference between the two ideals. The allied nations believed in the liberty of each individual state to live its own life in its own way without any encroachment or interference from its neighbours. On the other hand, the central powers believed and still believe, in the domination by force of one power over the greater portion of the world. In other words, it was the battle of democracy versus autocracy, liberty versus servitude. That being the issue, the Government of the day found the nation at its back. There was no hesitancy, there was no recrimination. As soon as the word was given Canada was united and determined to share in this war and to win it. We all know what this national unity in so far as our participation in the struggle is concerned has achieved for Canada.

Four hundred thousand men have left our shores. What they have done on the battlefield will remain for ever the brightest page of our history. But in this page also, if I may be permitted to say so, can our lesson of to-day be learned and our real mission be unfolded. Let us not forget—I think it is well to remember it especially at this time—that we have achieved our great task because we adopted, from the very beginning, the system of voluntary service. By this system we got the men; by this system we evaded a dangerous controversy as to which course we were to follow in the long and rugged years that were to come. By this system we succeeded in concentrating the minds of the whole people of Canada on the one great issue. Sir, I ask you, prompted in doing so by the one thought which supersedes all others in my mind, had we at that time adopted conscription, if the events of to-day have any meaning, would we have achieved such a splendid success as we have? Would we not have raised a grave domestic question which would have introduced into this Parliament the deadly poison of class agitation and national unrest? To put the question is to answer it. We would have defeated the very end we had in view. The policy of this country has been at all times the voluntary system.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. member mean to assert that the voluntary system allowed people in this country to dispute any law? Is it not the force of overwhelming public opinion, as promulgated by the majority, that rules in this country in everything?

Mr. PACAUD: That is why we are for a referendum.

Mr. BURNHAM: Then the hon. gentleman would not object to conscription under those circumstances?

Mr. PACAUD: I bow to the will of the majority of the people of Canada. The voluntary system remained the policy of this country from 1914 to 1917. The two leaders of our political parties are on record as having declared in this very House, not longer than a year ago, that there would be no conscription in Canada for overseas service. The feeble rumours which were circulated at that time throughout the country that conscription was coming had, no doubt, reached their ears. They alike saw the danger. They alike desired to assure the country. They both pledged themselves to a policy of no conscription.

To-day the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says: I stand by my pledge, no conscription until the people have decided upon its principle. The right hon. leader of the Government (Sir Robert Borden) says: Conscription at all costs, conscription right away, conscription behind the people's backs. That is the issue. For myself I, without hesitation, endorse the position taken by my leader, who stands by his pledge, who stands by the people of Canada and who stands by the voluntary system. I stand for the voluntary system. I do not believe it has failed. After listening to the speech of the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) I am inclined more than ever to the suggestion that the fault lay with the Government, who lacked the spirit and the power to make it a success. I may be right or I may be wrong in this conclusion, but, whether right or wrong, I maintain that the tribunal of last resort to weigh the facts and pass judgment is the people of Canada themselves. Is not our position alike logical and constitutional? I use these words not without a purpose. I heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) reproaching the leader of the Opposition for talking about the constitution and urging his point in a logical way. He tells us this does not satisfy him. Sir, I am afraid that this war has not taught us all the same lesson. For myself, I believe that if before 1914 we had reason to pin our faith to constitutional methods of Government, we have far more reason to-day to steer still more closely within these lines when we have

had before us for three years the example of an autocratic power such as Germany, when we have been able to measure to what depths it could stoop to achieve its ends. But, says the minister, if the necessity is upon us we must act. That is true. The failure of the Government to apply and practise this sound principle during the course of this war has been the cause of our principal complaint on this side of the House, and the reason of the general discontent throughout this country. But, Sir, there is no necessity which justifies this Government to usurp the rights of the people. Their right is to be heard on this momentous question. Our duty is to obey and respect their verdict. We have, Sir, before us a measure which embodies a new principle. True, the Prime Minister tried to impress this House and country with the belief that this Bill was founded on an old principle, which could be found in section 69 of the Canadian Militia Act. Why does he do so? He did so, Sir, because he recognized and appreciated how feeble would be his position if he failed to establish this contention, essential to his case. He felt that, without it, he could not meet the argument of those who based their plea for an appeal to the people on the very fact that a new principle, contrary to all the traditions of the Canadian people, was being enacted by this measure. Did he succeed? Sir, the answer of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), an answer based on the very despatches sent by the Prime Minister himself, and on an Order in Council passed by the British Government who had been consulted on this very point at the very beginning of the war making our Canadian soldiers Imperial troops, is so complete, so thorough, that there can be no further doubt as to this: It is a new principle. What does this new principle involve? The compulsory military service abroad of the man power of Canada, the very thing the Prime Minister told us a year ago in this House he would not apply. We placed our faith in this pledge of the Prime Minister. We voted for the extension of this Parliament. We did so at the request of the Government to avoid any domestic controversy during war time, although we on this side of the House had long lost confidence in this Government. To-day, forgetting this pledge, casting aside the very reasons which they gave in asking for an extension, the Government comes forward with the most contentious measure which has ever been presented to this House, and asks this Parliament, which holds no longer any authority from the people, the power to enact a law which, for myself at least, I am convinced will do more harm than good to the great cause we have in view. Why should not the people be consulted? Why not a plebiscite? It cannot be a question of delay. It cannot be, as is so often stated, the immediate necessity of filling the gaps at the front. The Prime Minister himself, in his correspondence with the leader of the Opposition, makes it perfectly clear that if there had been a coalition he would not have enforced this Bill before appealing to the country for its endorsation. Surely, Sir, the Prime Minister would not have made this offer had he believed that the delay which might have resulted from such an appeal would have been in any way detrimental to our soldiers at the front. So, Sir, let us be frank. The reason for refusing a plebiscite is the fear of its defeat at the polls. Is that a democratic doctrine? Are we going to be the tools of those who wish to implant in this country the very system to defeat which we have given our very best blood in Europe? For myself, and for those whom I represent in this House, I will not cast my vote for and share in the responsibility for such a course.

Yet, Sir, in the face of this, when consultation with the people is suggested, it is called a miserable dilatory motion. It is brushed aside and scorned, as a trifle which deserves no consideration. No doubt we have in power a true Tory party, and Toryism was once defined by Gladstone as "Distrust of the people, qualified by fear." Never was there a truer application of a sound definition.

Mr. Speaker, special attention has been given in this debate to the province from which I come, and to the race to which I belong. Harsh words have been used, severe attacks have been delivered, unjust statements have been made. Our French Canadian soldiers who had enlisted were not spared the insult of slanderous insinuations. Were these words but the passing utterances of men, victims who were carried away by an outburst of passion, suddenly revealing to us the inner soul of the fanatic, I would be inclined, for my part, to brush them aside, knowing full well that they would not carry more weight in the country than the men who uttered them could command the respect of their fellow-countrymen. These words are far more significant.

They remind us that we are face to face with a condition far more serious. For a long time now, but specially since this war began, a systematic campaign has been waged against the French Canadian race. Let us be truthful in this matter. It has become the political weapon for the Tory press of Canada. The motive is clearly revealed to us. The object can be clearly traced. Anxious to save the Government from disaster, knowing full well that they could not succeed, basing their sole plea on the administrative record of this Government, they are trying to divert the minds of the people of Canada from the issue which spells sure defeat to this Government, by appealing once more to the prejudices of men, hoping and expecting, in this way, to save the Government. What is, Sir, the pretext of this campaign? It is said to be lack of recruiting in the province from which I come. The hon. leader of the Opposition, and those from my province who spoke after him, have given a clear and frank statement on this subject. They explained the conditions in Quebec. They showed what should have been done, and was not done. They pointed out the lack of system, the lack of good will, of proper education which undermined the feeble efforts that were made in my province to encourage enlistment. We heard a few days ago the remarkable speech of the hon. gentleman from Three Rivers. He placed before the bar of this House, in modest terms, but with a vigour and straightforwardness which, I am sure, will reach the hearts and minds of many people in this country, the case of Quebec, with its just complaints, its true aspirations and hopes. It is needless for me to repeat what was so eloquently and forcibly presented by those who have preceded me. To the fair-minded men in this country, from whatever province they come or to whatever nationality they belong, they are the vast majority, I ask them, read these speeches, ponder over them, and have in view the lesson which it was intended to convey. To those men, my countrymen, of whatever nationality they may be, who understand the paramount necessity of an earnest undertaking, whose vision is clear enough to see the danger arising from further misunderstanding and estrangement, I say: "Hear the case before judging of its merits." I appeal to their sense of justice. I ask them in what other province, outside of Quebec, was the cry of "No participation in the wars of the Empire" raised and spread as the gospel of truth? In no part of the Dominion, except in the province of Quebec. In what other province in this Dominion outside of Quebec was the issue which we are now discussing ever debated? In none. Will any fair-minded man tell me that, when this war broke out, the conditions in Quebec were similar to those existing in the other English provinces of the Dominion? And who is responsible for this condition of affairs? Who created this difference of mentality between the provinces of Quebec and the other provinces? It was the Nationalist party, represented by two members of this Government, the Nationalist party who had the financial backing of the present Government and of the Tory party of Canada, and who, to-day, victims of their own work, are the first and only ones to throw us the stone. Is this British fair play?

Mr. Speaker, we are passing through a most critical phase in our national existence. Our destiny is in our own hands. Let us not lose at home the benefits of our great sacrifices abroad. Let us trust the people. Without their verdict we are disunited. With their verdict, we are again one people, united in a common effort, clasping, in lasting comradeship, the hands now withheld in doubt.

Mr. ARTHUR LACHANCE (Quebec Centre) (translation): Mr. Speaker, at this stage of a debate which has been going on for more than two weeks, it would be rash on my part to lay claim to new arguments either for or against the Conscription Bill introduced by the Government. On either side, the subject has been threshed out so far as the House of Commons is concerned. All that remains to me, therefore, in order to avoid repetitions, is to briefly state what are my reasons for voting as I intend to do.

What has been the dominant reason for Canada's participation in the war of nations which is laying waste the old continent?

In the month of August 1914, the almost unanimous vote of the House of Commons, expressive of general public opinion, as voiced by the press and public speakers throughout the country, authorized Canada's intervention in the bloody conflict, even then almost world-wide, which had been precipitated during the last days of July.

Was it solely the fact that England was fighting that brought about this decision? No, Mr. Speaker. For the greater part of us, if not for all of us, this was inspired by an even more generous sentiment.

Germany, in defiance of her own signature, had brutally pounced upon Belgium, a small, defenceless, neutral nation, with a

view, by violence and torture, to pave the way for a sweeping invasion of France, the ultimate object of the move being to invade the British Isles and strike at the Empire's industrial, commercial and naval supremacy.

General public opinion condemned that outrageous repudiation of a nation's solemn pledge; it saw in it, above all, a principle of undeniable justice to be avenged and to be sanctioned once more, and if possible, forever. Accordingly, the whole world cheered France, England and Russia as they entered the lists.

Is there anything strange in the fact that Canada, peopled by Englishmen and Frenchmen, should of her own accord have offered to draw the sword, young as she is, for the vindication of international honour? The contrary attitude would indeed have been astonishing, most painfully astonishing to me.

Parliament, however, authorized that participation after being given an assurance on the part of the Government that military service would be voluntary. And how often was not that engagement repeated in this House, as well as outside of it, by the Prime Minister, by his colleagues and by his partisans? How often also, upon the faith of such declarations, have not the leader of the Opposition and his followers confirmed it to their constituents?

This pledge was given from the very inception of the war in a despatch of His Royal Highness the Governor General sent by the Prime Minister to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and dated August 1, 1914.

Let us read this despatch:

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.

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

As will be seen, it was recognized by the president of the Council that the Canadian troops could not be sent across the sea, under the Militia Act of Canada and that they should be sent only as serving voluntarily in the war. The same condition is to be found in a despatch sent by the Governor General dated 5th of August, in which it is asked that the Government of Great Britain should issue an order to enlist our soldiers for the British army, as they were volunteers:

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.

The same pledge is reiterated by the Government in their order in Council of August 6, authorizing the mobilization of Militia units, such units to be composed of officers and men who were willing to volunteer for overseas service under the British Crown.

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.

Again, in the debate on the Address during the session of 1916, the Prime Minister stated that there would be no compulsory service.

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.

The Government reiterated the same pledge in their Order in Council passed on the 16th of March last authorizing the Minister of Militia to raise 500,000 men for home defence. That appeal was made under the Militia Act of Canada, but they took good care to add that this partial mobilization applied only to service in Canada for home defence.

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.

Such were the official statements which determined the nature of the military service authorized by Parliament. Such was the position from August, 1914, to May 17, 1917. Unexpectedly, on May 18, Mr. Prime Minister made a regular back down, and like a bolt from the blue, this Conscription Bill came down which staggered the House being totally uncalled for, confiscating uselessly as it does the liberty of the subject, in short, legislation which will ultimately prove prejudicial to the best interests of the Allies, in so far as Canada is concerned. Let me say here, Sir, that this measure has bred in the minds of the people a deep feeling of distrust.

The people of this country have been led into error, and henceforth they will mistrust the Government on this war question even more than on any other issue. They are under the impression that, through reprehensible manoeuvres, they have been befooled into giving assent to our participation in the war and to the exigencies that have flowed from it. In fact, Sir, what member of this Parliament would affirm that, at the outset, the people would have approved of our intervention, had not the Government formally pledged themselves to a strictly voluntary service?

Who is the hon. gentleman who pretends that the people would have assented to the various measures taken from the very outset of the war, three years ago, had the administration even given a hint that they were contemplating conscription?

Who would say that when the extension of the term of Parliament came up before the House in 1916, the general stand of the people of Canada, which was then rather a passive one, would not have been different, had they anticipated or even suspected that this compulsory service was being contemplated?

Had such a project been disclosed, never would the powers of Parliament have been extended, as the people would have objected to it, as they were opposed to conscription. Half the people have already manifested their opposition to conscription, not only in the province of Quebec, but throughout the whole Dominion, as shown by the numerous petitions received from every section of the country from labour unions, farmers, clerks, municipal bodies and other associations.

Besides, the fact has been acknowledged by many hon. members who have stated that they opposed a referendum or the holding of a general election, because, in their opinion, the verdict returned by the country would be adverse to the proposed Bill. What then? Do those hon. gentlemen mean to impose such legislation in defiance of the will of the majority of the electorate, legislation, I say in pursuance of which the life of the citizens is at stake? Is not such legislation the very negation of our representative system? In such a case, we should no longer have Government by the people, but merely representatives autocratically substituting for the will of the people their own personal opinion, at a time when they no longer have any mandate for legislating on conscription, and should they happen to have a mandate, rather hold it in order to oppose compulsory service.

It is even on that latter ground that I oppose the amendment to the amendment giving the Bill the six months' hoist. I oppose conscription, but I will accept it, should the majority of the electorate approve of it. However, it remains to be known beyond a doubt to which side leans the majority and how could it be so ascertained, except by the vote of the people? Of what right do you claim to prevent, by this amendment to the amendment, the people of Canada from expressing their opinion? What we are asked to do in the petitions that have been sent to Parliament is not voting down or killing the Bill but that the electors should vote on the issue.

I think that the hon. gentlemen who are introducing or advocating this amendment to the amendment show themselves just as arbitrary as those who support this Bill, being well aware that the people antagonize it. I for one cannot approve of this new and radical departure in our participation in this war, in this breaking away from our former policy, altogether at variance with the formal pledges given by the Government, as to which I happen to stand committed, through having adhered to those guarantees in the past and through the representations given to my constituents. I cannot endorse this Bill, the far reaching results of which nobody can foresee. I could not approve of this policy unheard of so far in our history, this new departure from our past traditions, unless it could be shown that the people were willing to accept it, and "a fortiori" am I bound to oppose it, when I am satisfied that the people condemn it.

But there is another branch of the subject of which I wish to speak now. Is the despatching of those 100,000 men warranted by the economical conditions of the country? On what ground do the Government rest their claim for imposing conscription upon the country? There is but one reason alleged by them, and it is this,

that as enough men do not volunteer to complete the quota required, it becomes necessary to resort to conscription, in order to maintain at full strength our expeditionary forces on the firing line. I grant it, as a general proposition; but it should first be shown that those 100,000 men will be of greater use to the Allies overseas than they would be here. Where is the proof of that fact to be found? When, on the 1st January 1916, the Prime Minister increased the expeditionary forces to 500,000 men, had he first of all ascertained whether such a policy was warranted by the economical conditions of the country? There is absolutely nothing to show that he had done so. Even to-day, what is there before the House to show us that those 100,000 men would better serve the interests of the Allies overseas than they would do here in the industries producing for war purposes and in the establishments dedicated to our national existence?

And should those 100,000 men remaining in the country be of greater practical use to the common cause, who would object to other men in the ranks of the Allied armies filling up the gaps in the Canadian army?

Many authorized voices have declared in the press and before public meetings that under present circumstances, the levy of 100,000 men would result in creating disturbances in the farming industry, in crippling our finances and throwing out of gear our industrial machinery, which would affect prejudicially Canada and indirectly the cause of the Allies.

What are the Allies clamoring for? Is it not for munitions, for food and ships for transportation? Why do you not open shipyards and encourage as much as possible shipbuilding? Under the circumstances, assisting the Allies in that particular branch is an imperious necessity, while by so doing, you should be encouraging an infant industry of the greatest importance to the country. But will the Government rest satisfied with this appeal to coercion? By no means, because next year there will be another levy of 100,000 men and as many more within two years. Did not the Minister of Finance state before the House a few days ago, that the war would be of long duration?

As will be seen, this new departure, this breaking away from our traditions, along the line followed by the Administration, may result most disastrously for Canada and for the cause of the Allies. You would be labouring under a delusion, in attempting to maintain in their integrity our Canadian forces, without providing for a corresponding efficient maintenance of our economical situation.

Now what was the position a year ago? What is our position to-day? The cost of living is going sky-high, prices are soaring and have reached fantastic figures altogether out of proportion to the revenue of the people. There does not seem to be any other remedy but a greater production, but so far the Government have not suggested any. But how are we to have more production without securing more labour? Where is labour to be found? Last year in the West of Canada there was an urgent demand sent out for farm help by the farmers, but to no purpose. Last winter agents were sent out by the Government for recruiting 50,000 farm hands in the United States, but they did not get any. And yet, despite this shortage of labour, the people were amazed on hearing that 50,000 men have been called under the colours for the defence of the country. Against whom was the country to be defended? The question has so far remained unanswered. A most bewildering thing, indeed all the same, that mobilization which resulted in uselessly stationing in various camps, forts and citadels of Canada 50,000 men, at a time when the neighbouring Republic was being explored by Government agents for recruiting the farm hands and labourers needed in our cities and on the farms.

But what we are justified in inferring from that policy is this: the Government cannot prove that the 100,000 men whom they contemplate despatching to Europe will be of greater use to the Allies, than they would be here. Do not all those facts show that this conscription Bill originates in the temerity of the Prime Minister apparently enacting on his own responsibility, on the 1st January 1916, that the expeditionary forces should be increased to 500,000 men.

This message seems to have been at first the ipse dixit of a Government leader who, on a New-Year's day woke up in the attitude of a Caesar. But had he well pondered over the still latent possibilities of voluntary enlistment on the abundance or shortage of labour for the production of food and all the essentials and necessities for the effective prosecution of the war? That does not seem to have been the case. That there was temerity has been shown by the events, the message did not meet with the anticipated success.

But, because the Prime Minister did not rightly size up the probable results of voluntary enlistment, was he warranted on that ground in resorting to coercion, in

defiance of the most formal pledges given, from the very inception of the war?

In addition to the question as to the desirability of conscripting Canadian manhood, there is the legal and constitutional issue. In this connection, I have in mind the axiom so often quoted in debate: "When Great Britain is at war, Canada is at war." Granted, but this axiom should be thus qualified: a belligerent with Great Britain has the right of attacking our country, even though Canada were standing aloof in the conflict; in case of such an attack, Canada could not invoke the status of neutrality.

But this axiom does not convey the meaning that Canada ought to participate in all the wars of Great Britain or that, even if she took part in any war she could not withdraw from it.

Under the Constitution, Canada could recall to the last man all her expeditionary forces, being in no way bound to send overseas men to fight in this world-shaking war.

To the accuracy of that statement an eminent statesman, the right hon. Arthur James Balfour bore witness in this House. From his oration of May 28, delivered before the House of Commons and the members of the Senate in joint session, let me quote what follows:

> Moreover, remember that the foreign speculators about the British Empire must have thought before the war began. They said to themselves: This loosely constructed State resembles nothing that has ever existed in history before; it is held together by no coercive power; the Government of the Mother Country cannot raise a corporal's guard in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or wherever you will; she can not raise a shilling of taxation; she has no power. When, unexpectedly, without giving an opportunity for preparation or discussion, or propaganda, war burst upon the world, even those animated by such a feeling might well have doubted whether this great Empire—each unit of which had it in its power to hold aloof had it so desired—might act as one organization animated by one soul, moved by one purpose and driving towards one end.

As will be seen from the above quotation, the Government of the Mother Country could not raise a corporal's guard in Canada nor in any other colony, and every colony could have stood aloof, had it so desired. Therefore, granted that if Great Britain has no power to coerce us into participating in her wars, how can the Government take authority to enact legislation for coercing us? No, the Government have no such power, neither in justice nor in equity.

Among the obligations involved in the status of citizenship is that of military service for the defence of one's country: but you could not quote a single case of legislation imposing military service for the defence of another country.

Now, to put it in a nutshell, what the Government said amounts to this: conscription is a case of emergency or at least it is the unavoidable result of Canada's participation in the conflict, as it is necessary to fill up the gaps and to maintain at full strength our expeditionary forces.

Now, to this I reply: You have secured our participation under false representations, because you kept repeating "ad nauseam" that there would be no such emergency and no such conscription as a consequence; and you cannot frame a law for conscripting Canadian manhood grounded on a consent which was not given freely, but erroneously, and that is the reason why I say that you should appeal to the people, in order to get the power that is lacking and which you cannot bestow on yourselves. Up to a few weeks ago, did any one pretend that our Canadian manhood could be conscripted and sent abroad in order to fight the battles of England and the Allies?

Besides, how could such a departure have been contemplated, in view of the fact that under the Militia Act of Canada no troops could be sent abroad on voluntary service? The leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has made that point very clear; he has grounded his opinion on the views held by the Prime Minister and the Government in the despatches of August 1 and 5, 1914, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies and in the order in council of August 6 authorizing the mobilization of the first contingent.

This interpretation squares with the policy and the principles embodied in all the legislation relating to the Militia Acts enacted in Canada. This was fully shown by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) in the exhaustive review which he made of that legislation, going back as far as 1808 and resting his case on the best authorities and the most competent exponents of the policy of that legislation.

It follows, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the Militia Act of Canada has nothing to do with the proposed conscription Bill; that the Government who pretend to graft it on the Militia Act are not acting in good faith; that Great Britain has no right to compel the people of Canada to go and fight her battles, and "a fortiori", that the Government have no right to enact a law in order to force upon the people compulsory service.

I approved of Canada participating in this world-war, and I do not feel regret for it, as the cause of the Allies deserves the co-

operation of all those who are far or near connected with it. In the province of Quebec, a certain school of thought has been manifesting, more ostensibly than they have been doing in some of the other provinces, its opposition to the country participating in the war. In the opinion of this group of anti-participationists there is no blinking the fact that our entry in the war results from what they think was the blameworthy stand taken, at the time of the South African war in 1898, and from the legislation enacted in 1909 and 1910 in connection with the Naval service and also from the contribution of $35,000,000 for the construction of these dreadnoughts to be incorporated in the British navy. But there is no similarity. In those three instances the question was as to the desirability of the Government proffering the assistance of Canada to the mother country. Now it is no longer a question of Great Britain prosecuting a redress or a conquest, but it is a case of the most peace-loving nations which, after repeatedly ignoring the most humiliating provocations, are now rising in their might and taking up arms on behalf of international law or the law of nations, and in vindication of the treaties guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium, which Germany might and autocracy pretend to trample upon with impunity; in short it is the case of a nation, threatening all liberty, despising all the rights bequeathed to the world by the English Revolution and the French Revolution. Thus is spite of the anguish of spirit and the heart-rending anxiety we were a prey to, from the inception of this orgy of destruction, I am still of opinion that Canada has done right in helping those of her sons who volunteered to go overseas and whose valour in this world-shaking war has stood equal to the noble cause espoused by them.

Undoubtedly being given that we are at war, we should grieve at having erased from our national records such glorious deeds as those performed by our soldiers who held high the honour of Canada on so many battle fields; those soldiers, I say, who at Ypres and Saint Julien saved Calais, those who died at Festubert and Givenchy and Saint Eloi, those who fell at Neuve Chapelle, those who gave their lives at Courcelette and who offered the supreme sacrifice at Vimy.

In the same order of things, Canada has risen to the height of the cause for which she is fighting, and the magnitude of the effort exerted by her has been recognized by military leaders and statesmen alike. In proportion, our contribution as a whole is ahead of that of any other colony and it has been estimated that even the United States would stand our equal only when they have put in the field an army of five or six million soldiers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, should we not be disregarding, to a certain extent, that great generosity on the part of the people, were we to introduce coercion for the purpose of increasing a contribution which, as admitted by competent parties, has already reached the extreme limit of this country's economic power?

Considering the results already obtained, voluntary enlisment, reinvigorated, skilfully directed, kept alive, would indeed have brought to a worthy completion Canada's participation in the war.

In order to justify conscription, Great Britain's example is invoked, but there is no analogy between the two cases. England had signed the treaty which Germany has torn to pieces; on pain of everlasting disgrace, she owed it to her honour to see that her signature respected, putting, if necessary, into the effort her last man and her last shilling. Canada on the other hand had signed no treaty; legally and constitutionally she was in no wise obliged to intervene in this war; her sacrifices have been inspired by her magnanimity and were made to the full extent of her resources.

Because Canada, heeding her generosity and self sacrifice, has sent over and maintained to this day an army at the front, is it logical to take for granted that she is bound to continue maintaining it in full numbers, notwithstanding any other considerations, when volunteering proves inadequate and when, on the other hand, volunteering has been the determining, essential, sine qua non reason for our original participation?

Arguing from our colonial status, some people in this country speak and protest as if Canada should be sacrificed to the insatiable Moloch that is, for the past three years, swallowing up the vital forces of the old world; as if Canada should trail along until spiritless, bloodless and emaciated, she drops gasping at the Allies' feet.

No! no!

A colony, be it so; but a free and self-governing country whose citizen has the right and alike the duty of speaking his mind. Canada is your country as well as it is ours, but in a different manner. Our ancestors were its discoverers and settlers; they have brought to it civilization; wherefore is it our country not in the sense that it is yours, you, Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen, who may claim also another

country as your own. Our fathers have spread over it the atmosphere of liberty; it needed, it is true, a revolution and bloodshed, but liberty, indeed, never had any other cradle nor any other nursing; besides, there is not a single Canadian, who stops to reflect, that does not applaud to-day that revolution of yesterday. How is it, therefore, that you cannot understand our fear lest a misplaced generosity should throw this country into a deadly state of languor, should paralyze our growth, and that, without improving to a perceptible degree the Allies' general situation.

That is the point upon which we ask the judgment of all Canadians. This country has already given too liberally of its blood and its gold, that the Government should to-day mercilessly treat it as liable to unlimited taxation and hard labour, whether in its individual or in its national life, and pay no heed to the views or the will of the people.

Canada must remain in the struggle, that is the feeling of all of us; but the Government wants to introduce coercion; we answer: You have no right to do it without the consent of the citizens. Let, therefore, the question be submitted to them. What do you fear? If you are convinced that conscription is necessary, you will have no trouble in satisfying the people of its necessity. Do you mistrust them? And why should you, if you are in good faith, if you have, as you contend, performed your duty. Would it be that you foresee a hostile verdict upon conscription? In my opinion, yes, that is the reason for your refusal. But then, it is the ipse dixit of a government group in defiance of the popular will.

As a parting word, let me say: Trust the people; they will be your supreme support, your only strength in the crisis which Canada, as the rest of the world, is going through; they are broad-minded, generous; sacrifices are easy to them; they will lighten your path. But if you have no confidence in them, in the people who have entrusted you with their destinies, they, your masters and your judges as they are ours, how can you expect us to have faith in you?

Mr. C. A. WILSON (Laval): Mr. Speaker, the Bill for compulsory military service which the Government has drawn up and presented to this House has been so thoroughly discussed and so fully examined in all its bearings that very little is left to be said on the subject. However, on such a solemn occasion I deem it my duty to state my views concerning the Bill.

All are of one accord on the main question; the sole thought of every citizen of this Dominion is the success of the Allies in this mighty struggle. Since we have entered upon this war, rightly or wrongly, the fact remains that we are now in it to the finish. It would be useless for me now to enter into any of the questions touching upon the wisdom or otherwise of our present participation in the conflict, or to devote time to the consideration of the necessity of bending all our might to secure ultimate victory.

At the outset of the war the Allies believed in an early triumph. They thought that in a short time—three months or so, at the most—their troops would enter in triumph the city of Berlin, that the heroic King of the Belgians would be reseated on his throne, and that the people of that noble little country would be given back their rights and privileges and be in a position to enjoy all the blessings of a permanent peace. For three years the Allies have battled. The thunder of war has been ceaseless; the sacrifices endured have been beyond number, yet the dawn of victory does not appear on the horizon. These are not words of despair, nor do they indicate any lessening of faith in the cause. On the contrary, I am absolutely convinced that ultimate victory will crown the efforts of the Allied armies.

I do not intend to occupy the time of the House in going over the different parts taken by the various Allies in this stupendous struggle. The question that occupies our attention at this moment concerns not only England, Belgium, France, or Italy; it concerns our own selves in Canada.

No one questions whether or not our efforts should be carried on to the end; for my part, I am convinced that that is the paramount duty of the hour. Effort means the use of force or strength, and it behooves us to know what our strength is, its nature, its extent, what the maximum of development necessary in order to secure the best that is in us. It is on this latter point that ideas and opinions differ. The difficulty is not insurmountable, the problem not without a solution; but it is necessary to lay aside all political interests and racial and religious prejudices, and approach the solving of the issue with open minds, generous hearts and clear brains.

The Government, realizing the position that Canada holds in regard to the Empire, thought well to take a share in this great struggle, called Parliament together, and received all the support possible from a united people through their representatives.

First, the necessity was for men at the front, and then for the means of providing for them. The Government employed the voluntary system of enrolment. At that time everyone believed in the effectiveness of that system, provided it was wisely and properly put in movement. What has been the result? In the work of recruiting this Dominion has performed miracles. England herself has declared through her most authoritative voices—even that of Mr. Balfour in this very House some weeks ago—that Canada deserves unlimited thanks for all she has done for the Allies, and that the conduct of her sons on the fields of Europe has surpassed the most sanguine expectations. Even the American people, a people pretty well accustomed to magnify their own achievements, could not refrain from paying homage to the magnificent and gigantic efforts of Canada at the beginning and on through this war of giants. They found that Canada, with an entire voting population of 1,600,000 men, including old men and men of all ages, as well as a vast number of inhabitants from other lands, had, without any coercion or enforcement, freely and voluntarily enrolled over 420,000 volunteers and sent over 330,000 of them beyond the seas to assist France and England on the fields of Flanders and elsewhere. And they marvelled at the achievement.

With these facts and figures before us, we cannot but say that the voluntary system in Canada, with all the difficulties incident to enlistment, has succeeded beyond all expectations. In support of this contention, I would like to quote from the Wall Street Journal of the 18th June instant, which organ, under the heading, "Conscription in Canada," makes the following estimate of this country's doings:

> Canada has a voting population of 1,600,000, including the old and feeble, and a relatively large number of Germans and Austrians of recent citizenship. Volunteer enlistments are over 400,000, and over 300,000 men have gone to England and France. Casualties run up to nearly 100,000. It cannot be said, therefore, that the volunteer system, with all of its faults of wastage of men, money and supplies, did not at least enlist popular support.
>
> Some time ago, national service was taken up and the industrial population of the Dominion has been classified, and an effort has been made to enlist men of fighting age who could be most economically dispensed with. Now, to round out the national service organization of the Dominion, a bill has been introduced for conscription.

I draw your attention specially to the following paragraph:

> When the history of the Dominion in this war shall have been written, it will not be recorded that she voluntarily failed to meet the high expectations of her Premier, for volunteers were in abundance, as they have always been. But it was necessary, even though late, to have due regard to an equitable distribution of the burden by localities and with reference to the state of industry, and in this way make good the pledge of Sir Robert Borden that Canada would stand at least half a million men overseas.
>
> The achievements of the volunteer Canadian contingents will survive in the traditions of the north long after every monument to commemorate them shall have perished.

This appreciation, which I consider as just and fair, brings me to the conclusion that, had it not been for the imprudent promise made by the Prime Minister in a moment of perhaps irreflection, the 500,000 men of whom he spoke would to-day be under the colours through the voluntary system. But that promise created a feeling of astonishment and stampede amongst a people who, considering themselves to be free men, did not wish to cut slices from their own liberty in order to secure the liberties of others. Such an appreciation on the part of the United States is not surprising, coming from a people who have themselves enjoyed the greatest amount of liberty in the world, and who are the personification of democracy in its fullest sense. But it is not enough to be a free people, you must practise freedom. I understand there are periods when great evils can be avoided only at the cost of great sacrifices. But efforts made for liberty should not lead to anarchy; it is very good to provide for men, but it is also essential to equip them and provide for them. Listen to a French writer on this subject. In the month of June of this year, Mr. Albert Peyronnet, of France said:

> It would appear that the first thing is to drive the enemy off the national soil. Doubtlessly correct. But to drive him, the combatant must be fed, we must plant, and to plant we must sow; seed and plants are required; these must be brought to their destination; transportation facilities are needed; and if we have none we must get them, cost what it may, and place them at the disposal of those who, while filled with courage and good will, are without the means and the implements to perform their work. While our soldiers are performing their duties for our freedom, they must be supplied.

Many comments have been made as to the reasons why enlistment in Quebec, if it has not failed, has slackened to a certain extent. Let us examine a few cold facts, and then although they may have been viewed from different angles by dif-

ferent observers, it is very easy for us to draw conclusions.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my opinion on some of those striking movements, those flashes of bright action which, at times, certain men perform, and which gain for them, if not fame, at least a degree of passing notoriety. Those deeds may be admirable in themselves, as far as they go, but the grave danger lies in the fact that the performer sometimes fails to gauge the ultimate and far-reaching consequence of that which, for the moment, appears worthy of praise. The lightning stroke is both brilliant and dazzling, but where it falls, generally ruin and ashes are to be found. We have an example of this in the action of the former member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche). With a splendid gesture he declared that he would not sit in Parliament, and that he resigned his seat as a protest against what he considered the unconstitutional and unworthy course taken by this Government in its retention of power without any mandate from the people. But Mr. Lamarche, unsupported by his other political associates, simply isolated himself and wrought an injustice to the very cause which he now eloquently advocates. Would he not be more useful, more effective, more patriotic and far more serviceable were he in this House to-day to register his vote against conscription, than to deliver orations, no matter how eloquent, against that pernicious principle?

11 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) who last week delivered his plea on the floor of Parliament, has been as inconsistent as have been all the other Nationalists in the political arena of the past few years. I listened very attentively to that hon. gentleman's explanations, and I have come to the conclusion that they explain nothing at all. I desire to be perfectly parliamentary in dealing with this phase of the issue before us; but I cannot help being to some extent severe; severe, but just, I hope. The Minister of Inland Revenue declared that French Canadians in various parts of the Dominion did well in recruiting, and that in Quebec they would have done equally well, had it not been for their leaders and the lack of sincerity in those leaders when encouraging enlistment. These are not his exact words, but they are the purport of them. Such is the central idea expressed by the hon. gentleman in his special pleading on Monday last. When I heard such excuses coming from the lips of that hon. gentleman, I sought for some word in the English or the French language to qualify properly the audacity of the statements. In 1910 and 1911 the men who preached a crusade throughout Quebec against all idea of conscription and of military or naval service, or any participation in wars of the Empire were the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin), the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) and their Nationalist brethren. The young lads of fifteen and sixteen years of age whom they taught to resist all thought of helping England, and in whom they implanted the idea that the Laurier Naval Bill was intended to send them as food for cannon on the fields of Europe or on the high seas, are to-day the young men of twenty-one or twenty-two whom these self-same apostles seek to force into the ranks of overseas regiments. Imagine the preacher of such doctrines arising to-day, simply because he is in possession of a portfolio, and blaming the leaders of public thought in Quebec for the lack of recruiting. The ex-Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) has been deceived, as the country has been deceived, but he has resigned his portfolio and has thus entered the strongest and most effective protest possible against the systematic deception perpetrated in Canada. Unlike Mr. Lamarche, the ex-Secretary of State remains in the House to vote against conscription; unlike the Minister of Inland Revenue he gives up his seat in the Cabinet to retain his liberty and to do his duty to his people and his province. But what am I to say of the course taken by the Minister of Inland Revenue? What a great day this Government has afforded him in return for his complete change of front; he has breakfasted off the shreds of his own principles; he has dined in the Speaker's chair; he now takes his supper at the council table of this conglomerate Cabinet; and he expects perhaps, to be allowed to sleep in the silent comforts of the Senate. What an example of the selling of a birthright for a mess of political pottage. The minister seems to have gone, in his brief career, the entire round of the political zodiac. But where I do not agree with him is when he pretends that he is retaining his seat in the Cabinet in order that French Canadians may not be deprived of representation in the Government. He is holding his portfolio under equally false pretences —because he and his associate no more represent the French Canadians than they do Australians or New Zealanders. But this is only one more of the deceptions he has learned in the school of political

deceit wherein he has learned his lessons of late. Do I exaggerate?

Let us turn to that school and to its headmaster. The Prime Minister and his party came into power mainly through the misrepresentations made in Quebec by the Nationalist crowd, who were ready to burn the country provided they could down Laurier. His Navy Act, which the Nationalists opposed tooth and nail and which the Borden party promised to efface from the statute-book if returned to power, still stands on the statutes, and this Government, in the face of events, dare not carry out its promise to repeal it. Nor would the Nationalists who then demanded its repeal, attempt to-day to repeat the arguments with which they deceived half of Quebec. Worthy pupils of a very worthy, or unworthy master. Bourassa yesterday; Borden to-day—different teachers, but professing the same principles, and putting those principles into practice each in his own way and according to his opportunities. I accuse this Government and its Prime Minister of repeated and reiterated misrepresentations; at all events they cannot be characterized more mildly than by styling them "dust-throwing into the eyes of the people."

Many times, has this Government, through its Prime Minister or other members of its combination, played a game of deceit with the people of Canada. On Tuesday night my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), in a masterly address, characterized by mildness, heart, fairness, fearlessness and every fine quality that belongs to the well-born French Canadian, exposed the miserable and un-British, narrow and anti-Canadian slanders that seem to have been specially concocted to carry on a campaign of unpatriotic persecution against my province. No need that I should mar that irrefutable oration by any repetitions of its indictments. It has been shown in this House, numberless times, and it has never been refuted, that the Prime Minister and his acolytes, the ministers from the province of Quebec, have constantly assured the country that conscription would never be resorted to by this Government. Had the Premier the idea of ultimately springing this issue on the people at that time? I do not know; perhaps not; perhaps his head was turned by some occult imperialistic influence during his otherwise fruitless trip to Europe last winter and last spring. Be that as it may, he and some of his ministers, must have assured the Archbishop of Montreal, either in writing or verbally, or both, that the National Service Card—the worst fiasco that the Government has ever perpetrated—was not the forerunner of conscription. On this I would like to hear from some of these gentlemen, in particular the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). Until refuted, or at least until denied, this self-evident fact must be taken for granted. It was a huge deception, backed by false representations of the worst kind. In this did the Premier and his Government deceive the people of my province. To-day they are reaping what they sowed in that hour. The eyes of the people are opened to the treachery of which they were the plaything and to the rule of deceit of which they are the victims.

I commend to the attention of the House the answer given by the right hon. the Prime Minister to a question put by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) on 18th June:—

Mr. Murphy: 1. Has there been any correspondence between the Government or any member thereof, and any Prelate or Prelates in the province of Quebec on the subject of conscription?

2. If so, will the correspondence be laid on the table of the House, and when?

And this was the answer:—

Sir Robert Borden: There is no official correspondence on the subject—

No "official" correspondence. But was there any?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Officious.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Yes, any officious correspondence, as remarked by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux).

—and the Government has no information in regard to the private correspondence of any member of the Government.

I leave it to the House to judge whether the complaint made by the Archbishop of Montreal on this subject, which complaint has been reported in the papers, was well founded or not. I think it was in my own county—

An hon. MEMBER: No, St. Benoit.

Mr. C. A. WILSON: Yes, at St. Benoit, in the county of Two Mountains, that the Archbishop stated that he had been deceived by some member of the Government. But, instead of full information being given to the public and to this House, we have the answer which I have just read. Having thus broken their own word and their own promises, I am not surprised that the gentle-

men opposite fear the people and cling to their seats despite the public clamour.

Let me read briefly from an editorial article which appeared in the Ottawa Citizen of this morning. It deals with the charge that Bourassa is the associate of the leader of the Opposition, or vice versa. The article is entitled " Playing it Fair." It says:—

To the unbiased observer there is no more pathetic symptom of the weakness of the Administration in the conduct of the war than the tendency of the partisan press to shift responsibility for the situation in Quebec to the shoulders of the leader of the Opposition. As antagonism to the compulsory military measure becomes more pronounced in the neighbouring province the Administration press all over the country, instead of attempting to find some rational solution for the problem, redoubles its efforts to make it clear that Sir Wilfrid alone is to blame for the difficulties that are being revealed in the attitude of Quebec. Politically, this may be intended to draw attention from the Nationalist alliance with the Conservative party in 1911, an alliance emphasized in a significant manner by the recent retirement of Hon. Mr. Patenaude from the Cabinet, but while this may have some value in an electioneering sense, it is an affront to the intelligence of the average Canadian to tell him, as does a local contemporary, that the province of Quebec virtually awaited a lead from Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the matter of conscription, and that the attitude of that statesman in the House determined to large degree the stand of the French Canadian province. It is worse than dishonest to assert that Sir Wilfrid handed Quebec over to Bourassa. The fact is that the influence of Bourassa was strong enough in 1911 to defeat Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the Dominion by almost dividing the number of seats in Quebec province.

The editorial closes with these words:

To blame the situation in Quebec on the leader of the Opposition is a cheap political expedient and lacks the spirit of manliness.

The appreciation which I was quoting from the Wall Street Journal a few minutes ago, you will notice, points out specially that it is as necessary to have due regard to an equitable distribution of the burden by localities and with reference to the state of industry, and in this way to make good the pledge of the Prime Minister that Canada would send at least half a million men overseas.. Equitable distribution and the pledge of the Prime Minister will illustrate la raison de naissance if not la raison d'être of this proposed legislation. So much has been said about this pledge that I do not propose to comment at any length in favour of it. Suffice it to say that for my part, I qualify it as imprudent, inconsiderate, presumptious, unauthorized, and tainted with jingoism. He wanted to outdo somebody, to "go one better " as is said in common parlance. And " the morning after the night before " when this promise had been flashed, he realized, I presume, that he had gone very far—too far —but he made up his mind to live up to his imprudence and make good at any price, even if he had to ruin Canada in men and money, sacrifice its autonomy and treat the British Act of Confederation as a "scrap of paper."

This is one of the considerations we are called upon to weigh, and I do not hesitate a minute to put it aside and consider it absolutely worthless and weightless. But the "equitable distribution" is worth considering.

At first glance it will be seen that the volunteering system adopted by the Government at the start would produce inequality. Inequality is in the very nature of voluntarism, and the Government, unless composed of blind men, could not do otherwise than foresee and expect inequality, discrepancy, difference in number. It was sure in advance that one part of the country would produce more man-power that another part, one province, one city, one town, one village, one hamlet one county, one parish, one township, one village would produce more or less than others. They knew that this system would engender comparison, friction, uneasiness, more especially in a bi-racial bi-lingual country like Canada and where all creeds are professed. Such a result, such an inevitable accomplishment having been achieved, the Government cannot now recriminate and complain. It is its own offspring, its own child. Though this system had grave disadvantages on the one hand, it had great advantages on the other, the most precious of which was that every man could of his own free will mould his conduct according to the dictation of his conscience.

I mentioned comparison a few moments ago. It happened that every other province, especially Ontario, compared itself with Quebec and found the latter wanting, lacking, "slacking," to use the consecrated terms complained—inde irae et lacrimae. From this day we had all kinds of insinuations and slanders, insults and appeals to religion, race and language—insults which have been met and repelled.

But the point I want to make is this. If a slacker is more or less to blame, more or less of a criminal, what difference is there between a slacker in Ontario, or the other English-speaking provinces, and a slacker

in Quebec? None. If any, the slacker of British parentage is more to blame. if blame should be attached, than the slacker of French blood, because his ties with the Motherland are linked more closely.

It is all very well to brag about loyalty and patriotism, but the fact remains that according to the figures given as a proposed basis for the conscription of 100,000 men, 75,000 will have to be enrolled in the English provinces and 25,000 in Quebec. Make all kinds of comparisons if you like now. If Quebec is slacking twenty-five per cent, the other provinces are slacking seventy-five per cent. But if it is a crime for a French-Canadian to slack, what would it be for a British Canadian?—a glory, I suppose. And to think that the Imperial Government had to enact conscription in the British Isles to stimulate the Briton's patriotism, while a whole English continent, Australia, with no Quebec within its confines, refused to have recourse to conscription, and nobody to blame them in this House!

I agree with many of the reasons that were enunciated in support of the proposal for a referendum, accepting as I do the principle that the people are the sovereign master of their destinies, and I deny anybody the right to dictate to the people without their consent. If any one doubts the soundness and prudence of this doctrine, let him become a student of the situation in Russia, China, Portugal or Greece.

Let us profit by the examples of others and the lessons they unfold, and apply them to Canada, I say, that neither compulsion nor conscription was ever before applied in this country. The people claim the right to have a say in a question which involves their lives, rights, obligations, privileges and property.

As to the insults, insinuations and slanders which have been offered in this House, they are the results of a campaign of fanaticism and ignorance carried on in Ontario and other English provinces and Quebec. Let us be frank about it; we have been abused so much by the Nationalists of Quebec and by their counterparts in Ontario and elsewhere, that we have become accustomed to it. At times, left to ourselves, we might have enjoyed the spectacle of a regular scrap between the two camps of our opponents if it had not been so sad, so unhuman, so depressing.

This measure has created a state of excitement amongst the people, and has given rise to all kinds of passions, religious, racial and political, which has spread to such an extent that some of the honourable members are asking themselves if we are not on the verge of civil war. We must admit that the people are excited, amazed and indignant over this unconstitutional measure, and want to have their say in the matter. Why not consult the people? The answer of my honourable friends who oppose the referendum is provoking and autocratic, unfair, unjust and insulting to the people of this country, because, they say, we know better than the people do. They say: We do not care for your opinion, we will send you to death without your consent, we are the masters of your destinies and we will pass this law against your will, or at all events without your consent. But what is the use of taking up the time of the House any longer. This measure will be enacted by the sheer force of the majority.

Before resuming my seat let me, en passant, take up the remark made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), in which he drew the comparison between the lion and the lamb. I wonder whether he intended to present an allegory, as a writer, Colonel Merrit, puts it:

> Both in war and in peace, so long as man is man, the weak will go to the wall and just as surely, so long as animal is animal, when the lion lies down with the lamb, it will only be when the lamb is inside the lion.

My hon. friend from Red Deer may feel assured that the lamb of Quebec will not lie down in this way, and it is better not to provoke that lamb too severely nowadays. The offender may find out that he has mixed up his animals, and that what he took for the lamb may prove to be the lion. He may have been a little bit mixed in his vision the other day.

Mr. DOHERTY: You might have indigestion.

Mr. WILSON: The Minister of Justice is very familiar with conditions in Quebec, and I think he is afraid of a bad meal when he goes back home. But what is the good of all that campaign of insult and slander? What benefit can be derived from it? In what way can the cause of the Allies, the cause of Canada, of Confederation, of union between the races in this country, be advanced by this pernicious and contemptible campaign? Has the Confederation of Canada to be cemented by blood, by a civil war? Are we to stain one more page of too many pages of our history already stained

with the blood of our heroes and martyrs? Let us hope that the right hon. leader of the Government will pause, and in order to avoid greater calamities, will drop this Bill, or at least appeal to the people, restore peace and harmony, help the cause of the Allies, and avoid the calamities that were pointed out to this House by his former colleague who a few days ago tendered his resignation.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I certainly could not find a better beginning for the protest I desire to register against the coercive measure which the Government wishes to force through the House without consulting the people, than by reading here a resolution adopted by all the mayors of my county, at a meeting held in Vaudreuil, the county town, on June 13 last.

As for me, I find in this resolution the whole subject matter of my speech.

Here is the resolution:

To the honourable Members of the House of Commons in Parliament assembled.

Extract from the proceedings of the municipal council of the county of Vaudreuil, adopted at its general session of the thirteenth of June, one thousand nine hundred and seventeen, literally takes as follows:

Moved by Counciller D. Bellemare, mayor of the parish of St. Lazare, seconded by Councillor Joseph E. Quesnel, mayor of the parish of Rigaud, and unanimously carried:

"Whereas the present Government no longer Minister of Canada, has just laid before the Canadian Parliament a Bill providing for military conscription for the overseas service;

"Whereas the present Government no longer hold a mandate from the people to pass such a Bill;

"Whereas this Bill is contrary to the Constitution which governs us, and to the country's traditions;

"Whereas we are governed by democratic institutions, and that the people should be consulted upon all important measures, with greater reason upon a measure which demands the blood and the gold of the nation;

"Be it resolved that this council strongly opposes the enactment of military conscription in this country before the consent of the majority of the people has been obtained by means of a referendum;

"And that a copy of the present resolution be sent to the House of Commons, to Sir Robert Borden and to Mr. Gustave Boyer, representative of the county in the House of Commons.

"And the petitioners shall always pray."

Given at Vaudreuil, this 16th of June, 1917.

True copy.

(Signed) J. N. Legault,
Asst.-Sec.-Treas.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by all the mayors of the county, not excepting a single one. Besides the two already mentioned in the resolution, were also present: Messrs. J. N. Lefebvre, county registrar and mayor of the village of Vaudreuil; Antoine Lalonde, of the parish of Vaudreuil; Azilda Daoust, of Ile Perrot; John McNaughton, of Como; Galt Brown, of Pointe Fortune; Ludger Cadieux, of St. Rédempteur; Emery Quesnel, of Ste. Marthe and James Berry, of Ste. Justine de Newton.

Two other municipalities have no representatives on the county council, on account of their having a city charter. I am speaking of Dorion and Rigaud, but, nevertheless, I may state that their mayors would have been of the same opinion as their colleagues, at least the first mentioned, in whose name I can officially speak. And what is most noticeable in this resolution, is its moderation. It is all fair play. It simply requests that the people be given an opportunity to be heard on a measure of such importance. Another fact which deserves consideration is that this county council has three English-speaking mayors who join in this petition.

Besides this protest coming from the most authorized body of my county, I laid before this House other petitions signed by several thousand people. Most of these petitions had been signed at the suggestion of the reeve of the county, and they call for either a referendum or a general election before this measure be adopted. Other petitions, from private parties, have also been sent to me and duly received, I have likewise laid them on the Table.

I may state, Mr. Speaker, that I was most happy to see such a general protest on the part of my constituents, for it encouraged me and confirmed me in the attitude I had decided to take, from the very moment this Bill was introduced.

The population of Vaudreuil county, Mr Speaker, is composed of peaceful people, law-abiding, fond of harmony and, above all, anxious to live on good terms with their English compatriots who cut quite a figure in the total population. And I would venture to assert that if all the English and French Canadians in the country could agree as they do in my constituency we never would have any knotty problem to solve.

How much, therefore, do I deplore the tone upon which the present debate is proceeding. The conscription issue has been completely set aside by some hon. members on the other side of the House, who saw fit to base their arguments upon racial grounds Truly, one might be led to believe that conscription is not a military question but rather a racial issue.

Mr. Speaker, this principle at stake does not appeal to me in such a light. To my mind, this measure is before Parliament just as all the other great questions have come before this House, but, because of its vital importance, it awakens a general interest throughout the country. On this question, the province of Quebec, among all the provinces, counts for one, no more no less, and I fail to see why some people are trying to have these proposals pivot solely around that province.

As I have just said, compulsory service is a matter of vital importance and it should not be considered from the several points of view of the two great races inhabiting this country, but rather from the standpoint of the whole nation from the Atlantic to the Pacific, according to their opinion of its citizens either for or against conscription. And I understand that the Liberals who are fighting this measure are not doing it to the aspirations of one race, but are voicing the anti-conscriptionist sentiment, as it is to be found in every one of the nine provinces of confederation. If the French Liberal members have stood in this House to defend the stand taken by their province, it is in reply to the provocations they have been subjected to by the Conservative members sitting on your right. And I would appeal to the hon. Prime Minister's sense of justice to check the vehement out-pourings of his partisans who, by their senseless appeals, are actually raising a rancour from which no good results can be expected.

These rumours of revolt which might arise, here and there, in the province of Quebec should cause no undue alarm, for I am honestly convinced that the only revolt that might likely break out in this country, would be between conscriptionists and anti-conscriptionists, to whatever race they may belong. And the riot which took place in Winnipeg not more than a few days ago, bears ample evidence.

I shall vote against the Military Service Bill for three reasons:

Firstly, because I have no confidence in the honesty or in the ability of the present Government;

Secondly, because this Parliament is presently sitting without any mandate but that of its own members, and therefore, has not, in the meaning of the constitution, any rightful existence;

Thirdly, because the establishment of compulsory service is an economic error and, adopted without the people's consent, would become an arbitrary act and a menace to confederation.

In order to make good my first argument, to wit.: that I have no confidence in the present Government, I will not lose any time in citing the long list of scandalous matters which have been charged against them, more particularly since the beginning of the war, although long previous to 1914, the Government had already made several vents in their coat of arms. Never did scandals arouse public opinion to such a degree as those connected with the supply of ammunition, equipment and all other war material. And what a pitiable defence have they not offered for every charge laid against the Government, or against some of its ministers.

The honest and independent public opinion of this country has long ago lost all confidence in the present Government. When I speak of the Government's incapacity, I am perfectly justified by what has unfortunately occurred: its unpardonable errors, its extravagant expenditure in the organization of the contingents. the grotesque and costly performances of its ex-Minister of Militia—its Napoleon the little, as Victor Hugo liked to nickname the last French emperor, who provoked the disaster of 1870—the exorbitant prices paid right and left for war supplies, the unrestrained squandering at the Valcartier camp; the quarrels of Camp Borden; the painful and condemnatory report made by Dr Bruce upon the Canadian hospital's service in England, and many other blunders the enumeration of which would by itself take up my whole time. However, the emergency is too great a one for me to exact today this rendering of accounts in connection with which the people of this country, willing or not must foot the bill. But, a matter about which the Government betrays its utter inefficiency and about which we have the right of demanding a severe and immediate accounting, is its criminal unconcern to protect the people against the vampires of every description, who are taking advantage of them and subjecting them to the horrors of the high cost of living. The poor people cannot maintain that equanimity for the morrow which may keep the millionaires who sit here as ministers or as members of the present Parliament. No. the working man, whether in the mills or on the land, to whom every other day brings trouble and uneasiness for his family and for himself, has to bear, during the terrible period we are now passing through, the adverse lot of hardships, the constant labour under the yoke, and the privations due to the lack of comfort, to the high cost of foodstuffs, of fuel, of clothing and of all the other necessaries of life.

The people who have been asked their generous and loyal contributions to this great war, the people who have answered so liberally, had at least the right to rely upon the Government's strong co-operation to be protected against the trusts of every description. I am therefore right when I charge the present Government with being unfit for the great task it had assumed, to wit.: to protect the labouring classes of this country. In the face of such facts, I am convinced that it would be unwise to let the Government venture into such a serious policy as that of adopting conscription without consulting the people, the sovereign dispenser.

My second argument is that we hold no lawful mandate and that we are sitting here solely on our own authority. In 1914, we passed an Act, the purport of which was to allow the Government to make a redistribution of the constituencies in the provinces, that is to say, to increase or reduce their numbers, according to their respective populations. From this fact, the representation of the House of Commons, from 221 as it is to-day will be increased to 235 at the next general election. That is to say that, since October 1916, these 14 new divisions are entitled to have a representative in this House. Under our Constitution a Parliament must never last more than five years. Now, the one elected in September, 1911, therefore ended in October, 1916.

Again, if things had been thus, that is to say, if the present Government had not believed itself indispensable to the preservation of the Empire in the first place, and to that of its political friends in the second place, we would have had elections in 1915 or 1916, and the population of this country would be now fully represented in this House. At the present date, although this Parliament has exceeded its term, of the 235 constituencies which should be represented, 23 are vacant through death or other causes of absence, and 14 are unrepresented; these being left here, as present members, to decide upon the important matter of conscription, only 198 members, when there should be 235.

In 1914, the war broke out. The Liberal party assented to a truce, in order not to hinder in any way the work of the Government who had decided to give its full co-operation. Although, at that time, the hon. Prime Minister had before his eyes the example of the British and French Governments, where the cabinets were reorganized by the joining in of the different party leaders until then opposed to one another, he saw nothing, and he never thought of asking the Liberal leaders to come into his government; a step which would have assured a more effective and a more honest participation.

In 1916, the Government asked for an extension of Parliament and it appears that, lest they should appear as being disloyal to the Empire, the Liberals had to give in. Jingoism had been so heated up that they had to consent. But it was clearly understood that the extended term which was to end in October, 1917, the Government should not bring about any coercive measure, such as conscription.

According to that agreement, this extension was unanimously voted by the House and ratified by the Imperial Government. What then has since happened that the Liberals' generosity and good faith should have been so grossly deceived? The hon. Prime Minister has declared on more than one occasion that he would not impose consciption. On January 17, 1916, especially, a month before the extension was granted, he spoke as follows in this very House:

> 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.

He also authorized his ministers to give the same promise. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) took advantage of it to pay his respects to the Archbishop of Montreal. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue made all he could of it in his Dorchester election. The hon. Colonel the Postmaster General went so far as to indulge in puzzles about conscription; in substance, he stated to the timorous voters of that division:

> You need not fear conscription; in any case, should it ever be imposed upon you, you have only to cross the line.

Now then, what happened, that conscription should to-day become an order of the day and that the Prime Minister should mean to impose it upon the country in such a peremptory fashion, in spite of the agreement made, in spite of his own declarations, of his ministers' declarations, and at the cost even of an unlawful act to be committed by a lapsed parliament?

Would it be that, during his last journey to London, it had been demonstrated to the Prime Minister that there was an urgent call for soldiers? Well, not so, if I can judge from the following official statement:

London, June 21.—The Canadian Associated Press is authorized to say that the attention of Honorable Walter Long, colonial secretry, having been called to a suggestion in newspaper despatches that Sir Robert Borden had proposed conscription in Canada because he was urged to do so in the Imperial War Cabinet, he states there is not the smallest foundation for the suggestion that Premier Borden was urged to introduce conscription either in the Imperial War Cabinet or the conference. The matter was never even mentioned and the last thing the members of the home government would do is to interfere in the matter which is entirely one for Canada. Mr. Long further adds he saw Sir Robert Borden frequently up to the last day he was here and had no idea when he left he was going to propose the introduction of conscription on his return to Canada.

The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) stated, the other day, in this House—and he must be well informed—that England had 3,000,000 soldiers on the reserve forces, and that the same country had 1,500,000 young men not yet enlisted. Quite recently, the Prime Minister asked the leader of the Opposition to join him in forming a coalition cabinet. It was somewhat late, indeed, as the war had been declared for over two years and a half. At all events, the first condition laid down by the leader of the Opposition was the withdrawal of the conscription Bill. This condition sine qua non could not satisfy the Prime Minister who, on the contrary, wanted the Opposition leader's co-operation to cloak his act. Now, if the Liberal party can be upbraided for having consented to that extension of Parliament, these facts should exonerate it. As I said a moment ago, Parliament should have been prorogued in October 1916, it has been extended for one year, that is until the month of October, 1917. Therefore, this prolongation term expires four months hence, when we should have general elections. But they are now already speaking of a further extension, for salvation, as far as the Canadian jingoes can see it, depends exclusively on the maintenance of the present Government in permanent power. No, really, did we not know the ravenous appetite of the Tories in this country, we would be led to believe that the present executive has a providential mission. Other British colonies have had their elections, New Zealand and Australia. Each and everyone of the provinces of this country have had their own. The Conservative party have felt their bitter result, and even not later than this very week, the results in Saskatchewan have disagreeably tinkled in their ears. And, nevertheless, the war did not fare any worse. Oh no, there is only Canada,

wherein all the democratic institutions which govern us must be broken, in order to, and against the will of the people who is the sovereign arbiter, establish stringent laws which are reproved by the very large majority.

I find it strange that it should be contended by some people that the Liberals strongly criticise the Government's conduct for the simple pleasure of worrying them or of running them down and putting them out of power. But, should the Opposition be blamed for having been vigilant? On every occasion, we have denounced the scandals, as it was our duty so to do, and it was only with difficulty that the Prime Minister condescended to give sham investigations, and the guilty parties have never been troubled. All those monopolizers enjoy immunity, always under the pretense of patriotism. But why not put it the other way? That we find it strange that a Government without any mandate from the people should thus cling to power. In our country, it is war that makes the Government to hold fast; in other countries, war causes them to change as often as circumstances warrant it.

If the Liberals exact due respect for the constitution, what is there so strange in that? In all these tactics on the part of the Conservatives, it strikes me that it is not the interest they have for the Empire that inspires their action. That is only the pretext. The reason, the only true one, is that they are afraid of facing public opinion with such a disreputable record.

We are in this country ruled by a democratic government, that is to say that everything in this government is amenable to the people itself. the representatives are directly responsible to the people, and nothing can be done without the latter's approval. And that is why the parliamentary term has been limited to five years, after which the members are obliged to go before their constituents and give an account of their trust to their constituents, who are the supreme arbiters; the latter either approve or disapprove the past conduct or the future plans of their representatives.

Therefore, every enactment of vital importance to the people should be passed upon by the people itself, just as the Liberals have done it for the Naval Service question and for reciprocity. Neither the Government nor Parliament have the right to adopt a measure setting the country towards an unknown destination, containing in itself extremely serious consequences, not only for the national unity,—I mean

the good understanding between the two great races who live in this country and which was referred to in many a speech—but especially for the very preservation of the people's welfare. The people, in my opinion, under these circumstances, have more than any one else, the right to say if they will consent to venture into the prosecution of a policy which may lead to bankruptcy, not only the country, generally speaking, but would also infallibly fall upon the property of every inhabitant respectively.

I have heard the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) also the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), in their speeches, deny to a certain extent the sovereignty of the people, and insinuate that the latter should be governed, even contrary to its own opinion, according to circumstances, or if the Government should see fit to do it. It is undoubtedly this same trend of opinion which caused the two hon. members for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and of West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), who seceded from their party upon the referendum amendment and prefer supporting the conscription Bill, to state that, if the conscription issue was submitted to the people, the latter's verdict would go against its enactment.

Such an admission on the part of several hon. members leaves us in a state of perplexity. They are then disposed to make a most serious infringement to the constitution which governs us, and once entered upon that path, it will not take many years before we have in this country an autocratic government which will care for the people only pro forma. The latter will have no more prorogatives in the affairs of State, except of paying the expenditure and assuming whatever responsibilities may follow, be they good or bad.

Why extol so much the beauties of democracy, that is to say the government of the people by the people, if, upon a question of life or death as this one, it is even refused the right to give its opinion.

In this very House, I heard not long ago two distinguished men speaking to us. One represented France, the other, Great Britain. Both of them displayed before us, in most eloquent and wonderful terms the beauty of democracy, symbol of most absolute liberty for every people. Democracy, were we told, is the safest guarantee for the preservation of civilization, it is the doctrine of equality; but what! it is through it that is manifested the people's will which must ever and everywhere be sovereign!

Mr. Viviani lives in a chivalerous country whose history is resplendent with heroic deeds. For many years past, in the statutes of that country there exists the obligation for all, rich and poor, aristocrats or common labourer, to rush to arms whenever the country is in danger. In the ranks of their armies, there is no caste, no privileged class, all are equal.

In England, the law did not oblige any one to take up arms, it is true, in case of war, for confident in her fleet which ensured her the supremacy of the seas and having, on the other hand, only a very restricted territory to defend, that country, as I say, did not foresee so terrific a conflict as the one which stains with the blood of millions now the European continent, and which would one day compel her to send to the battle front millions of her soldiers.

Now, in these two countries, France and England, what did happen since the declaration of war? From the very beginning the different parties hushed their combative spirit in order to have but one thing in view: the country's preservation. All efforts were directed towards a common end, that of victory, and for that purpose, the world has seen united in one same government the leaders of all factions who had till then been opposed to one another. In France, the adversaries of yore were now fast friends; all had hereafter one sole ambition, that of winning, of driving back the Teutonic invasion, which forty five years of active preparations had made, not only threatening, but terrific.

And not withstanding this first concentration of the moral forces of the nation's leaders, several ministries have succeeded one another. In France, they have changed their government as often as circumstances, always rapidly varying in this war, demanded it. And what a fine example of disinterestedness and of patriotism! Those holding power to-day would become on the morrow simple co-operators; leaving to others, without spite or resentment, the authority until then vested in them, knowing that France's destinies demanded those personal sacrifices.

In England also, we find similar instances of sublime patriotism on the part of the Liberal government. At the very outset, Mr. Asquith invited Mr. Bonar Law, the leader of the Opposition, and his followers, to form a National government. Later, Mr. Asquith himself resigned to make room for Mr. Lloyd George.

On the sea, England was formidable. Unfortunately, her land army was not equal to the gigantic struggle just starting. She realized that fact immediately. And then, how admirable is that enormous effort, which she has been keeping up for close on to three years, in organizing and sending to the front these legions which have not only helped France to check the Teuton hordes but that have also victoriously driven back the foe in battles which will remain memorable.

At the outbreak of hostilities, England had no compulsory service, and conscious of the fact that she would soon need a considerable army and that she must first rely upon her own forces, she decided to establish it. But what I admire in her, in spite of the danger which was menacing her on all sides, is that she only resorted to this extremity after having exhausted every possible means of volunteering, and when, finally, she found it necessary to impose compulsory service, the people had already received an education consistent with its duties. And even her conscriptive law exempts Ireland from the compulsory service and it contains no death penalty against the refractory ones.

So much for these two great nations, among those who are engaged in the dreadful struggle of bloodshed, of mourning, of tears and of irreparable disasters! For them it was the supreme hour: the result of the battle depended upon their resistance and the heads of these nations, firmly supported by their respective people, undertook it immediately; so that patriotism on the one hand was equalled only by heroism on the other. The service was not only compulsory, it was imperious; that is clear and we have for both these nations the greatest admiration. These nations were compelled to war, they were personally concerned and they had to take every measure to avoid being crushed.

Although Canada's obligations and degree of participation in this war cannot be compared with the obligations and with the duty of the allied countries, on their own account, I am still asking myself why the hon. Prime Minister has not, at the very beginning of the war, followed such a fine example of disinterestedness as that I have just cited. Why did he not bring together the moral forces of the nation? Why did he not secure in that solemn hour, the wholehearted co-operation of the party leaders?

[M. Boyer.]

No; on the contrary, his policy has remained a party policy, a near-sighted policy, a policy of patronage which could only, sooner or later, produce the sad plight of the present hour. We certainly would not be to-day reduced to the point of wishing to impose this brutal measure of conscription if all efforts had been directed from the start towards securing a common object and directed in peace and harmony.

In support of my third argument, Mr. Speaker, I will say that, beside the Government's evident inefficiency ever since war began, its inability to reduce the cost of living, besides the numerous scandals which overburden it, there is, Mr. Speaker, another question which in importance surpasses all others and which we should seriously consider: That is the economic question.

The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) may declare as often as he pleases, "that Canada will be put into bankruptcy, if it is necessary"—and, the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) may repeat what he stated in the House the other day, "that he would send overseas all our rails to the last one, if need be" these are not yet accomplished facts, and I do hope that, before long, the people will have something to say upon the more than hazardous dispositions of these ministers and of their Government, the apparent inspirer of their statements.

I know that this question causes a great deal of uneasiness among financiers, I do not refer to those who because panic-stricken when the proposal to enact conscription of wealth was discussed in the House; but to those who do not accumulate riches to the detriment of others.

Recently, I read in the Financial Post, a paper published in Toronto, in its edition of May 26, 1917, the following item:

> Canada's national debt, at the present hour, is approaching $2,000,000,000, before the war ends, it will probably reach $3,000,000,000.
>
> A pretty big sum for seven and a half million people to owe.
>
> It means that every business man, every farmer, every mechanic will have to pay, for interest, for current expenses and towards paying off a little of the sinking fund, between four and five hundred dollars each year.
>
> It is an appalling outlook.

According to the Tablet, an English paper, the countries hereunder mentioned spend monthly the following amounts:

Great Britain	$250,000,000
France	125,000,000
Italy	50,000,000

which would give Great Britain, with her 45,000,000 inhabitants, $5.55 per capita monthly, or $66.60 per annum.

France, with her 40,000,000, $3 12 per capita, or $37.44 per annum.

Italy, with her 35,000,000, $1.43 per capita, or $17.16 per annum.

And Canada, with her 7,200,000, $4.17 per capita monthly, or $50.04 per year, per capita, counting men, women and children, if it is true that we are spending $1,000,000 a day. Therefore, Canada spends, per capita, only $16.50 less than Great Britain, and $12.10 per capita more than France, and $32.88 more than Italy.

In these figures, it should be taken into consideration that these three countries pay very little to their soldiers, but that does not in any way diminish what Canada has to pay.

Is it not again the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) who said here, in this House, that the United States' effort, in order to equal that made up to date by Canada—would require from them an expenditure of $67,000,000,000 and the organizing of an army of 5,740,000 men?

Now, let us for a moment consider our financial situation. In 1911, when the present government came into power, our debt amounted to $336,000,000. In his budget speech, the hon. the Minister of Finance informs us:

> That it now exceeds $900,000,000, an amount which our official statements will not, however, establish before a few months hence, and that our national debt might well reach $1,200,000,000.

The hon. minister informs us that all the expenditure incurred on account of the war, will constitute a special debt, called the war debt, which will be reimbursed several years after the restoration of peace. Now, what will be the amount of the annual interests on this loan and what resources will we have to meet this interest, besides, naturally, our ordinary administration expenses, urgent works and others, without forgetting the interest on the $336,000,000 debt, which existed before the war?

The hon. minister has told us that the total revenue, for the last fiscal year, ending March last, has been $232,000,000, accruing from three principal sources, as follows: customs, $134,000,000; excise, $24,000,000, and war taxes, $12,500,000.

Last year's current expenses amounted to $172,000,000, leaving a surplus of $60,000,000 which have been paid to the war capital account. From all this, we must conclude that, after the war, our debt will be between $1,300,000,000 and $1,500,000,000 upon which we shall pay interest, and besides, from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 for pensions, which will represent, at the minimum, an annual sum of $100,000,000 and, of course, besides the expense for general administration and public works generally. If, in the course of the last fiscal year, our ordinary expenditure has alone figured for $172,000,000, let us admit they will remain at the same figure for a long time; with the war interests, our general expenditure to be met would amount to almost $300,000,000 per annum.

What will we have in order to face such a large annual budget? The hon. Minister of Finance does truly tell us that the revenue for the last fiscal year amounted to $232,000,000, which would still leave a difference of nearly $70,000,000 to cover by some kind of taxation; but, we should not lose sight of the fact that this $232,000,000 revenue is made up of temporary assets, the outcome of the war, thus the $134,000,000 of customs's receipts and the $24,000,000 of excise are largely attributable to duties upon raw material imported from abroad, to be used in the manufacturing of ammunition. When, after the war, those imports will no more be made, the revenue will be largely decreased and, consequently, the difference to be covered in our annual revenue will be far larger. It will not be only $70,000,000, but almost $100,000,000 which will have to be levied upon the people outside of the ordinary taxes and duties. Last year, the war tax brought $12,500,000 to the Government, after the Minister of Finance's own testimony. Well, let us imagine the prodigious leap it will have to make when, after the war, the country will have to meet the interest upon the war debt and the pensions. Will it be able to do it without resorting to direct taxation? I am afraid not. The figures I am now giving can only increase, instead of being reduced, for in this appropriation I do not count the amount we shall have to pay for all sorts of ammunition. The hon. Minister of Finance stated in this House, at the end of the last session, that, at present, England was paying for the ammunition supplied to the Canadian soldiers, but that, after the war, there would be a settlement and we would be obliged to pay about one-

thirteenth of the amount spent by England for the purchase of ammunition. Therefore, for every thirteen million which England spends in munitions, we shall be called upon to pay one million. You will agree with me that this item will form an enormous amount, especially when you will consider that the Imperial government for munition purchases is spending by the hundreds of millions.

In 1911, under the late Administration, when Canada was in its period of progress, we expended $87,774,000 and our revenue exceeded that expenditure by several millions, which we employed in meeting the interest charges on our capital debt. Future has therefore in stock for us some hard problems to solve. Our export trade amounts to $2,000,000,000. At first sight, we might be led to believe that such an enormous figure should bring a large revenue to the Government, but that is a mistake. The clearest profit of all that trade and of all that commerce goes directly to the manufacturers and, above all, to the war contract manipulators. The profits accumulated by the munition manufacturers are exorbitant. Fortunes have been created and many an individual, who was a poor man yesterday, is to-day a millionaire. As soon as war is over, this fictitious trade will largely fall. Ask the working men of any description, who have toiled and are still toiling in the factories, how much, at the end of each week with the high cost of living, they can save? After the war, the working men will be out of work, they may probably suffer privation verging on to famine, while their employer of yesterday will strut amid the gold which war industries have brought to his door. What should be done that we might usefully take part in the war? The Allies cry for food and munitions, for munitions and food. That is what we need, do they say. The English and French commissions have come to the United States, arrangements have been made, and that country has advanced them at once several thousand millions of dollars, but not in currency, only in food and ammunition.

Is it by imposing conscription that we can better fill their wishes?

In Canada, this Government and all the provincial governments have advocated and commended agricultural overproduction, the country places have been flooded with agricultural bulletins and pamphlets, in short, a most active campaign was everywhere inaugurated on those lines. The result up to date has not been a marvellous one. Will it be so to-morrow? Some doubt may be entertained when it is known that farmers are everywhere short of hands, for, from the beginning of the war, the farmers' boys, in large numbers, have gone to the cities where they were attracted by the high wages paid in the munition shops. Here they took the places of the working men and of the other labourers who had enlisted, in the first days of the war, to escape starvation which was then threatening the country. Indeed, we recall those armies of unemployed who made public demonstrations and cried for work. During the following year, the old shops, and new shops were opened everywhere to manufacture munitions, and they have all been filled, half, if not three-quarters of them, by men from the country places.

The official reports from the various provinces of the Dominion show that the lack of farm labour is already and everywhere giving rise to serious anxieties.

I now borrow from the Avenir du Nord a compilation of opinions given by the leaders of the agricultural movement.

Mr. Arthur S. Barnstead, secretary of the Industrial and Immigration department of Nova Scotia, writes in the Gazette Agricole du Canada:

> The labour problem will evidently be a most difficult one to solve in Nova Scotia, this year. We have until now depended for our labour upon the emigrating farmers who would come here from Great Britain. Not only is this resource gone, but thousands of our young farmers are to-day overseas on active military service. The situation is far from cheerful.

Mr. W. A. Riddell, superintendent of trade and labour, in the Public Works department, of the province of Ontario, writes as follows:

> Scarcity of help in Ontario is being felt just as much as in the other provinces. We have evidence of this in the following statement:
>
> We could employ five hundred farm labourers in our locality, writes a mayor to us. The same mail contained a letter asking for a farm boy and stating: We could employ a whole load of young men in this neighbourhood.
>
> We have five agents at work in the United States, soliciting men to come and work in Canada. The kind of help that can at present be secured in the United States for farm labour, is somewhat poor in quality.

Mr. F. Auld, Deputy Minister of Agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan, writes:

> Our agricultural production will be limited, this year, on account of the scarcity of labour, and that is why we have decided to make a

special effort in order to recruit all the old farmers and all the old farm hands, to help to get in the harvest.

Special agricultural agents of this province are just now in the United States.

Mr. H. A. Craig, Deputy Minister of Agriculture in the province of Alberta, writes in his turn:

Last winter, all those interested in the question of crop production have expressed some anxiety on account of the evident labour scarcity. The number of young men employed on farms is far inferior to what we could employ, for a very large number of young men of Alberta have enlisted for overseas service.

Mr. Wm. E. Scott, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, in British Columbia, writes as follows:

But the labour question is the greatest difficulty; it is the obstacle which for the time being prevents the increase in production. The farmer perfectly understands that it is his patriotic duty to do all he can in order to increase the food supply; he would do it, if he could get the necessary labour. It is, at this very time, a most distressing question in British Columbia and its solution is very hard to find.

We cannot expect much aid from the United States, because they are suffering from conditions similar to our own, and the farm labour is just as scarce.

It must not be forgotten that nearly 35,000 men have left the province for overseas service, since war began.

Hon. Martin Burrell, Minister of Agriculture, reminds his fellow-citizens of the importance of intensive culture, and then he adds:

Looking towards the gloomy days which may bring this third year of the war, the hardest one yet, we realize more and more the vital importance of the food factor in the final outcome. The Government urges farmers to hold on, a matter of increasing difficulty; I do so, not in view of the rise in the prices which will undoubtedly affect every commodity, but because of the precious and most special assistance which Canadian agriculture can extend to the Empire at this critical hour.

The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett), director of the National Service, stated on February 28, that:

In all probability, the lack of foodstuffs will be felt still more keenly before the next harvest in Great Britain, in France and in Italy, and as, of all the Dominions, Canada is the less distant from those countries, the latter are naturally looking to us; they see in us their first source of supply.

The lack of labourers, did he add, is the main difficulty in the way for realizing these objects and we intend making extraordinary efforts to find the proper remedy.

And this paper most sensibly concludes:

Is that the means to accomplish this end, by carrying on an exaggerated military mobilization, and by even imposing it though conscription?

Our agricultural start, far from being accelerated, has slackened since the war began. From 1910 to 1911, in one year, the number of sowed acres in the West had increased by 3,500,000; from 1912 to 1916, in four years, the increase has been only of 1,500,000.

And it is in the face of such a serious declaration, Mr. Speaker, in spite of this general state of uneasiness, stated and proved by all the provinces of the Dominion, that the Government wants to impose compulsory service, that is to say, to further drain our already reduced population, to increase the difficulties created by the lack of manual labour, and to imperil our agricultural production which is of vital importance for us, for the Empire and for the Allies.

Canada's foremost duty, to-day even more than in the past, is to increase her agricultural production, in order to provide for the victualling of the Empire and of the other allied nations whom the situation created by the war threatens with actual famine.

Let us increase our agricultural production. That is what we are called upon to do from all sides.

More than ever, in the face of present events, of the urgent calls for agricultural overproduction and of the statements of the competent men I have just quoted, I believe that the Government should let the working men remain in the cities and the tillers on their farms.

Canada has made a noble effort up to date, the part she has played is an admirable one, and for the future she should confine herself to produce and still produce.

It must also be considered that, if such a marked depopulating of our rural districts keeps going on, either for the army or for the city munition shops, it will be calculated to wholly upset our economic fabric, and expose us to incurable ills, not for ourselves alone, but also for the Allies who are clamoring for food. Where and how are we going to get it for them, if recruiting be continued with such energy, and especially if it be made compulsory, for there is no middle course possible, if you drain the shops, the labour market, the city stores; the next day, it will be the country places that will be requisitioned for men to fill the gaps.

And I could not conclude this argument in a better way than by quoting the testi-

mony of a man who should be considered as an authority in keeping with the high position he occupies:

Making use of the man power.

The question is rather one of organization than of recruiting without measure.

Under this heading, Mr. Henry Pate, deputy and secretary of the army commission in the French Parliament, wrote, in January last, in the Paris Journal an article from which we quote the following lines which should be read and pondered over: "There is, in every effort, what one sees, for instance the keys of the finger board, and there is what one cannot see, the mechanism. What would be, without the mechanism that commands, the war which our foes compel us to wage? Let us make up our minds to grasp the problem. Understanding the war does not consist in considering the war under its simpler aspect, recruiting exceedingly large numbers of men at the risk of imperilling the very bases of any prolonged action. Neither does it consist in adopting measures which are practically fruitless from the military point of view and which are of such a nature as to deeply perturb manufacturing and economic production."

It is intended to impose conscription; why so? It is to overcome a spreading uneasiness, to repair a failure in recruiting, or to show an untimely and inconsiderate zeal.

But before going to such an extremity, would it not be of common discretion to wisely consider if we have not, until now, participated in this war to a reasonable extent, and in proportion to our population and to the wealth of our country?

There are eyes who will not see and ears who will not hear. From their talk, one would take it that the aid given by Canada to England amounts to naught. Let us review the facts for a moment: the effort made and the aid given by our country during this war is something to be wondered at. Since the declaration of war, Canada has nobly done her duty, as compared to her population and her wealth. An army numbering 420,000 men of all ranks has been enlisted; 125,000 are already at the front, while 126,000 are in reserve in England. According to a report submitted by the Minister of Militia, 100,000 soldiers have already fallen on the field of honour, either killed, wounded or made prisoners. A large number, still in Canada, are only awaiting the order to embark.

All honour to the heroes who face the foe's fire! They have shed their blood upon the plains of Flanders, at Langemarck, at Saint Julien, at Courcelette, at Vimy. Thousands of them have fallen heroically, engraving, in immortal letters on the tablets of history, the name of our country. Let us do homage to our braves whose valiance was great, as great as the magnitude of the task they had undertaken, for it was voluntarily that they rallied to the British flag.

Besides all this, Canada who, before the war, had a debt of $336,000,000, will soon have one of $1,300,000,000. Add to this also, the high cost of living, in this country, which is putting every family in narrow circumstances.

Well now, in the face of this admirable participation of our country heretofore, who could take us to task for failing to do our duty? Great Britain is certainly not complaining. Then, why should the Prime Minister of this country resort to this extreme and arbitrary measure, when the most interested country, Great Britain, has not even requested him to do so? Why so much haste in rushing the country into troubles which can entail nothing but evil, if the country itself do not so decree it after an appeal to the people?

And I do repeat it; if, from the very beginning of the war, the Prime Minister had appealed to the Liberals and formed a national government, our effort would certainly have been more successful and at no greater expense. And we would not to-day have to resort to conscription.

Now, what is really this compulsory service bill? The Government, by this Bill, is cajoling more than one class of society, and one has only to belong to them, as all and everyone of them would be exempted from the draft. The exemption clause is so wide that it may cover all cases; for it does not specifically state what classes, what callings shall be exempted; it does not mention the farmer's son any more than the workman employed in the munition shops. It simply states that: "a tribunal may decide whether it is expedient, in the national interest, that such or such a man, then appealing to it, should instead of being employed in military service, be engaged in other work in which he is habitually engaged." And in section 12 of the present Act, the Government reserves the right to make regulations to secure the full, effective and expeditious operation and enforcement of this Act.

We have indeed been told in the House, that the farmer's sons would be exempted, but up to what number, two, three, four, we do not know; that is in the tribunal's discretion. And the munition workers and

others who will be dismissed from the shops just before enlistment opens, will they have ceased to be useful to the national interest, on account of the arbitrary measure taken against them? These are so many open questions. But, at all events, the law shall be the same for all. As soon as the order will have been given to apply it, all those whom it concerns, class after class, according to their age and condition, will be automatically enlisted. If they wish to be exempted, they may afterwards appeal to the said tribunal.

And another point upon which I would like to call the attention of the House, is that the Bill does not specify that the Government may enlist only 100,000 men. As the Bill is framed, the Government may go up to the age limit of enlistable men. If certain fanatics were to be believed, the province of Quebec were the only province opposing compulsory service. Well, that is not proven; only a referendum could bring out the facts. Moreover, the inhabitants of that province are charged with every crime and overloaded with every hardship; they are called disloyal and pro-Germans, and some hot-headed people, who have evidently more belly than brains, such as the editors of the Orange Sentinel and the Toronto News and notable chieftains of the Orange order, threaten us with all kinds of dire punishment. Fortunately, the sound and enlightened majority of our population know how matters stand; they are well aware that this persecution is stirred up by a boisterous minority and do not hold responsible for it the bulk of the English Canadian. And as the latter, indeed, judge the French Canadians in another light than that in which their agitating compatriots hold our race, they likewise understand that the acts of the agitators in our own midst are not chargeable to the mass of the French Canadians. It is a well known fact that opposition to conscription has been manifested from Vancouver to Halifax. Have not the English labour associations declared themselves unanimously against the measure? Upon this question of intensive recruiting, was it not Lord Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who, on March 12, 1916, made before the Montreal Board of Trade a statement somewhat as follows: Canada has performed wonders, but I cannot believe that the proposal that we raise 500,000 men, is either practical or possible. We have so many things to attend to, munitions to manufacture, lands to till, we are asked to help in feeding the British nation, and lastly, we have our financial problem to solve. By sending over 500,000 men from Canada, we would make among the labouring people of this country a gap which might bring most serious results.

And yet I believe this eminent citizen, is indeed a political friend of the Government The Government intends to enforce compulsory military service, Mr. Speaker, and seek elsewhere the required labour; it is spending several thousand dollars advertising in the American newspapers for farm hands to fill the places of those who are gone. What said the working men of Canada at their convention in Ottawa, on June 11, 1917?

For an efficient participation in the war, it is not compulsory service we need, and we are positively of the opinion that:

> The necessities for the effective conduct of the war are: Food, munitions, shipping and military man power, and Canada is geographically well situated to supply the first named three essentials and can do much to assist in winning the war by developing her production of these essentials to her fullest extent.
>
> We are strongly of the opinion that this is the best service that Canada, with her small population, can render. We declare ourselves as most emphatically opposed to the proposed conscription measure, and we urge the workers of Canada to oppose by every means in their power enactment of such legislation.

When this Bill was announced by the Prime Minister, anti-conscriptionist demonstrations took place in Montreal. Such a course was most likely in a city of 700,000 souls, where the labouring masses are numerous, where meetings of thousands of men can be called like a train of gunpowder. It is easy to understand that, in such populous centres, there should have been scuffles, even disorders, but in the country-places of the province of Quebec, everything ran its usual peaceful course; the farmers have simply voiced their protests, through their municipal councils or by petitions.

But what is there so abnormal, so anti-patriotic, in these protests against an unpopular measure? Were not similar meetings held even in the city of Toronto, the hotbed of the purest jingoism? It is true that in this luminary-city of Canada, the principle of free speech was scorned and the soldiery did brutally break up the peaceful meeting which the common people intended to hold. In Guelph, the same thing hap-

pened, and the English citizens, who boast of their freedom in this country of Canada, were very roughly handled, by the soldiery again. In Winnipeg and in Vancouver, likewise, popular meetings of honest citizens, of the common people, of the men who sweat and toil to earn their living, have had a similar fate.

Truly, what a fine civilization is that preached by a Canadian government who, to defend a democratic principle in Flanders, or to have the citizens of this country appreciate the full beauty of free opinion, of free conscience and of civilization, would be ready to have their own fellow-citizens massacred right now. Therefore, it is not only in Montreal that consciences are revolting against the conscription Bill. From every part of Canada protests are coming, from Englishmen, from Scotsmen, from Irishmen, as well as from the French Canadians. But the yellow sheets of Ontario take good care to close their eyes to what is going on everywhere else, to fill their columns with filth only against the province of Quebec. Their object is most apparent, for, to have conscription passed, they think it necessary to overheat their fellowmen's patriotism by giving vent to an unwholesome hatred against the French element of this country. But, fortunately, the fair and honest element of our English compatriots are not disposed that way and they let every one bear his own duties and responsibilities. In that also do we trust.

But was it not in Calgary that, at a public meeting, they sang "God save the people" instead of "God save the King"?

If all the hon. members whom I have heard speaking in favour of compulsory service, since the opening of this debate, should likewise be within the scope of this Act and were, like all those it may reach, obliged to put on the uniform and go to the front, I am wondering if they would have spoken with the same fervour and enthusiasm. It is all very well for them to allege age, function or any of the causes of exemption included in this Bill; but it seems to me their loyalty would show itself in a much better light, if they gave the best proof of its sincerity, by enlisting. They should follow the example of Kerensky who has bravely put himself at the head of the Russian troops, for in the rear of the firing-lines there are positions to be filled by men of forty-five years of age and over, by members of the learned professions as well as by mechanics, by millionaires as well as by paupers.

And should these hon. gentlemen, who endeavour to increase by compulsion the contingents already sent to Europe give evidence of all the eagerness and the courage to do the duty they preach to others, I am satisfied that the example, set from so high, would induce thousands of other brave men to do the same. And I might add that such an example of disinterestedness would find an echo even in those who just now deny them the right to impose this coercive measure.

These remarks are addressed not only to the conscriptionist members of this House, but also to the advocates of this compulsory measure outside of these premises, who are preaching the fulfilment of a duty they are beforehand assured of being rid. In other words, they are conscriptionists less for themselves than for others.

I shall vote against the amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette). A six months hoist would not settle the question; it would only suspend for that space of time the anguish of the country, that is all, while a referendum or a general election would settle the question once for all. If the majority of the voters of this country declare themselves against conscription, the over-excited minds will revert to order and the country will resume with more fervor the work of efficiently assisting the Allies. If, on the contrary, the majority of the electors should vote for conscription, there will be only one course to take, that of bravely submitting.

For us, French Canadians, our sentiments are vastly different from theirs, for we have no particular attachment to France or to England. For France, we still return the remembrance of far away associations; we above all have much admiration for her. It is France herself, with her conception of beauty, with her literature, her arts, her science and her democracy that we love.

To England, we owe loyalty for the granting of the liberties we enjoy, and which permit us to live so peacefully in our homes, —for we cannot hold her responsible for our domestic quarrels embittered through the fanaticism of certain people of this country. But, our English and our Scottish compatriots in the Dominion, have more than a kindly feeling and remembrance for England; she is doubly their mother-country.

The Englishman, the Scotsman, who have emigrated at the time of the conquest have come to settle in a country which had become their own. The British flag which, upon the citadel of Quebec, took the place of the Fleur-de-lis, has never since ceased to shield them.

Our ancestors who took the oath of allegiance, and centuries have caused us to forget later on, the one who had abandoned us, without ever remembering us. Now, English immigration, begun at the start, has always been continued uninterruptedly since then, and that is why we should not wonder nor blame our English fellow citizens for that loyalty which draws them towards the country of their origin, neither should we hurt their heart feelings. However, while admiring in our neighbours that patriotism which arms them in defence of the land of their origin, and the greatness of the cause which inspires them, I am asking myself how it is that so many of them have not yet understood that we also, the French Canadians, we likewise feed upon an ideal of patriotism for everything pertaining to our race. The soul of our English fellow-citizen enthuses at the thought of the mother country; no one thinks of denying them that noble feeling; but they should at the same time realize that the preservation of a language by a people is likewise entitled to great respect. The Canadian of French origin has but one country, Canada, while the English, the Scottish, the Irish Canadian have each two countries. That is why, upon a question of such importance as that of compulsory service, the best means to take not to bring these elements to clash, is indeed that of a referendum, and I shall vote for it. The British Crown, in granting to the French Canadians the privileges which duly enjoys every British subject, did consequently guarantee them all the rights which this quality confers in its most absolute meaning. And is that what is happening? I say no, and that, most of the time, they have to be satisfied with what the majority feels like relinquishing to them. Whilst, in the province of Quebec, where the English are the minority, the latter enjoy under the provincial government the greatest liberty in the organization of their educational system, in the other provinces, where the French Canadians are in a minority, they only enjoy a few concessions. If the latter claim what they believe to be fair and just, if their compatriots of the province of Quebec take their part, they are accused of disloyalty and of rebellion.

Anyone who judges matters dispassionately and impartially must admit that these continuous discussions and this ostracism of the French language, in the schools of certain provinces, have only created bitterness between the two great races who divide the country between themselves.

No one admires more than I do the patriotism of our English compatriots who long for Great Britain's triumph, but how much I do wish also that they too could understand the respect they should likewise profess for a whole people who want to preserve their language.

In 1867, a solemn compact was made by the two nations, English and French. That contract stipulated to each its privileges and its obligations. Nothing is more sacred that the pledged word and more official than the magna charta of Confederation. Why does one of the contracting parties to this memorable document now wish, in defiance of honour and of its solemn promise, pass over and consider the Confederation Act, which guarantees the equality of the French race in this country, "as a mere scrap of paper." Is it that we are here living in Germany? Should the sons of those who have signed and approved the Act of 1867 be less honourable and less conciliating than their fathers? The latter have made a compact, which their sons should in honour respect, and in so doing, peace and harmony would be restored in this country. And then the two great races inhabiting it, uniting their common efforts, would in mutual love and respect, work out their destinies.

On motion of Mr. Kyte the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Doherty for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose we shall have the report to-morrow of the special committee, with reference to the amendment to the amendment moved by Mr. Barrette.

Mr. BURRELL: The report has been made to the Speaker.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

Wednesday, July 4, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE NAMED TO CONSIDER CORRECTNESS OF AN ENTRY IN THE VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings) presented the report of the Special Committee named to consider correctness of an entry in the Votes and Proceedings, as follows:

Your committee beg to report that they have had certain witnesses before them, to wit: His Honour the Speaker, Dr. T. B. Flint, Clerk of the House, Mr. Arthur Beauchesne, Assistant Clerk of the House, and Mr. R. P. King, Chief Clerk of Votes and Proceedings, and find as follows:—

That the proposed amendment to the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette) was written both in French and English, the French version being as follows:

Que tous les mots du dit amendment après le mot "suivants" soient retranchés et remplacês par ce qui suit: "Ce Bill ne soit pas maintenant lu une deuxième fois, mais qu'il soit lu une deuxième fois dans six mois de ce jour,"

and the English translation reading as follows:

That all the words of the said amendment after the word "therefore" be left out and replaced by the following: "this Bill be not now read a second time, but it be read a second time this day six months."

That the English rendering is a correct translation of the French.

That the proper official being of the opinion that the language could be improved so as to accord with precedent, and accordingly making the change deemed by him necessary, had the amendment to the amendment inserted in the Votes and Proceedings as follows:

"M. Barrette propose comme amendement au dit amendement:

"Que tous les mots du dit amendement après le mot "que" soient retranchés et remplacés par les suivants: "Ce Bill ne soit pas maintenant lu une deuxième fois, mais qu'il soit lu une deuxième fois dans six mois de ce jour."

"That all the words of the said amendment after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "This Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months."

The committee are of the opinion that the change referred to was made in good faith, without any idea on the part of the official in question that it would alter the substance of the remainder of the amendment to the amendment.

The committee recommend that authority be given by the House to change the wording of the amendment to the amendment as it appears in the Votes and Proceedings, and also in Hansard, by inserting the amendment to the amendment in the actual form in which it was handed to His Honour the Speaker and submitted by him to the House, and that such alterations be made.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose this does not settle the point of order raised?

Mr. SPEAKER: It has no bearing on the point of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: All the committee did was to ascertain the facts and report to the House.

On the motion of Mr. Northrup the report was concurred in.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

J. H. LEWIS.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Is there any one named J. H. Lewis employed in the stores branch of the Post Office Department?
2. If so, is he a British subject?
3. Has the Government been informed that a person employed under the name is a reservist of the German army and the name of Lewis under which he is known is not his real name?
4. If the Government has been so informed, has it ascertained correctness or otherwise of such information?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes, for a period of over thirty years.
2. Yes, having been born in the United States but father being a British subject by birth and descent.
3. The Government has been informed that Mr. Lewis was a reservist of the German army, but has ascertained that Mr. Lewis is not a German subject, and is not now and never has been in any way connected with the German army, and is therefore not a reservist; and that Lewis is his real name.
4. Answered by No. 3.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

For a statement of rails and all other material taken from the Transcontinental Railway, the Intercolonial and any other railroad, shipped to France or ready to be shipped, giving a description of each locality, and maps, where above material was taken from. Also a statement showing to what Government rails have yet to be delivered.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John): I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to Bill No. 82, which stands on the Order Paper for second reading. This Bill, which is to provide that the time in Canada be advanced during the summer months, is not being proceeded with as rapidly as the summer is going. My object in rising is to ask whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the Bill this session. I have had a good deal of correspondence from gentlemen in various parts of the country who would like an opportunity to be heard by the Government before the Bill gets its second reading.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: On account of the debate on the Military Service Act, which is taking up the time of the House and takes precedence over other business, it has been found impossible to proceed with the Bill during the last fortnight, but when that debate passes away, as in due time we hope it will, the Daylight Saving Bill will follow in its wake.

GOVERNMENT GRAIN ELEVATORS.

CANADA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): Has the Minister of Trade and Commerce decided whether he will accept my Bill in connection with Government elevators in the West, relating to claims made by injured workmen and that sort of thing?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think it would be advisable to accept the proposed legislation of my hon. friend, and I will give my reasons later when we take up the question of elevators.

COST OF LIVING IN THE YUKON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I again desire to ask the Government a question in regard to the high cost of living in the Yukon. I have been favoured with another telegram on the subject which I should like to bring to the attention of the Government. It is dated Dawson, Yukon Territory, June 29, and reads as follows:

Mr. SPEAKER: I assume that the hon. member purposes to lay the groundwork for a question?

Mr. OLIVER: I stated that I was going to ask a question in regard to the matter. The telegram reads:

Dawson, Y.T., June 29, 1917.

Hon. Frank Oliver,
Ottawa, Ont.

Ottawa despatches state Dawson business men deny our statements and claim allegations of administrator complying with dealers unfounded. We never alleged administrator was dealers' accomplice. We stated administrator evinced sympathy and partiality to companies and that local administration was obedient servant big business. We repeat statements. Given opportunity will prove them. Situation for working people is desperate; growing worse daily; quick action necessary, hence these telegrams. We pay for ours; business men tell us Government frank theirs, and that they were asked to eulogize administrator in theirs but flatly refused. Eighty per cent local business people alien. Ninety per cent alien born. Few women in our leagues but have relatives at front. Our word is good as aliens. We demand proper investigation Pueblo mine disaster. Six men killed last March through inexcusable negligence. Prompt inspection demanded before new force one hundred men commence work as contemplated. We ask immediate investigation high cost of living; adjustment labour troubles between our companies and employees; suspension and investigation Administrator Williams; better service to Yukon from Dawson news in return for many thousands federal and territorial monies. Failing this our last appeal to Premier we appeal to Canadian public. Prompt and considerate action regarding telegram June first would have averted strike. Our final word, wages must go up or extortionate prices come down.

Geraldine Sharp,
Secretary Yukon Women's Protective League.
Marie Fotheringham,
Secretary Yukon Progressive League.

I wish to ask the Government if the strike alluded to here is still in progress, and also if the price of flour still remains as it was stated to be in the telegram I read to the House some weeks ago.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): I have no recent information—nothing further than I conveyed to the House some days ago.

Mr. OLIVER: If I might be permitted, I would suggest that there is an administrator of Yukon affairs, and I think it would be only ordinary courtesy to the House and to the country if the minister would be good enough to inquire from the administrator and give the House the information.

Mr. CROTHERS: A lengthy reply was read some days ago from the administrator

of the Yukon. While I do not remember the exact wording, I do remember that it contradicted substantially the statements which the hon. member has conveyed to the House this afternoon and which he has read several times before.

Mr. OLIVER: If the minister (Mr. Crothers) will excuse me, it did not contradict those statements. It did make certain general statements. I have asked the Government certain specific questions, and I would appreciate, and I think the House would appreciate the courtesy that would cause a definite reply to be given.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not received communications upon the subject for some time from the association which, it appears, is communicating with my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver). I will examine the telegram he has read, and I will consider the advisability of making further inquiries.

SUPPLY.

ADDITIONAL GENERAL VOTE OF ONE-SIXTH FOR 1917-18.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Blain in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The three months' vote of supply which was previously granted has expired. The right hon. Prime Minister has taken the matter up with the right hon. leader of the Opposition and has arranged for a further supply for two months. I beg to move that an amount of not less than one-sixth of the several items in the Estimates for 1917-18 be granted.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This proposed vote will cover two months and presumably will carry us close to the end of the session. But there are certain items in regard to which I shall desire information, such as some of those to be voted for the Department of Public Works. I assume that, though this motion is carried, it is understood that ample time will be afforded for the consideration of the various items.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) that ample time will be given for any discussion which he or any other member may wish.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is understood, of course, that such a vote as this will not prejudice any member speaking to any of the items. This has always been the understanding when such votes have been passed.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is always the understanding. This vote is granted in order that the public business may be carried on, and that civil servants and others may not be deprived of money justly coming to them from the Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand, too, that no objection will be taken to a discussion on going into Supply on a day when ordinarily such discussion is not in order.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will not raise any technical point of that kind.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As we are now voting the salaries for two months for the Civil Service, I will ask the Minister of Finance to consider giving a little lift to the messengers and the elevator men. I have received several petitions on the subject and have promised to bring the matter to the hon. gentleman's attention. By the Bill which this House has passed he has provided for the civil servants, and I would ask him if he intends, later, to do something for the messengers and elevator men.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The messengers have been dealt with in the Bill which was passed by this House and, I understand, by the Senate. So far as the Outside Service is concerned, I have already referred hon. members who have asked questions on the subject to the supplementary estimates which may contain votes which enable the ministers to make such recommendations as they deem proper. I am not able to pronounce specifically with regard to the elevator men,—and I suppose my hon. friend is not punning on the word "lift."

Mr. KNOWLES: In May last, I asked the then Postmaster General for information as to the application of the post office clerks and letter carriers for increase of salary. I was informed by the then Postmaster General that he would have the information for me in two or three days. I have quite a number of constituents who are interested in this matter, and since the occasion to which I have referred, I have heard from the post office clerks and mail carriers of Regina, which city is not now represented in this House, but to which I am the nearest sitting member; and it is a genuine disappointment to all those interested that the promise made many weeks ago has not been fulfilled. No doubt the promise was made in good faith, but it is unfortunate that a promise should be made of information to be given in two or three days and then have two months elapse without the information forthcoming. Can-

not the Government give some information as to the application of the postal clerks and letter carriers for increased salaries? I strongly recommend this to the Government. The increased cost of living is so well established that it goes without saying that these faithful servants of the public should receive some remuneration in addition to what they received when the cost of living was less. Not only do I ask for an answer, but I trust that the answer will be favourable.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. gentleman had been present in the House when I made an attempt that did not meet with success to proceed with the post office estimates, he would have heard the information then given. That was some weeks ago. I then said that this matter is one that would have to be dealt with in the supplementary estimates, and that it is proposed to insert in the supplementary estimates an item to provide an additional allowance, in view of existing conditions, to the lower salaried post office employees.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not think that the minister should lecture me because I do not know what has been said in the House. I asked a question on this subject many weeks ago, and repeated the question a few days ago. The minister himself then said that he hoped to have the information soon. It must have been prior to that answer that this information was given in the House. Then was the time to inform me that this information was on Hansard, and not at this late date.

I wish to ask a similar question of the Minister of the Interior. In the West there are many clerks in the Dominion Lands offices whose salaries are the same as when the cost of living was lower. I am informed that these salaries are not adequate to meet the present cost of living. Has this matter been called to the attention of the minister and has he given consideration to it? I trust that he will give it favourable consideration.

Mr. ROCHE: I have had numerous requests along these lines on behalf of these public servants in the lands offices, and have given the matter consideration. I was waiting to see the legislation to be passed for the Outside Service in Ottawa, which has been referred to by the Minister of Finance, in order to decide what action I should take. However, I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that when my estimates were up I was severely criticised because I had such a large expenditure in connection with the Civil Service.

Mr. KNOWLES: That might be possible. The minister may have too many of them. He probably has a great many civil servants who are not doing anything, and money may be extravagantly spent and men still be underpaid. I am appealing on behalf of those who are not receiving enough, but who are doing a good day's work. There are some, even under this Government.

Resolutions reported.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The House in Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Blain in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved:

That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1918, the sum of $16,118,106.25 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved:

That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1918, the sum of $24,054,845.38 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in:

SUPPLY BILL.

Sir THOMAS WHITE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 108, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1918.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Consideration of the motion of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto, and on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barrette, resumed from Tuesday, 3rd July.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, in approaching the consideration of this very important question, I do so with

the desire and with the feeling that it is the duty of every hon. member of this House to face the conditions as they exist in this country at the present time. I need not, and will not, refer to many of the addresses which have been made to this House, in which, I think, the real condition and position of Canada have, to a very large extent, been disregarded. I consider it is the duty of every member of this House, and of every citizen of this country, to be animated by two feelings at this time: First, that we may, to the best of our ability, render the best service, and play our full part as a nation in this war for freedom, and against the military despotism of Germany. Secondly, that we may have peace at home, present a united front to the enemy and keep our country free from discord and division, so that we will be worthy of the effort our sons are making, and evoke for Canada their pride and devotion when the boys come home again.

Mr. Speaker, for myself I have no misgivings as to the attitude that the individual Canadian should assume at this time. This is not an occasion when one should worry over the problem whether or not we are fighting for Britain. We are fighting, Sir, for Britain and with Britain. We are fighting for France and with France; for the United States of America, for Italy, for Russia; we are fighting for and with all those free countries, animated by a common purpose and idea, namely, that the militarism of Germany and the domination of that power which is attempted to be asserted by its ruler, may be put an end to, and that democracy and the rule of the people, may be the guiding element in the days that are to come. That cause is one which is so high, so noble, and so worthy that, let me say, Mr. Speaker, had the right hon. gentleman, who is the Premier of this country, appreciated that these were the real issues in this war, long ago all the forces of this country would have been mobilized, in order that we might render, in every way, to our cause, the best possible service. Long ago it was the duty of my right hon. friend to have conferred with Great Britain, with France, and, during the last two months, with the United States, as to what our part should be in this war, and what was the best service that we could render to this great cause. First, as to the food supply upon which these nations can rely, and which we can produce. There comes across the sea, from the old land—which those of us, Scotch, English and Irish, are proud to call our home land—a call for food for the people. There comes also a further call, which my right hon. friend has not heeded in that he, by conference, should have arranged with the Allies as to the proper supply of our munitions, our minerals and our mineral products, which they require, and which they should have from us. He should have arranged to determine as to the transportation which we were to provide and to the ships in which we could transport the products of our Dominion to the Mother Country.

In addition to that, there should have been a conference as to the number of men that we should furnish, having regard to our population and to the needs at the front. In reference to all of these matters, there should have been conference and mobilization long ago. To the extent that my right hon. friend lagged in his duty and put off the making of proper arrangements in regard to all these matters, he has been responsible for failure and is to be blamed for the present condition under which Canada is not giving her full service to the Mother Country. If we had to-day what we should have had long ago, a proper mobilization and organization of all these resources, a generous, united and enthusiastic people would have seen that all things necessary were supplied. But, instead of deliberate organization and mobilization of our resources, what have we had since the war began? Nothing but hysteria. Month after month, year after year, instead of calm deliberation and cool attention to those conditions which history tells us are necessary to victory, we have been going from one hysteria to the other, without regard to consequences. For instance, at the beginning of the war the Government, instead of providing machine guns and making them available for war purposes, permitted the raising of subscriptions throughout the country for this and other purposes, without the slightest guidance or direction. A generous response was made by the people to whom these appeals were directed in no organized form. But since the handing over of the money to the Government, what evidence have we of any organization in regard to matters of that kind?

Every hon. gentleman in this House has been waiting for the election contest which my right hon. friend kept hanging over the heads of the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD: On no less than three occasions indisputable evidences were given of my right hon. friend's intention to precipitate an election. In 1915 the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Robert Rogers) stated in this House that in respect of such a petty question in war time as representation in the Senate the people of Canada were calling upon the Government in tones of thunder to bring on an election. My right hon. friend yielded to the efforts of that gentleman to this extent: ballots were printed, ballot boxes were sent to England, and every preparation was made for an election. Since then the same condition has gone on. My right hon. friend has been keen in his regard for political considerations; and now, in the light of a condition arising for the first time and affecting the whole country, he suggests that politics should be forgotten for the moment and that we should face this condition together.

Then, take the story of the national service propaganda last year. By virtue of the last powers given him by the War Measures Act, my right hon. friend appointed a commission which he called the National Service Commission. He quarrelled with the chairman of that commission over a question of political patronage, and then appointed the member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) as chairman. Then a campaign was carried on throughout the country—for what? Was there no wastage at the front last year? Was it not necessary last year that the places of the boys who went out and died should be filled? Did my hon. friend find out only a month ago that there was wastage at the front? My right hon. friend and his colleague went through the country discussing matters of patriotic concern. But it turns out now, after the propaganda is all over, that the object of that campaign was not to secure the filling of wastages at the front, but to find men to work on the farms and in other places.

Then, take the absolutely undignified incident that occurred only six months ago, the dispute that arose between the right hon. gentleman and the then Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes). The letters which were made public at that time had no parallel in English or Canadian parliamentary history. If the statements they contained were true, those letters disclosed a condition of affairs within the cabinet which showed that the Government were not worrying about filling the wastages at the front. These are a few of the curious performances which have characterized the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with the war.

The hysteria seems to have affected some hon. gentlemen on this side. Take, for instance, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). Last year the member for Red Deer gave evidence of being affected by hysteria. When criticisms of a most legitimate and proper character were being made by gentlemen on this side with a view to seeing that the administration of military affairs in Canada should be wisely carried on, that hon. gentleman undertook to denounce every one of his former confreres. A similar obsession seemed to have affected the hon. gentleman some few weeks ago.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: He can look after himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: When hon. gentlemen wish to speak they should do the House the courtesy of rising.

Mr. MACDONALD: When hon. gentlemen recall that the member for Red Deer was one of those in Great Britain who preached against Great Britain's taking any part in securing the freedom of South Africa they will wonder whether there is not something in the suggestion of hysteria. I would remind hon. gentlemen, also, that a little over a year ago the member for Red Deer intimated that he was proud of the position taken by Sir John Simon, who retired from the British Government because he did not believe in conscription, and that he had congratulated Sir John Simon upon his sturdy defence of Liberalism. I have some ground, therefore, for suggesting that the member for Red Deer has been affected by some sort of hysteria. Fortunately, the plain people of this land, who have been watching what the Government has been doing, have not been afflicted with hysteria. Where the people have had opportunity of expressing their views in respect of provincial affairs their votes have been against the Conservative party, largely, if not wholly, on account of the way the Government has been managing Canada's part in the war. Let me give you an illustration. A little over a week ago there was an election in Saskatchewan. The slogan of the Conservative party in that election campaign was: vote for Willoughby, the Conservative leader, and for Borden. That campaign cry was met in this way by the Regina Leader:—

It means expressing approval of the Borden Government's military administration, including its "political colonels," the profiteering in mu-

nition contracts, political favoritism in the army and in the awarding of contracts for army supplies; in a word, approval of the whole inefficient, graft-ridden administration of Canada's part in the war.

The people of Saskatchewan, after considering the issue, gave their verdict overwhelmingly only a week ago.

If this Government were in earnest in regard to this matter, what should they have done from the beginning of the war? Why has the Minister of Finance not made proper financial provision for the needs of the country at the present time and for the future? He has adhered to the policy which he announced two years ago, namely, that the proper thing to do was to make posterity pay for this war; in other words, to make the boys who have gone out to fight and if needs be to die for us, pay for this war when they return. Has there been the slightest evidence of economy in the public administration? While there are spasmodic evidences of it at the present time, in the previous two years there has been a reckless expenditure in all the public services, and not the slightest sign of a desire to economize. The Minister of Finance has taxed industry under what he calls a Business Profit Tax, but he will not and has not touched accumulated wealth. During the last session and in the present session hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have pointed out to him the fact that the debt of this country is reaching tremendous proportions. Already this year it amounts to $1,250,000,000. We have also urged that he should make those who have more money than they need contribute something towards the necessities of the state. The Minister of Finance replied: At some time in the dim and distant future I may possibly impose an income tax, but I want posterity to pay for this war. He is perfectly willing to go into the homes of the poor and levy taxes upon them for our war expenditures, but he hesitates to touch the pockets of the rich. In the United States, when the Liberty Loan was placed before the American people, not a banker charged the Government a single cent of commission for getting the money, but the Minister of Finance never asked the financial people of this country to be patriotic enough to give their services free in regard to the floating of our war loan. Why should we not, in these days of blood and strife, and while the tumult is still going on, make the accumulated wealth of this country contribute its share towards the winning of the war?

What has been done during the last three years towards organizing and mobilizing all the resources of this country? Day after day, session after session, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have

4 p.m.

pointed out to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) that the faces of the poor in this land were being ground down, and that they were compelled to pay enormous prices for the right to live in this country. Day after day the plea was made that some action should be taken to remedy this condition of affairs, and what answer did the Minister of Labour give? He passed an Order in Council—which everybody in this House and in this country knew was absolutely ineffective in every way, and which did not furnish any adequate remedy for the necessities of the people of this country. I give in proof of that my hon. friend's own words:

> In July, 1914, just before the war began, the index figure of the Labour Department showing wholesale prices stood at 134.6. In November of 1916, when the Government passed its control regulations, the index figure was 198.4. In February, 1917, when the regulations had been in force four months, it stood at 217.3, and was moving upward with more momentum than before. In July, 1914, the estimated cost of a weekly budget of food for an average Canadian family was $7.42. In November, 1916, when the new regulations went into force, it was $9.81. In February, 1917, after four months' operation of the regulations, it had risen to $10.46 and was still going up.

Was that organization or mobilization of all the forces of Canada in order that we might support this great cause to which we all give adhesion? On the contrary, that is an evidence of an utter disregard of all the conditions and is similar to the disregard that has characterized every other branch of the Government.

For two and one-half years, there was not the slightest attempt to organize in any way the coal supplies of this country; not a single effort was made to ensure that the people of this country should, in the wintry days, be kept warm at the lowest possible cost. When we asked that the request of the gentleman who came from Lloyd George that we should build ships and more ships, should be granted, and when we pointed out that the great republic to the south of us had had a conference, which this Government never took the time to have, and that the United States authorities were providing ships, working in close touch with the Mother Country, what did the Minister of Trade and Commerce say to us? We are per-

mitting the Imperial Government, through the Imperial Munitions Board to build ships in Canada, and we are loaning $10,000,000 to them for that purpose, but as for us, we will not spend a dollar. That showed no mobilization of resources and no effort on the part of this Government to provide for this, the greatest necessity, which is becoming of more vital importance every day this war continues. There was no effort to see that our Allies might get from Canada, the nearest overseas Dominion, who ought to give her supplies most liberally, everything they require in connection with the war. This Government says: not a ship shall we build and not a dollar shall we spend in order that Canada may play her part in this war.

Two years ago, we upon this side of the House, and last year my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) urged upon the Minister of Railways that ample provision of rolling stock of all kinds should be made for the transportation of all the products that were going overseas, and at the same time for the adequate accommodation of the internal trade of the country. Was anything done? The trade of Canada was practically paralyzed for two years as a result of the inactivity of the Government. Was there any mobilization of Canada's resources in order that she might play her part in the war? To-day, by the policy of drift and inattention on the part of the Government, the railway situation in this country has been allowed to become most serious, and it will require the deepest wisdom of every gentleman in this House to solve the problem.

There was a call for the mobilization of the agricultural, industrial, transportation, and natural resources of this country. The need was great. The demand was made that we should give our all to aid in this war. Why was that call not answered? When it was urged that the Government take steps to reduce the cost of living to the wives and families of those who had gone to the front to fight and die, the Minister of Labour, instead of grappling with the problem, had an Order in Council passed that was not worth the paper it was written on. And so the situation that I have described was created, and created by this Government. Was it the fault of the Canadian people? No. From every village and hamlet in this country, from our cities and towns, men have gone out voluntarily, moved solely by a spirit of patriotism to fight in this great cause, while at home their mothers and wives and sisters have worked for their comfort with a devotion that has never been exampled in history. It is not the fault of the Canadian people that we are to-day facing in this land a situation that requires the wisest guidance of the shrewdest minds. Are hon. gentlemen who sit behind this Government responsible for this condition? I am not prepared to say that they are. I believe that there are men on the other side of the House who have done their best to recruit and train men for this war, and the splendid efforts they have made should command the admiration of everybody in this country. Are hon. gentlemen on this side of the House responsible for the condition we find ourselves in to-day? Why, Sir, from that fateful day in August, 1914, when the word went out that this world-war had begun, we on this side of the House have supported the Government and voted all the money that has been required from day to day and year to year to carry on the war. We have asked our sons to go and fight, and they have gone, Liberals and Tories alike. Who then is responsible for this condition? It is the fault of the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, and who throw into the arena the Bill which is now before us.

Where has my right hon. friend the Prime Minister stood on this question of conscription? Day after day he has solemnly asserted on public occasions that he was opposed to conscripting Canadian manhood, that he believed the voluntary system was the best way in which Canada could help the Empire; we have all heard him say that. He said the same thing to representatives of organized labour in this country. He caused or permitted his Minister of the Interior in the autumn of last year down to the 1st of May this year, to advertise to the people of the great nation to the south of us that conscription in Canada was deemed neither desirable nor necessary. But during all those days the war was going on; our boys were dying at the front and gaps were being made in the ranks; the hearts of our people were being harrowed, and yet the Prime Minister could not see the necessity for conscription.

In order that there may be no doubt where the responsibility lies, let me read a question I asked of the Government on April 30 of this year just two months ago:

Mr. Macdonald: In view of the position taken by the Government through the Premier last year that they were emphatically not in favour of conscription, and of the letter of the Minister of the Interior published in the western United States, and advertisements published by

the Interior Department to the effect that conscription was not deemed either advisable or necessary in Canada, I would like to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence whether it is the intention of the Government to change their policy in regard to enlistment and provide for a policy of conscription, or whether they intend to put in force compulsorily the provisions of the Militia Act.

During all that time the men were dying at the front just as they are now; the losses were just as great if not greater. What do you think, Sir, the then Minister of Militia replied in answer to my question? He said:

The question to which my hon. friend refers has not yet had the consideration of the Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: My hon. friend spoke of the "then" Minister of Militia. Does that refer to me?

Mr. MACDONALD: No, I was referring to the present Minister of Militia. We have had two Ministers of Militia and I confuse them sometimes. I do know, however that the ex-Minister of Militia previous to his resignation last autumn had said that while he was in control of the military forces of this country he could raise 200,000 men by the voluntary system in Ontario alone. In answer to my question on the 30th of April the present Minister of Militia, with all the authority which attaches to his position, told the House that the Government had never considered putting a conscriptive law in force in this country. That was only two months ago. At that time the boys were dying at the front. The whole of this Dominion was calling for the mobilization of all our resources, and yet the Government had never considered this proposal.

Let us follow events a little further. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister went to England and visited the men at the front. As late as April we all thought that the Fifth Division had gone to France, commanded by the son of the ex-Minister of Militia. But they have not gone. What stopped them? The war was going on, and our men were dying just as they are today. My right hon. friend says that he never for a single moment while he was in England discussed the question of conscription in Canada; he is on record as making that statement. What did he discuss in England? Did he go over there to find out whether voluntary recruiting had failed in Canada? Not at all; what did the people overseas know about voluntary recruiting in Canada? My right hon. friend did not believe that voluntary recruiting had failed in this country when he sailed for Canada in April. He had no conscription ideas in England, and yet he comes back to this country and tells the House on the 18th of May that he proposes to introduce conscription. His announcement almost synchronized with the preliminary statement made by one of his colleagues who accompanied him on his visit to Europe, and who in an interview at Montreal stated that he thought conscription would have to come in this country. Where did my right hon. friend find out that voluntary recruiting had failed in Canada? Who told him it had failed?

When did he discover it? All the facts show that this Bill was introduced into this House, and this question thrown into the arena, for political purposes, and not for the reasons suggested by my right hon. friend. Had he come back actuated only by the highest ideals and desiring united action by the people, including those represented on this side of the House, why did not he, before making an announcement which was not warranted by the previous history, come to my right hon. leader, lay before him what he believed to be the case, and ask him, untrammelled and without conditions, to join him in order that the Canadian people might move forward in one grand united effort to play their full part in the war? We are told that coalition would be a splendid thing. My right hon. friend did not learn in England that volunteer recruiting had failed. He made his announcement about conscription, and then he came to ask my right hon. leader to join him. He was playing politics when he made that announcement and asked for coalition. The evidence is absolutely clear; it is proven on the face of the Bill itself. The right hon. Prime Minister and those who support him tell us about the great need for troops at the front. But this Bill is not to come into force when it passes this House, as it ought to, if the need is so great; it is not to come into force until proclamation, by Order in Council. He talks about the need of troops at the front, yet he knows in his heart that the need was not so great; for he himself said: Let us have a coalition and, let us not bring the Bill into force, and we will have an election some time in the autumn before the Bill is brought into effect.

I will not go into the figures in detail as they have been given from time to time. We had the figures of 14th May, then the figures of 7th June, and the Under Secre-

tary (Mr. McCurdy), speaking in the House yesterday, gave us a new set of figures. I gather from these figures and from the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite that we have about 136,400 men in France, and about 108,736 in England. On 14th May, there were in England 84,000 of all ranks available for reinforcements before the end of the year, and infantry exclusive of men in hospital 47,478 men. The need of men was not so great but that my right hon. friend could play politics and could postpone the sending of aid until we had an election. It is plain that under the proposition made by the Prime Minister to the leader of the Opposition there could not be a man sent to France to fight in this war until the autumn of 1918—not a man. And the Prime Minister knew it if he was well advised.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I take exception to that statement; I knew nothing of the kind.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then the right hon. gentleman had not taken the opportunity to consult about it. Let me show him what would have taken place under this proposition. Were the election held in October it would not be possible for the newly organized Parliament to be in existence here until November. After November, according to this Bill, local boards would have to be appointed all over this country. After the local boards were appointed every man who claimed exemption from service could make his appeal to the county court, afterwards to the judge of the Superior Court in his district, and afterwards even to the Supreme Court of Canada. Men could not be mobilized for training until the spring of 1918. And, if my right hon. friend will ask his Minister of Militia with regard to the time necessary to train men and transport them across the ocean, he will learn that they could not have had a man in France until the autumn of 1918, as I have said.

Now, there are in this House five groups in relation to this measure. First, there are those who are in favour of the six months' hoist of this Bill, who practically say that Canada has done enough in the war and are opposed to conscription in any form or at any time. Second, there are those who are anxious that Canada should play the full part of which she is capable in this war, and who desire, in order that disunion should be avoided, that the principle of the Bill should be submitted to the people for ratification before it goes into force. Third, there are those who favour the Bill, but are anxious that further efforts should be made for voluntary recruiting before the Bill is proclaimed. Fourth, there are those who want to pass the Bill as it stands, but not to enforce it until after an election. And, fifth, there are those who want the Bill passed and put into force immediately. For the benefit of the gentlemen who take any one of the last four grounds, I should like to discuss the Bill in principle for a moment or two.

I take the ground that this Bill is not a bona fide attempt to deal with the problem, and I propose to prove that from the evidence contained in the Bill itself. In the first place, there is no provision for the registration of the man-power of this nation. In Great Britain, where conscription was ultimately adopted, there were, first, various schemes of registration—the Lord Derby scheme and others. All the preliminaries were gone through by which the authorities learned the number of men in Great Britain, with particulars about every man—his age, occupation, capacities, all the needed information—so that when the time came to send out the recruiting officer that recruiting officer could put his hand on the man he wanted. In the United States they dealt with this problem sternly, properly, as it would have been dealt with in Canada if this Government had not been absolutely ineffective from the beginning. In the United States a simple method was provided under which the aid of the municipal authorities all over that great republic was enlisted to make a roll of the available men. On the tenth day of June, when the labours of the day were concluded, there were forwarded to the military authorities of the United States complete statements of the man-power of the nation, showing, with relation to every man, his age, residence, trade, or occupation, and all other necessary facts. When they require these men they know where to find them. Have we in Canada had any registration, any attempt to bring home to the people the sternness of the situation, any attempt to put down in black and white the facts with regard to our man-power, so that the authorities may know what that man-power is?

Have we anything of that kind in this Bill? No, there is nothing of the kind. When the Bill was introduced, I asked the right hon. gentleman whether he intended to have registration, and he said he did not. I say that the absence of a provision for registration is evidence that the Government do not intend to put this Bill into effect with any degree of haste. Having

failed to provide for registration, what are they going on for their data? They are going on the census which is seven years old, and they are going on the National Service data. The National Service data was obtained, according to the statement made by responsible labour men in this country, under the representation that National Service was not for men to fight but for men to work. Do you not think that that is a very singular and very peculiar kind of basis for people to start from who are anxious to deal with this problem in a stern way in keeping with all the eloquent addresses we have heard in this House? The evidence of the failure to grapple with this question from the standpoint of the gentlemen who hold views such as I have mentioned, is beyond all doubt. Take, for instance, the men in the first class from twenty years up: How is the gentleman who has to deal with this matter from a military standpoint to find out from the census returns or from any other source the whereabouts of a boy who was eighteen years old two years ago, when this war began? How are you ever going to get the names? Where is the gentleman who is going to mobilize these people to get the data on which to start? It is absolutely impossible under this Bill. Why, Sir, in the United States they provide that every man between eighteen and forty-five having no dependents of any kind and not engaged in employment essential to the national security had to register on a certain day; they had all the names of these people on the register. My hon. friends are not proceeding in that way.

Take the provision in regard to the Board of Selection. My right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) claimed great credit for the method of appointing local tribunals. That is subsection 3 of section 6 which reads as follows:

> Each local tribunal shall consist of two members. One member shall be appointed by a Board of Selection to be established by joint resolution of the Senate and House of Commons.

That means, when you get it translated into ordinary Anglo-Saxon, that the Government of Canada, through their appointees on that Board of Selection, are going to appoint one of the members of the local board, and the consequence will be that you have the same pernicious political influence that has blasted the ideals of a large number of the Canadian people, in operation under this Bill. If a county court judge is a good enough man to select one member of this local board, he is good enough to select two. There can be no possible justification, unless there is a desire to interject politics into this question, for this Government reserving to itself the appointment of one of the members of these local boards, through the committee of selection. If the Bill proposed is bona fide, let a county court judge appoint both. If he is a person to appoint one member of the board, he is a proper person to appoint the other.

Why all this elaboration in regard to appeals, if the need is so great and my right hon. friend is sincere? You will have this result: The man who has money enough to go and retain a lawyer to raise the legal question as to the meaning of "national interest" in the first three exemption clauses can carry his case to the Supreme Court of Canada, while the poor beggar at home who has not enough money to fee a lawyer cannot appeal. The man with money can prolong his hearing for months and months. The evidence is that these gentlemen do not believe in their hearts that there is such urgent necessity, because if they did so believe they would have a Bill of such a character that there would be no question about it.

Then, let us come to the proposition as to what national interest is. I asked my right hon. friend when he introduced this Bill whether there would be any definition by this House of the words "national interest." My right hon. friend said there would be none, that it was proposed to define national interest by the regulations that were to be made by the Government. In other words, this Government is reserving to itself the right to say who shall go and who shall not go. Respecting to the full, as I do, the position taken by men in this country who believe that conscription is imperative at this moment, I say that when this Government reserves to itself the right to define national interest, it thereby wipes out all the enthusiasm of these people, and when the people come to study this thing closely, they will realize that this Government is playing politics more than anything else.

Are the agriculturists of this country to be exempted or are they not? My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) frankly told the people of Quebec the other day that they need not worry about this Bill; they were nearly all farmers, and they were going to be exempt. Is there anything of that kind in the Bill? Nothing of the kind. The words "national interest" are left entirely in the hands of this

Government, to give whatever definition of it they like.

Let us look at the figures as to the occupations of the different people in Canada as defined by the census of 1911. I am giving now the figures of all those from ten years of age to the oldest man in the country. The numbers engaged in the different occupations were as follows: Agriculture, 917,848; building trades, 245,990; domestic and personal service, 75,133; civil and municipal government, 72,531; fishing and hunting, 42,901; manufacturing, 392,781; mining, 62,706; professions, 62,781; trade and merchandise, 240,903; transportation (which includes sailors and railway men and so on), 210,692, making a total of 2,358,813. Now, is this Bill intended to exempt agriculturists? I should like to know from the right hon. gentleman. I pause for a reply.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend is capable of reading the Bill and drawing his own conclusions. As to the particular provisions, this is not the time to discuss them. We shall discuss them in committee.

Mr. MACDONALD: With all deference to my right hon. friend, I think this is the time, and I think it is about time that somebody in this discussion did find out what this Bill is providing for.

I want to know, and the country wants to know, whether the 917,848 men who are engaged in agriculture are to be exempted, or whether they are not. I want to know what the Solicitor General, who did discuss the details of the Bill, meant when he intimated to the people of Quebec that they need not worry about this thing. He said they had large families, that they got married young, that they were all working on the farms, and they need not worry about it. The Prime Minister will not tell me whether that is so or not. There is in the preamble of the Bill this statement:

> And whereas, by reason of the large number of men who have already left agricultural and industrial pursuits in Canada to join such Expeditionary Force as volunteers, and of the necessity of sustaining, under such conditions, the productivity of the Dominion, it is expedient to secure the men still required, not by ballot as provided in the Militia Act, but by selective draft.

That is in the preamble, but not in the enacting clauses. All that is in the enacting clause of the Bill is the proviso that the man who can show a local board that it is in the national interest that he should continue in the employment he is then engaged in, may be exempt. The Solicitor General indicated that the farmers were to be exempt. Connected with industries, manufacturing and industrial plants we have 392,000 men. In other words, in the agricultural and industrial classes there are 1,300,000, so that 200,000 more than half the working people of Canada are connected with those two industries. In Great Britain, they do not take the sailors or the railwaymen. In Canada there are 210,000 transportation employees. Adding these figures, we have 1,500,000 men exempted. Then what about the miners, Mr. Speaker? Are the miners to be taken, or are they not? They are an essential element in this country. We are appointing commissions giving complete control to gentlemen to deal with this problem of the production of coal, in order that next winter our people may not freeze to death. Are the miners of Canada to be taken under this Bill? Then there are 34,547 men engaged in the fishing industry in Canada. In Great Britain they are exempt. In Canada they are the greatest producers of cheap food that you can find all over the country. If these gentlemen on the other side of the House had organized the national resources of this country, the cost of living in central Canada would not have been so great as it is. If the fish obtained in the Maritime Provinces and on the Pacific coast had been taken to our Canadian cities, it would have reduced the cost of living. Should the fishermen be conscripted? In the United States, I observe they exempt civil and municipal government employees, which classes make 72,531 in Canada. Are they to be exempt in Canada? There are men in the professions, 62,781. There is no question about them. I guess they will have to go. No doubt the lawyers and the doctors will have to go.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a problem. It depends on whether it is in the national interest that they should go.

Mr. EDWARDS: It would be in the national interest that the lawyers should go.

Mr. MACDONALD: Referring to the lumbering industry of Canada, the number of men engaged in forestry is 42,901. Are those men to go? I am citing these figures for the purpose of showing that it is about time, in the discussion of this serious measure, that we had some pronouncement to the country as to what is really meant by this Bill. Are we going to leave it in the hands of this Government to say what national

interest means, and to say that Tom Jones has to go and Dick Smith may stay? Any one familiar with the conditions in England and Scotland knows that, as a result of having left to the local boards in Great Britain the sole determination of this question of national interest, the gravest dissatisfaction has arisen. There is a suspicion of favouritism. There is a feeling that there has been discrimination, and in the operation and carrying out of the measure, conditions of the gravest character which should not have arisen now prevail, and the consequence is that the poorer people of the Old Country are discontented. My right hon. friend must have heard that when he was over there. My right hon. friend has another proposition—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what he is going to suggest on this point, when the House goes into committee?

Mr. MACDONALD: I will give my right hon. friend many suggestions. I will give him one at once. My hon. friend has, as I say, for political purposes merely, introduced a measure, the details of which he declines to explain, and, in the interests of the country, I am calling the attention of the people to the fact that the Prime Minister will not furnish an explanation. I will give the hon. gentleman an illustration. Paragraph "C" of section 11, referring to exemptions, reads:

> That it is expedient in the national interest that, instead of being employed in the military service, he should continue to be educated or trained for any work for which he is then being educated or trained.

What does that mean? It means that if one has a boy between 20 and 25 years of age going to college, and can afford to keep him there, and can afford to go to the local board and say, "Here is a boy I am educating and training, and it is important he should finish his education and training," that boy can stay at home, while the son of the poor man, who does not go to college, who has to work for his living, and get it as best he can, has not the advantage of that exemption. I say that exemption should be wiped out.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD: Subsection "D" of section 11 reads:

> That serious hardship would ensue if the man were placed on active service, owing to his exceptional financial or business obligations or domestic position.

Let me give an instance. Dealing with the case of the poor man dependent upon his daily work for a living, who has purchased a home on the instalment plan, or having gotten his home together, has obtained some furniture on the instalment plan and not paid for it, does he come within this category? I think not. I think this means that a man between the age of 20 and 45, who is engaged in some important business, can pay a lawyer, go before the Board and prove that his financial position is such, and the matters depending upon him are such, that he should be exempt. In the eyes of the man who wants to perform full service in this great cause, is there any reason why the poor man should be taken, and the rich man left at home? That will happen under that section.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does the hon. gentleman favour striking out that provision?

Mr. MACDONALD: I certainly would not permit a clause of that kind to be put in without a definition, so that there would be no discrimination against the poor man, as there apparently is, in that section, as drawn. Why, in this curious measure, should a clause be inserted that it should not come into effect except by Order in Council? There is no more reason why this Bill should not go into effect on the day that His Excellency gives assent to it than there is why any Bill passed by Parliament should not become effective when sanctioned. My hon. friend may have some good reason for inserting that provision. He may have an election in mind, but I warn the Prime Minister that many a man whose soul is stirred will be keeping his eye on him when he decides to make this provision.

This Bill is based on a peculiar statement in the preamble. You will observe that in the preamble, after reciting the provisions of the Militia Act, the clause says:

> And whereas enough men do not volunteer to provide such reinforcements.

In other words, according to all geneses upon which legislation is perfected, if men volunteer in sufficient numbers, there is no need for this Bill. I decline to assent to the suggestion that voluntary enlistment in Canada has failed. If it has lagged behind; if the youth of the land have not responded as they should, it is the fault of the Government. In the first place, more inducements of a material character should have been held out to the men who were asked to go to the front. To ask a man who had a family depending upon him to give up his work and accept $1.10

a day as a private was not calculated to lead men to believe that the state was generous in its dealings with volunteers. More harm has been done to recruiting by the manner in which the assigned pay and separation allowances have been handled than has been done in any other way. Many wives who were depending upon their 55 cents a day did not get their cheque when the month came around; others did not get their separation allowances when they should have got them. Would that have a tendency to arouse enthusiasm among the people? Wives of men at the front have begged members of the House to intercede for them at Ottawa and endeavour to have their money sent to them. These persons have spoken to their friends and relatives about the way they were being treated. Would that instil enthusiasm into the people? Why did not the Government insure the lives of men who left dependents behind them, in order that, without legal technicalities or red tape, their relatives would be enabled to get a certain sum of money if injury should come to their dear ones who had gone away?

Then, Sir, consider the breaking up of the regiments. Consider the extent to which sentimental ties were broken when regiments were disbanded. Look at the way the Irish boys of Montreal were treated. Consider the conditions in my own province. By vigorous effort, there were organized four battalions which were full of the sentiment and enthusiasm that are characteristic of men of the Scottish race. These battalions went out with the full assurance that they would go to the front as units. A week after they landed on the other side, an order came for a draft. They used to tell us that the British authorities asked for these drafts, but the British authorities did not ask for this draft; it was asked for and made by the Canadian authorities in Great Britain appointed by this Government. When they made the draft, did they take one of the battalions and send it over with its officers? No; they proceeded to slash the whole of the four battalions, crippling and destroying them, so that to-day only two remain out of the four that left our province to fight together in this great cause. Is that calculated to arouse the enthusiasm of the boys whom we have been asking to volunteer? Not at all.

Mr. EDWARDS: How would the hon. gentleman fill up the wastage?

Mr. MACDONALD: I am showing that this Government says: As a result of our maladministration, mistakes and failures, we cannot get any more recruits; therefore, we must have conscription.

I need not relate the story of political management in connection with the war; it is known everywhere. The purchase of supplies was placed in the hands of local patronage committees; no medical men who were not Conservatives were permitted to examine recruits and the ideals of our people were blunted.

Let me say here that the country has a right to know definitely the circumstances in connection with the stopping of recruiting a year ago. On the one hand we have a positive and definite statement made in this House by the ex-Minister of Militia, and on the other hand we have a modified denial by the Prime Minister. The country has a right to know what occurred between these two gentlemen and whether or not recruiting was halted, if not stopped, as a result of anything that took place last year. If the efforts in the matter of recruiting had been maintained with all the vigour and enthusiasm of previous years, there would have been no necessity for throwing this apple of discord, the Military Service Bill, before the Canadian people.

The people of Canada have no faith in the present militia officials of this Government. We had in this country various generals whose names were household words when they were sent over here by the British Government. They were such men of recognized ability in military matters as Lord Dundonald, General Lake, General Mackenzie. How many people in Canada ever heard of the man who is now general officer commanding the forces in this country? Who ever saw him commanding any of the military camps in Canada? What influence has his personality upon the Canadian people? Who ever heard tell of General Gwatkin except a few persons in Ottawa? Australia has its General Birdwood, whose name is a household word in that Dominion, and who takes overseas the men who enlist under him. Who is this General Gwatkin, upon whom the Canadian people are asked to pin their faith as their military leader? The present Minister of Militia and his parliamentary secretary are genial men, but what do they know of military organization? What have they tried to learn? They have simply marked time. If you want to find out anything about anybody on the other side, you are told: We will cable to England and find out. If a soldier is seriously wounded, many weary

days must pass before information can be gained as to what has happened to him. The methods of the Government in this respect have caused the people to feel that the present Administration is weak, inefficient and incompetent.

I am rather inclined to inquire of some of the gentlemen opposite who have been overseas as to what is the actual position occupied by Sir George Perley, whose title is Overseas Minister of Militia. If they would speak frankly I know what they would say. I have here a letter that was written by a colonel in England on the last day of March:

> There never was such dissatisfaction in the world as exists in the Canadian forces, all things seem to be subordinated to politics, and pull, and everybody here recognizes it. I have heard many men who have been prominent Conservatives all their lives; some have been members at Ottawa, and others of provincial Houses, declare that all they wanted was a chance to get even with the present Government.

Indeed, it is stated that a certain member of the other side of this House has said that when he took his battalion overseas, he took over 1,100 Conservatives, and when he returned he left 1,100 opponents of this Government behind him. This colonel makes this further statement:

> The present Canadian administration in London are trying to gain the confidence of the forces, and I think General Turner is honest in his work. I had a talk with him the other day and he assured me there was no politics in the present appointments, but when you notice Bob Roger's son as his personal aide sitting outside his door, and Major Montague, a son of the doctor of that name, in the next room, and when you have to see these men and state your business before you can see the General, even if you have a definite appointment, then you begin to wonder what the game is, and it is the same all through everything, if you have not a political standing, you don't count.

I take from the Calgary News-Telegram a letter written on June 22, by Private A. H. McPherson, No. 116838, 11th O.B., C.M.R.:

> It is the duty of every young man who has no one to support but himself to enlist and help out his country in time of trouble. In this way there would be no need for conscription. I do not think it a good policy for a "rump" government to pass conscription without first putting it to the people. In this way our country will be saved and brought into unity. Otherwise, I fear there is going to be a rupture, and I am of the opinion that the Prime Minister was right when he said that he dreaded the coming home of the boys from the trenches. There was some truth in his statement that he dreaded their coming.

When such statements are made with reference to the voluntary system of re-

cruiting and everything else in connection with the management of the war and the leadership of the men who have gone forth so gladly and proudly to fight; is it any wonder that we ask here that there should be some regeneration, a development of new ideals in this House and in this country? That is the situation.

I said in the beginning that I would speak of conditions and not of theories. I have attempted to outline briefly and as earnestly and effectively as I know how the facts as they appear to me and they cannot be questioned.

Some very unkind statements have been made as to the attitude of the labouring classes. I have seen in the Conservative newspapers published in my province a very abusive article reflecting upon Mr. J. C. Watters. I have known Mr. Watters for the last four or five years, and any one who has met him must agree with me that he is a very thoughtful gentleman, and, in my opinion, one of the highest type of men who have ever been connected with labour in this country. He has had the confidence of this Government. My right hon. friend and his Government appointed Mr. J. C. Watters on that Economic Commission which was created by the Government. When there was a conference at Washington a short time ago with the representatives of Great Britain who came over here, Mr. J. C. Watters was one of the men whom this Government selected to take down to Washington with their representatives to confer upon questions relating to the war. Therefore when Mr. Watters speaks on these matters, we have no right to disregard him. We can not say that, because the sons of labour have gone out and fought valiantly in this war, their brethren at home have no right to express their views. The labour leaders represent 160,000 men associated with labour in this country, and in dealing with an important question of this character, we should carefully consider their position. You cannot brush them aside and tell them that they are slackers, or traitors. They represent a large body of people, and Mr. Watters is a gentleman of the highest possible ideals. The labour people say that they went to the Prime Minister and discussed these questions from time to time. They say: When our organization at Vancouver took a position in regard to this question of conscription, and when later on, at Toronto, we dealt with this matter, we proposed the nationalization of all the aids necessary and the conscription of all the power of the nation for

the prosecution of the war. We cannot find fault with them for that. We may not all of us agree with them as to the nationalization of all the industries of this country, but when these gentlemen, at this time, when the future of Canada is at stake, submit these matters to us for our consideration and say to us: We must have conscription of all the resources of the nation, you cannot brush these people aside; they must be heard, and if their plea is a good one it must be considered. In the proceedings of the Trades and Labour Congress, held last year, they stated their position in regard to munitions as follows:—

5 p.m.

When it was known by the Executive Council that the conditions resulting from the outbreak of war would necessitate the manufacture of munitions in Canada, it was urged that the Government undertake the same by utilizing their various shops for that purpose. . . .

All things being equal as between Government shops and those of a contractor, the same conditions as to hours of labour and as to quantity and quality of work performed, the Government, by undertaking its own work, saves the profits otherwise taken by the contractor, the amount of which profits can be distributed in the shape of higher wages to the employee and at reduced cost to the Government. This has been demonstrated in Great Britain, South Africa, New Zealand and Australia.

They ask that such action should be taken. They say: Hand in hand with conscription of men, if you are going to have that, let us have conscription in other things also. Have they not a right to be heard? In the circular issued last year by Mr. Watters, after the National Service propaganda had begun, and when certain of his associates had complained because he had asked them to sign these cards and return them, he made this statement:—

At the three conventions of the Congress held since the outbreak of war the policy adopted was to "lend every assistance possible to the Allies in a mighty endeavour to secure early and final victory for the cause of freedom and democracy." This policy was qualified at the Vancouver convention by the adoption of "unchangeable opposition to all that savours of conscription." At the Toronto convention the war policy of the Congress was still further modified by opposing registration. . . .

The opposition to registration which developed at the Toronto convention was based on the assumption that it was only a preliminary step to conscription such as had taken place in Great Britain. There is a wide difference, however, between the system adopted in Great Britain and that in Canada. The purposes of the two systems are, also, very dissimilar, according to the statement made by the Premier, Sir Robert L. Borden.

The system of registration put into operation in Great Britain led to conscription, the system of registration in Canada is designed to lead away from conscription. The Prime Minister and the Director General of the National Service Board were both emphatic in their assertions as to there being no connection between registration and conscription. They were equally emphatic as to the purely voluntary nature of the service to be rendered for military, industrial and agricultural purposes in calling on every individual to fill out the cards. The purpose, as vouched for by the First Minister of the Dominion, of the registration plan, therefore, is to secure such information as will demonstrate how and in what particular our efforts may be best directed to give effect to the declared war policy of the Congress itself.

Should the Government undertake to adopt military or even industrial conscription a wholly different state of affairs would obtain. The action of the Vancouver convention, reaffirmed at Toronto, clearly sets forth the position of the Congress in unqualified opposition to conscription.

That was penned last summer before the question of conscription was raised, and it was given as a defence by Mr. Watters to critics, because he had asked the labour men to sign and return the cards because he had the assurance of the Prime Minister that the cards meant, not conscription, but merely registration .

Here is another statement:

If the Government is sincere in its determination to "consecrate the power of the nation" to the cause of the Allies and democracy and not dictated to nor influenced by "Downing Street," or the dominating privileged interests in Canada nor simply actuated by miserable political party considerations, the conscription of man power will follow and not precede that of wealth and the nationalization of every industry necessary for the prosecution of the war. Until the Government gives proof that conscription is, in the words of the Prime Minister, "the only effective method to preserve the existence of the State and of the institutions and liberties which we enjoy," organized labor has every warrant in seeking its defeat by both their economic and political power.

That is the position of labour. They say to the people of Canada: If you are going to take men—and you told us you were not—deal first with wealth and with the industries of this country, so that the best possible service can be given by the whole country to the war. They ask that the measure be submitted to the people for consideration, but that request is disregarded.

Now I come to the other problem that faces us, dealing here with conditions again—and not with theories. We have in this country over 2,000,000 people who speak the French language. The census returns of seven years ago show that one out of every three men in this country speaks the French language. The position, therefore, of the province of Quebec in this Confederation cannot be ignored. We all know that the issue in the province of Quebec

six years ago was not reciprocity, but whether the Laurier naval policy meant the conscription of the people of that province. A continuous propaganda was carried on from every church-door almost, in the province of Quebec by the Postmaster General and the Minister of Inland Revenue against participation by Canada in Britain's wars, and the charge was made that because our leader desired the people of this country to help maintain the supremacy of Great Britain on the sea by building a Canadian navy, which both the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Prime Minister of this country had approved in 1909, conscription was to follow. Men were sent up and down the province of Quebec, to take the names of young men available for conscription to excite the people. Men who are now ministers in this Government fell on their knees on public platforms and prayed that Quebec might be saved from the awful calamity that was being brought upon it by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In 1911 twenty-four men from Quebec were elected to this Parliament who were absolutely pledged against anything in the way of Canada's participation in Great Britain's wars. The result has been that this Government has lost the confidence of the plain people of the province of Quebec—and that is not overpainting the situation. We must never forget that the French have been here longest; they have their roots in the soil. Their ancestors, unlike those of us of Scotch or English or Irish blood, did not come from the Old Land within the last one hundred years. We are bound to the Old Land by family ties, the most potent of all influences, but France deserted the French in this country in 1759, and the people of the province of Quebec have now no tie with France except that they speak the French language. They are devoted solely and wholly to this Canadian land, which has been their home and the home of their fathers for the last two centuries. They are a modest, a brave and a chivalrous people, tillers of the soil, and animated with a love for this country greater perhaps than that of any other section of our population. What part of this country other than the province of Quebec has given to Canada songs breathing such an admiration for this land as "O, Canada, mon pays mes amours" and the other home songs and "O, Canada" which are heard in every home in the province of Quebec.

We all know that there is a feeling of disappointment throughout Canada because the French have not recruited satisfactorily. Everywhere you hear the question asked: Why have not the French Canadians volunteered? I have already given one or two reasons out of many and I might mention another, a small one, perhaps, but indicative of different conditions. How much has been spent in the province of Quebec and Ontario in educating the people on the issues involved in this war? In Ontario, $18,566.37 was spent in advertising for recruits. In Quebec $3,446.19 was spent amongst the English papers, and how much do you think amongst the French papers of that province? Only $550.79. In Prince Edward Island, a little province with 90,000 people, $1,000 in round numbers was spent in advertising—$999.16 to be exact. It is all very well to say the French have not recruited, and that we are going to force them to do their duty by this Bill. Nearly every minister of the Crown has said that in turn, but the Solicitor General, realizing the danger, took a different line. He said:

> Rather, on the other hand, for just and good reasons—not because that province desires any favouritism for it gets no favouritism but for just and good reasons, this Bill in its results will work more lightly on the province of Quebec than on any other province in Canada. In what way will it work so lightly? In the first place, the province of Quebec is an agricultural province. A much larger proportion of the population of that province is engaged in agriculture than in the case at least with any other of the other old provinces of Canada. . . . Therefore, the exemption clauses, applied evenly and fairly all over this Dominion, as is the intent, will, for just and good and sound reasons, be of more value to the province of Quebec than to any other province of Canada.

What does that mean? Let us frankly face the situation. We know that everybody in this country is asking: Why don't the French Canadians volunteer? Hon. gentlemen say they are going to make them enlist by means of this Bill. The Solicitor General, however, takes the position that the Bill will fall more lightly on the province of Quebec than on other provinces, and therefore we must not say much about it. There is an evident insincerity there.

There is only one way in which the whole power of the nation can be devoted to the cause, and that is by a Bill which will make every part of the nation do its duty from one end of the Dominion to the other.

And according to the Solicitor General, this Bill is not going to do that. So, you have the solution of the problem as offered by the Government in these two stories,

—the story told by one group that we are going to make Quebec go, and the story told by another that not as many men are to go from Quebec as from other parts of the country. The men who really want this Bill should declare that every man in the country must be treated fairly and that when the Bill is enforced the regulations under it shall be so drawn that all parts of the country must contribute equally.

But notwithstanding all that has gone by, notwithstanding our lack of faith in the conditions existing since 1911, notwithstanding that we have been attacked and vilified; the French Canadians say to the rest of the Canadian people: submit this whole question to a referendum, and as citizens of Canada we will accept the verdict of the people and abide by the results. In the face of conditions as they are, with Canada as she is and as we hope she shall be, is this an unreasonable condition?

Then, what is our duty? As I stated in the beginning, I am animated by the desire, above all else, that we in Canada should play our full part in this war. The Government has so mismanaged affairs, they have so dealt with pledges given in relation to matters touching the very life of the people at this time, that for the moment recruiting has subsided. The Government itself has abandoned it since taking up the policy embodied in this Bill. I can speak for myself, and I believe I can speak for many hon. gentlemen on this side; certainly I can speak for my own province, when I say that if proper conditions are created, and if the members of this House, Liberals and Conservatives, go to the people, each in his own locality, and show the people what is at stake in this war, and ask them to come forward as Canadians and as British citizens and give their best, and their all, in order that Canada may play her part, they will not be found wanting. Is not that a fair proposition to make? Is it not a hopeful and workable proposition in view of the fact that even under adverse conditions the people have given over 400,000 men voluntarily and of their own free will, to maintain the cause of justice and civilization in this war? Recall the conditions in 1914 when the war broke out. In those days we should have received with surprise the statement, had it been made, that in three years Canada would have 400,000 men fighting in this great cause. And yet those men came. Do you mean to tell me that more will not come if the cause is properly presented to the people? I am ready to go to my own people and make the appeal. And I am sure that if all the members in this House will go and show the people the greatness of the cause and the need for Canadian unity and Canadian action, the response will not be wanting.

In the meantime let us submit this question to the Canadian people. I have shown by the provisions of this Bill, and by the method with which this question has been dealt with, that this Government do not mean to put its provisions into force in the way in which it is alleged the necessities of the case demand. Therefore, why should not we turn to labour, and also to these two million people of French extraction in Canada—who do not take the position that they are not interested in this war, but who simply say, in view of all that has passed, we object to being coerced as Ireland was; we want to go freely—and deal with them along lines of conciliation and true leadership? Look at Australia. They have there no race problem as we have; yet, working along constitutional lines, they have submitted a referendum on this question, and under the statesmanship of William Hughes they are working out the problem. They will work out a solution of this problem, and they will maintain a commonwealth which will go on to greater and greater prosperity in the days yet to be.

There come to this House day by day petitions from all parts of the country signed by people who desire the destruction of the liquor traffic. They declare that the record of that traffic is one of the most nefarious the world has ever known, and that that traffic is as worthy of destruction as is German militarism. Yet, what do they ask of this Parliament? They ask that this Parliament should submit to a referendum the question of whether or not this traffic should be abolished. This is the very voice of democracy; it is a recognition of the principle that lies at the root of the issues that are being determined between Germany and the world to-day. And shall we not listen to that voice? We must listen to it if we are to preserve this land with its freedom and its possibilities for our boys when they come home again. We must not introduce in this land the doctrine that the son of the labourer, born in the quiet cottage, is any less worthy before the law than he who was in a mansion overlooking half a county. Yet is not that what you declare in effect, if you say to labour to-day: we do not regard your voice, and it matters nothing, even though you believe that we have misled you and have followed a path which

we said we would not follow. We must not allow that for the sake of the Canada that is yet to be. We must not create race divisions in this country. When I hear our friends talk about "these Frenchmen," I recall the history of the great nation to which we are so proud to belong. Are all the British race men of Saxon blood? No, Sir. They came to the tight little island people from many different nations of Europe—Angles, Saxons, Danes and Normans, and the Celts came to Scotland and Ireland. In the old land they had their difficulties of race, they had their problems to deal with, as we have in Canada. They worked out their destiny by good will and toleration, and they welded into one all these conflicting elements, making the imperial nation of to-day. We will follow where Britain has led, and by a policy of conciliation and good will among all the people of different nationalities, we will establish on this northern half of this continent a nation anxious only for the greatness of Canada, proud first and last of being Canadians and of being a nation within the great British Empire. Were that great leader, the late Sir John Macdonald, here to-day, animated by the feelings which guided him in dealing with these problems fifty years ago, he would tell how this situation should be met.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Would you support him?

Mr. MACDONALD: I certainly would support Sir John Macdonald on this question, because I know the position he would take. His career as a statesman is proof that if he were dealing with the questions confronting the Canadian people to-day, he would guide them along lines of toleration and good will, and not along lines of force and of coercion.

We should aim to build up in Canada a nation loving its land, a land of the free and home of the brave—powerful in its freedom to stand by the Empire in peace and in war. Wise men laid the foundations of our nation. On the basis of good will and toleration, they sought to prepare the conditions under which we might go on and attain our great destiny. If we, at the opening of the last half of our first century, fail to realize the broad principles on which they constructed their edifice, we shall not do our duty to this nation. Lord Shaughnessy, the other day, in a message to the Canadian people, said:

> The fifty years of Confederation have been fifty years of growing intercourse between East and West, but we still have much to learn of each other. In a time of crisis such as the present, it is our first duty to overlook differences of creed, of local interest, and of origin, and remember only that we are Canadian citizens of a great Empire which has taken up the cause of freedom against the aggression of a military caste. We must temper our criticism of each other's apparent shortcomings and devote our whole energies to the triumph of freedom and to constructive national effort.

We might well all follow the model here given by Lord Shaughnessy—that should be the purpose of all of us to-day—and out of the mists of the present, animated by the desire to play our full part in this great contest, let us trust our people and not coerce them; and by appealing to their best ideals of sacrifice and service we will get the highest results and keep this nation loyal and free, worthy of the great traditions of the past and strong and sure, prepared to face the future and its problems with pride and confidence.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie-Napierville) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, at a few minutes to eleven o'clock, I rose in this House to take up the discussion of this conscription Bill which we have been considering for more than two weeks. I had scarcely opened my mouth and uttered two words: "Mr. Speaker" when my hon. friend from Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) immediately sprang to his feet, upon a point of order, and asked if there was a quorum of the House. You had the roll called by the deputy Clerk of the House who stated, after taking down the names of the members present, that there was no quorum, so that the House was then adjourned until Tuesday, yesterday, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

I may add, Mr. Speaker, that to-day, I will tell you immediately that I am against conscription, in case my hon. friend for Rimouski should again rise on a point of order and there would be no quorum in this House. Therefore, I immediately declare myself against conscription.

This Bill, which we have been here discussing for over two weeks, is so far-reaching in its effects as regards the people of this country, that everyone is wondering where the Prime Minister is leading us to, as the Prime Minister has so often declared, in this House and elsewhere, that the pursuit of this war would forever be continued under the volunteering system.

In the course of the debate, in this House, on January 17, 1916, the hon. Prime Minister, speaking after the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) declared, explicitly that there never would

be any conscription in this country. There is, therefore, nothing strange in the fact that the people of this country should want this war carried on without having such a measure of compulsion passed by Parliament.

As for me, I do not need this conscription Bill to say that I condemn the Government. On several occasions, I have spoken in this House about the carrying on of this war, stating that the Government had led us to bankruptcy, and after putting us in bankruptcy, they now want furthermore the blood of our children.

I agree with the great French and English statesmen. I have always agreed with the big London dailies which have, almost all of them, declared in their columns that to ask the people of Canada 150,000 men, was an extraordinary effort, and that England would never ask so much.

The people of this country have decided to do more than that—I commend the soldiers who have volunteered and enlisted—but, unfortunately, those who will have to foot the bill, after the war, will think as I do, that the enlisting went too far, even voluntarily.

Conscription, in my humble opinion, dates from the moment this Government has attempted to follow in the footsteps of the British government. We have had, some six months ago, the National Service cards, the Government wanting to know the man power of the nation, so they said. Our good papers of Montreal and all over the country, among them that sanctimonious Patrie of Montreal, which circulates in our counties declare day after day in its columns that there was no harm in signing those National Service cards; that the people should obey the State, and it was merely to know the man power of the nation, to work on the farms, to work in the ammunition factories, etc.

I had already declared, previously, in the county of Laprairie-Napierville, that this Government would surely bring about conscription, because I always remembered the statement made by the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) in his own province of Manitoba, that for this war, as he put it, we should give our last dollar and send our last man.

The hon. Solicitor General counts for much in this Government. It is he who gets the Government out of its difficulties, and I believe he is the Prime Minister's right bower. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that he is often called upon to defind its wrongdoings, for his party gets often enough in a quandary.

I therefore did tell them, at home, that we would have conscription. The Prime Minister has not fooled me; I know the Prime Minister better than my electors do, and even better than our bishops of the province of Quebec, who had taken his word and told us: submit, because the State demands it.

As to the National Service, my parish priest read that letter, which had been sent to him by his bishop and, after Divine service, I openly declared that I knew too well the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) too well to have faith in his word and I further stated that these National Service cards were a step towards conscription. I also declared that, in the cases of dogma and religion, I followed the bishop's advice, but that, in politics, I claimed to be better informed than he could possibly be. To-day, these same people admit that I had then spoken the truth and that, indeed, I knew what was going on.

The Government and the politicians, of both parties, are not agreed upon this Military Service Act. Not being a lawyer, but a farmer, I will refrain from discussing pro or con, but I am comforted when I think that, in a general way, laws are made so that nobody can understand them.

Mr. BOULAY (Rimouski): (Translation) Not even the lawyers?

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): The reason is to enable lawyers to make use of their accomplishments, and I am not at all surprised when I see that they do not quite agree upon this Compulsory Service Act. But, Mr. Speaker, this legal entanglement has, nevertheless, a bad side; it makes our judges grow old too soon and, consequently, we have to pay them pensions too young. At all events, I am glad that we have an ex-judge as Minister of Justice; he grasps my meaning and he may perhaps extend his co-operation towards changing present conditions. Now, that he enjoys fairly good health, that he has recovered his nerve and —no mean consideration,—that he receives a fair indemnity as a retired judge, minister and deputy, I say that he should turn all his efforts to improving the Militia Act of this country or any other Act, so that we may be able to discuss them in an intelligent way. Why not insert in the Militia Act that our troops shall be levied only for the defence of Canada, unconditionally? Now, Mr. Speaker, the best evidence of the fact that the Government do not understand our laws, as I stated a moment ago, is that they have not seen fit to rely upon the existing Militia Act, to levy volunteers

and send them overseas. After all, that Militia Act may perhaps not be as bad as might be imagined, since the Government could not use it for sending our troops away.

Upon several occasions, I have declared, in this House, that I was in favour of a reasonable participation in this war; even to-day, I am of the same mind, and I believe all rational people will suport me in such an attitude; but when the people of this country are asked to bleed themselves to such an extent, I say: Let us stop, it is more than time to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the reasons given by the Prime Minister to justify the introduction of this conscription Bill? The reasons alleged are that our soldiers are loudly demanding reinforcements and, secondly, that we have trenches to defend in France and in Flanders. To this, I reply that we have no trenches in France, not having been consulted before the declaration of war and that, probably, we will not be consulted either when the matter of signing peace comes up. To my mind, it Was Canada's duty to aid the Allies in this war, but, I repeat it, having had nothing to do with the declaration of war, I maintain that we have no trenches to defend in Europe and that the countries who have and who must defend their trenches are France, England and Italy, but not Canada. That is why I oppose, as forcibly as I can, the sending of men to the other side.

We must be fair, Mr. Speaker. The son must assist his father, but he must do so according to his means. If, in helping his father, the son is going to ruin, I say that it is his duty to refuse his assistance. Applying that simile to Canada—and it is appropriate—I say that we must not go any further. I have spoken of this ticklish war question with many people and every one of them has told me that the stand I have taken in this House is surely that which should be taken by all the members and by the Prime Minister himself, if they have at heart the interests of the people whom they represent, before siding with the nations of Europe.

Mr. BOULAY: (Translation) Even the leader of the Opposition?

Mr. LANCTOT: (Translation) Certainly. What did really happen during this journey to England of the Premier and of his two colleagues, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. R. Rogers)?

I presume that the Minister of Public Works has had a great deal to do with this Bill for, if I can judge from what I read in the newspapers of this country, and especially in the papers friendly to the Minister of Public Works, something was needed to divert public poinion from the Minister of Public Works himself.

Mr. Speaker, you know that there has been a judgment rendered by a commission sitting in Winnipeg, out of which the Minister of Public Works has emerged something to the worse and on his last leg. Therefore, so as to face the electorate, it became somewhat necessary to save appearances, and, in order to shield a little the Minister of Public Works, to introduce this conscription Bill, so that nothing else could be discussed during the coming electoral campaign Conscription will, in fact, be the main topic of discussion in Quebec and in Ontario; but it will be discussed from one point of view in Quebec and from another one in Ontario.

I believe that the Bill is the master stroke of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill, and the clauses of which I have read, is called a "Selective" bill. The Government will be able to take soldiers wherever they please. The friends of the Government will say in the West: This is not for you; in Ontario, again it will probably not be for them, because they have done their duty, but we wish to reach Quebec, which has not given enough recruits,

The minister who just now represents the province of Quebec, Hon. Mr. Sévigny, was in Quebec last Sunday; he has given every one his share in Quebec; he is going to send from the city of Montreal 10,000 men; from the city of Quebec 1,000; from the municipalities, which number 1,200, ten each, I believe. That is not much, so he says, but I would like to know who are those who are ready to go, from Montreal, from Quebec and all the municipalities?

As the hon. minister belongs to the old city of Champlain, to Quebec city; as he is strongly in favour of conscription and of war, I do hope he will be the first one to leave Quebec and give the example to the other young men of that city to go and fight the good battles of the Empire. He is young and, moreover, this gentleman is a man of means. The wife of the hon. minister is well to do—it is far more cheerful, when you set out for the trenches, to leave your wife with enough to eat, as would say my good friend from Montcalm (M. Lafortune), to have some savings, and with her husband in the trenches, she will be comfortable during his absence.

Mr. Speaker, this conscription business will certainly lead to putting the two races

at loggerheads in this country. By the Confederation compact—the fiftieth anniversary of which we have just celebrated—it had been decided that both nations, English and French, would retain their rights and respect their obligations. What is more sacred to us, French Canadians, than our language, our faith, our religion; and the enjoyment of these privileges in the way that Englishmen in this country have it, is denied us in several provinces of the Confederation, is denied us by the majority of the people?

We are asked, we French Canadians, to go and fight in France, in Flanders, to compel the Boches overseas, as they are called, or the Huns, respect the rights of the small nations; to have them respect Belgium's neutrality. That is very fine. But if, on the one hand, we, the French Canadians, are bound to go and see that the treaties, the agreements made by the great powers, be respected, to see that the rights of the weak be respected; I contend that, surely, in this country, the Englishmen should say: You, French Canadians of Quebec, you, French Canadians of Ontario and of Manitoba, you are weak, we shall give you your rights, and now enlist. There would be good sense in that. But, no, they maltreat the French Canadians, and then say: Enlist, go and defend those who are being outraged across the ocean, but as for you, here, we'll keep on maltreating you, and go on just the same.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated it on many occasions in this House, and I do state it again that, as a French Canadian, and being myself of military age, I shall not vote, for anything in the world, in favour of a measure which might enlist me under such circumstances; I would not enlist. I have always declared, and I declare it again, that not one single Canadian should enlist when we see how we are at present treated in this country, for, Mr. Speaker, it is not only in Germany that Boches are to be found; there are some in Ontario and in Manitoba, they are to be found in both political parties. It is here, that we, the French Canadians, must stand up and tell them: which foe have we got to face. But why always persecute the French Canadian and tell him he is not doing his duty, when that majority in the country is forever interfering with our rights and will not even grant the French Canadians, in this capital city of Ottawa, the right to have their children learn their mother tongue?

Is it a wonder now, if you go down into the province of Quebec, that among these same people, who know what is going on here, in Ontario, and in Manitoba, recruiting should be at a standstill? Mr. Speaker, I say they are right, they should remain at home and await developments.

Now, as to this conscription Bill, whom will it cause to go and fight for the Empire and for France? It will reach only our poor people, while the folk of the Board of Trade of Montreal, of Toronto and of the whole country, that is to say, the big wigs, the millionaires, those who are coining money out of the war,—as I see some of them in front of me, in this House,—these people have long been wanting conscription. They are in favour of conscription, they want the war to last as long as possible in order to hoard up still more millions.

We have even in this Government millionaires who favour conscription. Somebody has spoken of conscripting riches—the conscription of wealth. I would be in favour of extending conscription to all the millionaires who want conscription. I want to be fair. I would exempt all those who do not speak of it, but for all the millionaires in favour of conscription, I would introduce another Bill in Parliament, I would bring in and submit a Bill which would not be No. 75, but No. 76, and I would say: all millionaires of the country in favour of conscription will be left with $100,000 the day after to-morrow, and they shall retain no more, they will be allowed to start business over again, as in the past; but in the meantime they shall be left with $100,000 only. Rightly or wrongly, I understand there are about 300 of these gentlemen in the country. It may be exaggerated, I do not know. If there be 300, according to what I mean to do, by seizing 90 per 100, that would make a fine amount. There are some having more than one million, some have five millions, ten millions. With such a sum of money, we could send off 100,000 men, to suit these gentlemen. but I would want the men sent away on these gentlemen's behalf, to be paid $3 a day. That is not all. The wives of these soldiers should be maintained, during their husbands' absence, on the same style as the wives and children of these millionaires; that is to say, there would be no more use for this conscription Bill, and all these millionaires would be happy, since they want to continue the war and favour conscription. I think that is the best means to give them satisfaction.

Now, I have got several observations to make. As I see on the other side, members who understand me, the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) for instance, I beg

of him to transmit to the Prime Minister and to his colleagues, the message I suggest, as to the Bill I would like to introduce.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke a moment ago of our millionaires of this country, of those very people who positively want to have 100,000 more Canadians sent over to the battlefields of Europe, in order to allow these gentlemen to make money. It is for this same reason that I suggest to the Government, when this conscription Bill will have been disposed of by this House, that they introduce another Bill bearing No. 76, and the object of which would be to seize 90 per cent of these gentlemen's money, in order to send off these 100,000 soldiers and to pay them well. If my suggestion be not accepted by the Government, is it necessary to send overseas 100,000 soldiers chosen among the people of this country, and that the Canadians remaining in the country provide for their expenses?

Let us first examine the present situation in Europe. England, so state several members who have taken part in this debate, has, at the very least, three million men who are not enlisted, three million men who have not answered their country's call and whom compulsory service, such as it exists in England, cannot reach. If my information is correct, there are at present in England, more than two million men ready to go and fight in France. I am further told that there are over a million young men, employed in the banks, in brokers' offices, in the theatres and in the moving-picture halls, who, like the others, are not yet enlisted. If such is the case, Mr. Speaker, why should Canada be called upon to do more in this war than England? If it be true that this war is Canada's war, it is still a hundred times more true that it is England's war, because for our mother country it is a question of life or death. In this war England has at stake the supremacy of the sea, and the supremacy of trade, whilst for us, for Canada, it would be no more, no less, only a change of master.

I do not mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that I would be ready to change masters, but my idea is this one, that the outcome of the war is of much greater consequence for England than for us, because England is not used to be under master's lash, while, as far as we are concerned, we already have had two in the past and it would not be so hard on us to have a third one. I have stated more than once, in my previous remarks, that we had no trenches to defend, and that is certainly true. The Government tell us that we should fill the gaps made in our ranks by the foe and make good the terrible losses sustained lately my the Allies. Have we not, in England, as I have just said, two million men that might serve for the same purpose? I will go further. For some time past we have a new ally in this conflict. The United States have just entered into the fray; if that country, with its population of 112,000,000 and the wealth of the whole world, if that country, do I say, makes an effort in proportion to the one made by Canada since the beginning of the war, that means that they should send into the trenches of France and of Belgium, from 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 soldiers. It seems to me that the United States are more interested than we are in this war; they have been attacked while we have not, their ships have been attacked and sunk with many lives on board. I, therefore, say to the Government: Do put a stop right off to this war craze and do not lead the people of this country at such a pace to ruin, when others, more interested than we are, having both people and wealth, can, without any apparent effort, furnish those 100,000 soldiers we were to send, and even more. That seems to me as logical as indisputable. There is not a single sensible man, knowing this state of things, that could reply, plausibly, I will say more. with a speck of common sense, that Canada has not done her duty. The whole country acknowledges that the effort made by Canada, i. e. the enlisting of more than 400,000 men, out of a population such as our own, deducting all the foreign races living on our territory, and also the numerous exemptions specified, is most worthy of admiration. I therefore maintain that Canada has contributed to the same extent as any other nation fighting under the Allied standards.

Now, were there any reason to impose conscription in this country, it seems to me that should rather have been done some eight or ten months ago, when Russia's efforts had somewhat slackened, being short both of arms and ammunition; the revolution which broke out in that country might have been considered a reason for the British colonies to make a greater effort. But, when all those clouds have rolled by, when Russia has recently fought such battles with as great a success as at the beginning of the war, when the entrance of the United States into the conflict puts at the Allies' disposal inexhaustible treasures of men and of money, I do not actually see why the Canadian people should be asked to further bleed themselves.

Both the United States and Canada have had quite recently the visit of an eminent British statesman, I mean the hon. Mr. Balfour, who was honoured in the most important cities of the neighbouring republic, where he delivered quite a number of speeches. On every occasion, he always declared that the most urgent need of the present hour was not men, but ships, ships, and still more ships, as well as foodstuffs, for Europe was threatened with famine. He also came to Canada and did speak to the two Houses gathered in this hall. In his speech here, I do not find that he asked for soldiers, but on the contrary, he made a pressing appeal to the farmers, asking them to increase production for, did he say, foodstuffs are the great need of the present times He is not the only one, Mr. Speaker; other representative men, no less eminent, have expressed similar views. In June 1916, Sir George Paish wrote in the Statist:

> Victory over militarism will depend as much upon the farmers of the world generally and upon those of America and Canada, in particular, as upon the armies at the front.

In a recent number of the Echo de Paris, a noted writer, Mr. Maurice Barrés, writes as follows:

> We, the Allies, have the superiority of numbers and, in the Franco-British lines, we have even a million men more than the Germans facing us. As to the industrial supremacy, it is decidedly in our favour, on account of America entering in to the war.

In another French publication, the Paris Journal, Senator Humbert writes as follows:

> Stocks are exhausted. The neutrals themselves have come down to the allowance system. The new arrivals are lessening in number. Famine is threatening the whole world. I had foreseen, some twenty months ago, the present consequence of this dreadful crisis, when I said: Let us spare our reserves. But I was not listened to, no more than when I demanded a year ahead guns and ammunitions. Is not the danger most apparent to-day? There is only one remedy: to call back from the front-lines two or three hundred thousand Frenchmen, of the older classes, and settle them once more on the land. Such are the necessary means of recuperation. The condition of the armies, the immense numerical superiority of the Allies, on the Western front, compared with their opponents, permit of adopting without delay this method of recuperation. Let us hurry, for it is already very late, and to-morrow, perhaps, it will be too late.

In the face of these statesments by such eminent citizens, both in France and in England, I would like to know why the Government still persists in sending over soldiers and yet more soldiers, when France herself admits that it would be appropriate to recall home two or three hundred thousand men who are presently fighting in the trenches, in order to apply them to farm labour. Is it not true, Mr. Speaker, that, in Canada, the farmers cannot get the necessary labour, because these same people prefer to go and work in the munition shops where they earn $3, $5 and even $7 a day? We, farmers, cannot pay such excessive wages, specially in the province of Quebec, where farming pays less than in the western provinces, where wheat is particularly grown, although there may be other grain, but on a smaller scale. As forces, who are doing mixed farming, we cannot pay more than $30 per month for this kind of labour. I may frankly tell you that any farmer of the province of Quebec who would pay more than that, could not live there, and pay any interest however low the rate, if he owes anything on his land.

Now, you have also read in the newspapers, the opinion of a man of this country, the largest manager, I believe, there is in Canada, I want to speak of Baron Shaughnessy, whose views evidently, are worthy of consideration. I am not acquainted with him personally, I do not know his politics although I believe him to be a staunch Conservative, but, at all events, has he not, on more than one occasion, warned the Government? Has he not done it publicly, before the Montreal Board of Trade, in the presence of the ex-minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) when he called upon him to stop volunteering? That was during the winter of 1916. Did he not warn us not to go too quick in the matter; that the people of the country could not stand such an extravagance; that some day the bill would have to be footed, and that, if war was to keep on, said he, one year more, we, in Canada, would be at war a year and a half or two years after the others, because, as he said, if you really intend sending 400,000 men to the other side of the Atlantic, it will take at last a year and a half or two years before you get them back from the front. Therefore do I say, Mr. Speaker, that upon such a statement, coming from such an authority, from a man who knows our country so well; for he personally took a hand in its development and he thoroughly knows our needs; knowing, above all, what is going on across the seas, the warning of this man is most opportune. I believe that he came to Ottawa quite recently, he must have warned the Premier—I was not present—but, I really believe he must have warned him of the

danger he was running, as Prime Minister of this country, in bringing down a policy so contrary to the interests of this country, his conscription policy.

In the face of such a state of affairs, I do not understand and I never will understand—and I am not the only one in the country—that a Government having no mandate from the people, that is to say, that 105 men, or so, who support the Government in this House, in order to please perhaps the jingoes of a certain portion of the country, or to carry the elections, could impose upon a people of 7,000,000 souls compulsory military service without beforehand this Government consulting the people. I find this a most extraordinary proceeding in a country like ours. Australia, a British colony like ours, but composed almost entirely of Englishmen, has acted quite differently, the people of Australia were against conscription; they did prove it by the vote they gave upon the referendum which the Government had submitted to them. They defeated the Conscription Bill by their vote. General elections have been held since. Did the Prime Minister of Austraia ever declare to the people of his country that conscription would be applied, in Australia, without another vote being taken by means of a referendum? And here, in this Canada, where we number over 2,000,000 French Canadians in the province of Quebec, we whose ancestors have been here for centuries, we who have opened up Canada to civilization, in spite of what may say some hon. gentlemen, such as the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who spoke of the lamb of Quebec, we would be saddled with conscription without even being consulted! That shall not be. The lamb of Quebec, may I say to my friend Dr. Clark, is not mischievous towards its compatriots; the lamb of Quebec is the same lamb that gives the Englishmen of Quebec what they have the right to have; the Quebec Englishman is treated as the French Canadian lamb of Quebec; he has his schools, he practises his cult in his own way, he prays to his God as he sees fit, he is dealt with in the same way as the French Canadian in Quebec. I wish the member for Red Deer, who came to this country some fourteen or fifteen years ago, had made a better study of the history of the lamb of Quebec. I would tell the hon. member that, if he possesses a large farm to-day in the west, it is because the lamb of Quebec had gone forth, opening this country to civilization.

[M. Lanctot.]

And yet, this fine domain does not cost him much, I congratulate him, but the lamb of Quebec did greatly contribute to it.

I should have thought that a man who has gone through Oxford University, landed here a few years ago, would have said to the Englishmen of Ontario and elsewhere: You do not know, you, what the French Canadians are; you do not know, you, what these Frenchmen are, but I, who come from overseas, I know what are the Frenchmen of France, and in Quebec, you have the offspring of these Frenchmen.

My friend from Red Deer should have thought, when he spoke of the lamb of Quebec, of what these same Frenchmen have done at Verdun, in France, for the defence of civilization, before abusing the Frenchmen of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be very long now; however, I have some more remarks to submit to you. I always like to speak of this country's public debt.

As a business man, I learned that in order to get on in this world, in order to make a success of any undertaking, we must not go piling on deficits, and I wonder where the hon. Minister of Finance and where this Government will land the people of this country, should the war last a year or two years more, or possibly, three years. The gross debt to-day, is close on $1,500,000,000. Some will tell you, the Montreal papers, La Patrie and others in the Government's pay, will say that the debt is $800,000,000. Mr. Speaker, I say that the gross debt is the actual debt of the country, and that the assets which the Government holds, in many cases, are worth nothing; but the actual indebtedness is the gross debt. We will have, moreover, before long to see to the financing of our railroads, that is to say, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Northern. We will have to add to our national debt not less than $800,000,000 or $900,000,000. That must be done soon, for they are verging on bankruptcy. If we keep on as we are now started, great gods! where are we going to? Two years hence, our debt will have reached the three thousand million dollar mark. And the Prime Minister who has no mandate from the people, who has gone to England came back to us with a conscription scheme, which means adding some more hundreds of millions to our indebtedness. I would like to know if the Prime Minister of Canada represents the people of Canada, or if he does not represent the mother-country or the Imperial War Council in England?

I tell you that the Prime Minister of Canada should first represent the people of this country and take their interests, that is a thing we have not been able to discover since these gentlemen are governing us; but the hour will come when the people of this country will have their say about those who have been leading us to bankruptcy and to ruin for almost six years. But, Mr. Speaker, let the Government bring before this House as many conscription Bills as they please, let them try to disfranchise all the people they can in this country, there will always be enough left to punish them as they deserve.

I shall vote for the referendum, in favor of the amendment moved by the right hon. leader of the Opposition; I shall wote against the conscription Bill, and when this Government will come and ask for another extension, I propose to speak and to vote against it, for, Mr. Speaker, had I thought for one moment that the Government, when they solicited from us last year another lease of life for Parliament in order to carry on the war, that they would have enacted conscription, I frankly declare that I, for one, would never have agreed to such extension. Since they have done so without any mandate, without the Opposition's authorization, I propose to speak and vote against it.

There is another thing I almost forgot to say: the Government through their leader, after introducing their conscription Bill, have attempted to form a coalition government, tried to get the " rouges " with them in order to have the people swallow this conscription question, in spite of themselves. Even had I known I was to be the only one to do so, I would have denounced, single-handed, all those who would have formed that coalition government. If there was any justification for a coalition government, before passing the Bill, I say there is a hundred times more justification for an appeal to the people after the passing of this conscription Bill, and I beg the Prime Minister to ponder a little on what he is doing, and not impose this Bill upon the people of this country without beforehand consulting them.

That is all I had to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for listening to me.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CLARENCE JAMESON (Digby): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to occupy but a few moments of the time of the House, as I feel that at this hour the country is calling for acts, not for words.

I listened to the speech of the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), to-day with a great deal of interest, especially when he was dealing with the amendment of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) which calls for a referendum. My hon. friend's speech was energetic; it was more than energetic; it was lengthy; it was an able defence of a very weak cause. My hon. friend is an able lawyer, but the inherent weakness of his case was that the leader of the Opposition has heretofore been opposed to the principle of referendum. My hon. friend went on to contrast the sad, sad days under Conservative rule with the glad, glad days under a Liberal ministry, and he charged the ministers of this Government with various sins of omission and commission. He compared the pure government of by-gone days with this Government, which he painted so darkly. As he compared them, I was reminded of those lines in the opera Utopia with which you Mr. Speaker, and the members of the House are doubtless familiar. You remember that the princess presented the lawyer to her father the king, in these words:

A complicated gentleman allow me to present
Of all the arts and faculties, the terse embodiment;
He's a great arithmetician who can demonstrate with ease,
That two and two make three or five or anything you please.
A wondrous logician, he can make it clear to you
That black is white when looked at from the proper point of view.
A marvellous philologist, he'll undertake to show
That "yes" is but another and a neater form of "No."

As I listened to my hon. friend from Pictou I thought how marvellous the coincidence that the poet could have described so accurately the hon. member and the lawyer in the opera within the same ten lines of poetry. But my hon. friend's better nature finally came to the surface and although at the commencement of his speech he most vigorously attacked the ministry, he threw out, I think, the olive branch, and as he closed I almost felt that he was willing to accept a seat in a coali-

tion government. And, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman were to enter a coalition government or any other government, he would bring ability, energy, application, and enthusiasm to the Cabinet. I am sure that no person will agree more readily with me than the hon. gentleman himself when I say in all sincerity that he would be a very successful minister.

The Military Service Bill which the right hon. the Prime Minister has introduced provides for the raising of 100,000 men as reinforcements for overseas service by means of the selective draft, that number being required in the future upon the highest military authority. Every one who has familiarized himself with existing conditions knows that these men are available, without drawing upon labour engaged in the vital or essential industries of the country.

The right hon. the leader of the Opposition has proposed an amendment that the principle of the Bill be referred to the people of Canada by means of a plebiscite; a cautious policy in time of peace, but one which the right hon. gentleman did not heretofore favour; a faltering and dangerous policy, I believe, in time of war, with 20 per cent of our voters overseas, and one which will not provide the required men.

The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette) has moved an amendment to defer the further consideration of this Bill for six months, which is the parliamentary method of stating that Canada has no business in this war; a question which was disposed of, once and for all, in August 1914, when this Parliament unanimously pledged Canada's participation in this sacred cause to a triumphant conclusion.

The question can thus be condensed to one as to which system shall be carried out in future, that of voluntary service or the selective draft. Voluntary service has hitherto proved sufficient in small wars. Many supposed it would always meet our requirements, and had all parts of Canada contributed equally, it might have served in this war. However, it has proved inadequate and improvident. In my opinion, voluntary enlistment has proceeded far enough; it has proceeded so far as already to strain the economic efficiency of Canada. If proceeded with further it cannot but seriously impair our economic efficiency, by drawing men from the vital and essential industries, with possible dire consequences to this country. Most of us appreciate the fact that the world is confronted with a food shortage, one which may result in a famine so widespread that the famine of ancient Egypt would appear trivial by comparison. The western hemisphere, and Canada in particular, is especially favourably situated in this respect, for Canada is an exporting country. But, even in Canada, unless we see to it in time, there may be a serious shrinkage of food production, with equally serious consequences to ourselves and our Allies, who, in some measure, are dependent upon us. This means that our man-power engaged in the vital and essential industries must be kept at productive work, to prevent the danger of disaster both at home and abroad.

Now, to those who still favour voluntary service, I would ask, if, by some magical or new method, the 100,000 men required could be secured by voluntary enlistment within three months, could Canada afford to spare them? The answer must be certainly not, but why? Every member of this House, in his heart of hearts, knows that not 25 per cent of these men, no not 10 per cent of them, would be those that a selective draft would yield. The selective draft would reach those who have not enlisted, and who will not voluntarily enlist, the very men the country can spare, namely, the men engaged in non-essential industries. This, the tribunals provided for by the Bill would decide. It is, therefore, to the men whom the country can spare that our soldiers must look for reinforcements, and, by voluntary enlistment, they cannot be obtained. Hence, the choice is not between voluntary enlistment and conscription, but is really between reinforcements by conscription, on the one hand, and no conscription and no reinforcements on the other.

In my opinion the Bill should pass and the amendments should not be adopted. If the referendum carries, what does it mean? It means that we pass a vote of want of confidence in ourselves, and in this House. A vote of want of confidence, which the people of Canada following our lead would certainly ratify, if the question were referred to them by means of a plebiscite.

I impute motives to no man. Every member of this House is the keeper of his own conscience, but, as I view it, if either the amendment to defer the consideration of the Bill, or the amendment to refer the principle of the Bill to the people by a plebiscite, be adopted, it means, if not in purpose yet certainly in effect, that

Canada's sustained participation in this war ends. Ends not because valour has forsaken the breasts of Canada's soldiers in the trenches, but ends because, shall I not say it?—ends because the spirit of betrayal of our soldiers has entered the breasts of those in Canada, whom they voluntarily went overseas to defend. It means that we, in this House, think more of our political lives than of the lives of those Canadians who, with their crushed and bleeding bodies, helped to stem the tide of Prussian barbarism, which otherwise would have overrun the world.

To-day, for the world and for Canada, peril stands in the gateway. It did not cease to exist when the Huns dug themselves in, from the sea to the Alps. Young Canadian volunteers thrust themselves between us and that human torrent of hate and fury, which seeks to submerge civilization, law and order. The line they hold is as vital to our safety as the line which is held by Great Britain or by France. For them in the trenches there is not rest day or night, Sunday or week day. Every moment they are defending those in Canada of whom we in this Parliament are the representatives. They cannot always get sufficient time off to restore exhausted nature, because of ceaseless bombardment and lack of reinforcements. Meantime in Canada the Lord's Day Act and eight hour law protect from overtime the men whom the country can spare, the men engaged in non-essential industries, the men whom this Bill only can prevail upon to go overseas. Should that line give way, either for lack of reinforcements or for any other reason, and the Huns win down to the French coast, the only law this country would eventually know would be the will of the Kaiser and Von Hindenburg. Almost 2,000 years ago, the Emperor Nero fiddled while Rome burned, and history has never let the shameful fact be forgotten. Shall the Parliament of Canada in effect duplicate his despicable act? I trust not.

My conception of the situation is this: That no member of this House can escape his responsibility. Be he prominent or be he the reverse, history will record of him for future generations that in the supreme hour he stood for either national dignity or for national decadence;

That every member must line up for or against those men in the trenches and for or against the future existence of Canada as the free country it now is. For let it not be forgotten that those who leave others to defend them necessarily become thereby their vassals;

That the alternative of this Bill virtually means, so far at least as we are concerned, the abandonment of our voluntary defenders to their fate and the abandonment of our country to the most ruthless foe the powers of darkness have ever let loose upon the earth.

What human standards or rules of conduct have thus far survived this awful war —a war whose battle line is 3,000 miles in length; a war in which thirty millions of armed men have contended; a war which will shape the destinies of nine hundred million human beings; a war with, literally, its thousand battles and shaking a hundred thrones? If in this war all other standards have been swept away, two at least have survived. One is that standard of physical and moral courage which Canadian soldiers have assisted in elevating to its loftiest plane; the other is that standard of national and international good faith which requires of us that we supply reinforcements to those soldiers in the trenches. They at least have worthily performed their duty in the face of stupendous difficulties—difficulties relatively much greater than those with which we in this House and in this country are confronted. If we face our difficulties as a united Parliament and people, they will lessen and finally disappear. Therefore I would say to my fellow members in this House: Let the Parliament of Canada, setting aside all other considerations, emulate the example of our forces in the field, face courageously our difficulties and, by overcoming them, prove ourselves worthy of the sacrifices which our men across the seas have made as well for us as for our people and our country.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, my remarks upon this Bill will be very brief, but I wish to place on record the position I take with regard to it I consider that the strenuous and serious times through which we are passing make it necessary for the Parliament and people of Canada to exercise the greatest moderation and prudence, lest in our efforts to preserve the peace of the world we lose our own.

The right Hon. A. J. Balfour, when he was here a few weeks ago, said:

> We are convinced that for every human combination that has reached the degree of civilization and development that has been reached by all the great western communities, there is but one form of government, under whatever name it may be called, and that is

the government in which the ultimate control lies with the people. We have staked our last dollar upon democracy, and if democracy fail us we are bankrupt indeed. But I know that democracy will not fail us.

I sincerely hope that Mr. Balfour's vision in regard to the ultimate triumph of democracy may be fulfilled.

The Government, as well as several influential newspapers throughout the country, tell us that voluntary enlistment has broken down and that if we are to do our fair share in the prosecution of this terrible war, compulsory service must be resorted to immediately. If these statements be true, a case for compulsory service is made out. But are they true? The mere fact that the number of men now offering themselves for overseas service is much less than in the early days of the war is not of itself sufficient proof that the voluntary system has failed. The number of men able to go to the front and the number of men that Canada can spare for overseas service, even under the most urgent circumstances, must necessarily grow less as the months and years go by.

Again it is stated, and, I think, proved, that the voluntary system has never received anything like a fair trial. Hear what a minister and an ex-minister of the Crown say in this regard. The Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin), who went down to Quebec some weeks ago to recruit, says of his experience there:—

> 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.

Who was to blame for the discreditable way in which the business of recruiting was handled in Quebec? Surely the Government of which Colonel Blondin was and is a member, and his colleagues from that province were and are supporters. Surely it was the duty of the Government to see that the viewpoint of the French Canadians in Quebec received some consideration. It would almost seem as if every proper sentiment in Quebec had been outraged to prevent recruiting, so that the voluntary system might break down, or that that province might be charged with lack of patriotism. If this be so, what a terrible responsibility rests upon the Government as a whole, but particularly upon the French Canadian members of the Government. I am led to make these remarks from the fact that in every other province of the Dominion the Canadians of French descent responded to the call of duty in proportion to their numbers as nobly as any other class of the population except the British born.

About the campaign that was waged in Quebec by the so-called Nationalists in 1910 and 1911, aided, abetted, encouraged and financed by the Conservative party I will not say anything beyond stating that if the English-speaking members of the Government and the English-speaking members of the party have a conscience, it must give them many a pang for the pernicious seed which they helped to sow on that occasion, the harvest of which we are now reaping.

The spectacle that was presented only a month or two ago in Quebec would be ludicrous if it were not so serious, and the Government should be ashamed of itself. Col. Blondin, a member of the Government, and General Lessard recruiting for the overseas forces, and at the same time Col. Armand Lavergne in military uniform, and in the service and pay of the Government, recruiting for home defence, and denouncing the sending of troops beyond the seas. In the name of common sense why were troops needed for home defence? Who were going to attack us in Canada? The present Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp) is a business man and is supposed to have some sense. Would he in his private business put half of his office staff at work to undo what the other half was trying to do, and expect success? Col. Blondin, a member of the Government, and Col. Lavergne, in the service of the Government, opposing each other and rehearsing in public "The Comedy of Errors!" The people, as you might expect, either laughed at the pantomime, or turned away in disgust.

But the worst performance of all, if there can be degrees of comparison in anything the Government has done in regard to recruiting, was the admission by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) that he had tried to get a man appointed to a lucrative position in the Civil Service because he had opposed recruiting in Quebec by publishing articles in his paper against it, and he thought that would be a good way to stop him. Yet under those circumstances the Government has the hardihood to blame Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the situation there.

But unfortunate as the situation is in that province, it is exaggerated and misrepresented by several newspapers in Ontario, and with what object? The object of promoting racial harmony, I suppose. A few days ago the hon. member for North

Grey (Mr. Middlebro) who will not be accused of being prejudiced in favour of Quebec, gave us the total enlistments from each province, and Quebec was credited with 44,000. The figures seemed to have been compiled with a great deal of care and were, no doubt, accurate, because other hon. gentlemen from Ontario, speaking since, have made them larger. The papers to which I have referred, have stated, day in and day out, week in and week out, that the total enlistments from Quebec are but 29,000. What can be the object of such misrepresentation, and why is it resorted to? The Lord only knows. It is evident, however, that the winning of the war is not the only object of all Canadians at the present time. Listen to what the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) says in regard to the way in which voluntary recruiting was handled in the province of Quebec and in all the other provinces. Only a few days ago he stated in this House that several members of the Government had hampered him in his recruiting work, and that finally the Prime Minister himself had asked him to "go slow." He said that the Government had been influenced by the war profiteers who did not want to have their business interfered with by having the number of their employees reduced or their immense profits curtailed, and he further stated that he had documentary evidence, even letters from the Prime Minister himself, to prove these statements. But we have additional evidence of the changed attitude of the Government towards voluntary enlistment. In the early days of the war they passed an Order in Council giving the members of the Civil Service who enlisted their military pay and their Civil Service pay as well.

This was more than generous. Later on, they passed another Order in Council giving them an amount equal to their Civil Service pay only, and last spring they passed another Order in Council cutting out the Civil Service pay entirely and giving them military pay only. This was tantamount to telling them they did not want any more of them to enlist, and that they would be penalized if they did enlist. And when we add to this the fact that some of the ministers publicly stated they would not allow their clerks or officials to enlist because of the inconvenience it would make in the office work, can you wonder, Mr. Speaker, that private employers would hesitate to reduce their office and their other help to the point of great personal inconvenience?

But probably the worst blow that voluntary recruiting did or could receive was the outstanding fact that from the day that war was declared the object of the Government seemed to be how best to enrich their party friends and benefit themselves politically, as witness the nauseating scandals that were brought to light in the purchase of horses, drugs, binoculars, motor trucks, and, in fact, everything that was purchased for the army; as witness the evolutions of that notorious scoundrel, Col. J. Wesley Allison, who with a few Yankee associates, was able to walk off with a million dollars, who was able to give his lady stenographer a present of $105,000, his flute player $50,000, and other pals from $10,000 to $70,000 each; who was able by reason of his association with the Government to bring into Canada from the United States trainloads and scow loads of goods without paying a cent of duty on them, or without even having them entered or examined at the customs house. There was no danger of Col. Allison losing his soul by trucking and trading with the Yankees. He was able to sell millions of rounds of Government ammunition from the Government arsenal in Quebec at a profit of tens of thousands of dollars to himself. As witness the further fact that the ex-Minister of Militia was able to give his lady stenographer a shovel contract whereby the taxpayers of Canada were mulcted out of thirty or forty thousand dollars. And, as witness the still further fact that the grafting and the profiteering were not stopped or even checked in Canada until Lloyd George, with all the multifarious duties, responsibilities and burdens which he was carrying, had to send a man across three thousand miles of ocean to save the taxpayers of the Dominion and the taxpayers of the Old Land from being literally robbed of tens of millions of dollars, while our Government of fourteen men were looking hopelessly or helplessly on, and either could not or would not bend their little finger to end the disgraceful orgie. Such a condition of things would not only stop recruiting, but would almost justify any action on the part of an outraged people.

I have stated that from the day war was declared the object of the Government seemed to be how best to enrich their party friends and benefit themselves politically; and to carry out this purpose it was necessary that Liberals be carefully excluded from all positions of honour or emolument, and that from time to time it be insinuated

and in fact stated that the Liberal party from Sir Wilfrid Laurier down was tainted with disloyalty. Liberals, of course, were expected to take their full share of the burdens and sacrifices, and to their eternal credit be it said they did not shirk their duty in this regard. To prove this statement I will cite some instances from my own province of which I have personal knowledge.

The first two young men from our province to make the supreme sacrifice were from Liberal households—McKinnon and McManus. In their boyhood they had been playmates and schoolmates, and in their early manhood, companions. Now they sleep not far apart in the soil of France. McKinnon's father kept a small lighthouse on the coast, but was dismissed from that position by this Government. Was there any resentment in McKinnon's heart or in his son's heart? Well, actions speak louder than words. I suppose the McKinnons were disloyal.

The next case I will mention is that of Capt. McDonald. Capt. McDonald had sailed the seven seas in charge of square rigged ships, had been in command of freight and passenger steamers, but his wife being in poor health he was willing to accept an inferior position at home where he could be near his family. Consequently the late Government gave him charge of one of the dredges. He is a splendid type of citizen, and his record in the 9 p.m. department was first class in every respect. He was no political partisan in any sense of the word, having voted but two or three times in his life, being generally away at sea when an election would be held. The Conservative members from Prince Edward Island and every man in Canada who knows Capt. McDonald will endorse every word I have said in his behalf. Did his record save him? No, he was dismissed from the service. When the war broke out his three sons were of military age—splendid specimens of young manhood, and all at work; boys of their type would not be idle. Donald heard the call and went with the first contingent. He has been twice wounded, recuperated at one of the base hospitals, and is back fighting again in the trenches. About eighteen months ago, George, the second son, volunteered. He has been at the front about a year. These boys did not resent the treatment their father had received. I suppose the McDonald family are disloyal.

[Mr. J. J. Hughes.]

Now what I particularly complain of is this: There are a number of military positions on Prince Edward Island all filled by Conservatives. Some of the men who fill these positions have neither sons nor near relatives at the front. Some of these positions Captain McDonald could creditably fill. Has he been invited to do so? Oh no. He is a Liberal and no Liberal need apply, except for a position in the trenches. Are there many military positions of emolument on Prince Edward Island? I think there must be a good many. A few days ago I put this question on the Order Paper:

> What are the names and addresses of the parties on P.E.I. who have been engaged or who are now engaged in recruiting for the army and navy or doing other work of a like military character, since August, 1914? 2. What remuneration or pay does each of the said parties receive, and what allowance is given for travelling or other expenses? 3. What is the total amount each person has received up to the 1st June, 1917?

This question was changed to an order of the House for a return, the number employed being so large, I presume, that it was not easy to count and tabulate the several amounts that had been paid, and give the same in an answer of ordinary length. Consequently the question was changed into an order for a return. When we get the return I venture a statement that a Liberal will not be found on the list, with the exception perhaps of one or two medical examiners.

The next case that comes to my mind is that of Louis Meurant, a Frenchman and a Liberal. Louis had a large family of children, and when the war broke out his eldest son was just of military age. Louis was only a poor working man who was not supposed to know or to feel much. He needed his son's help as much, I think, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce needed the assistance of his private secretary, whom he would not allow to enlist. Did Louis hesitate or weigh the consequences? No, twelve or fifteen young men were going from the town with the first contingent, and Meurant asked his son if he were going to be one of the number. The boy answered that he did not know. The father said "yes, you are going to be one of the number. If you do not go I will go. One of us is going anyhow." Of course the boy went, and a few months ago he was invalided home seriously wounded. These are but samples, and this is the spirit that was behind voluntary enlistment in the early days of the war, grand, noble, incomparable. This is the spirit

that would still be behind it but for the mean, sordid, inhuman, diabolical grafting and profiteering, some of which has been brought to light, and further, if it were not for the cowardly and villainous insinuations, backed up and supported by action, that Liberals are not as loyal and as whole-heartedly devoted to the winning of the war as are their Conservative fellow-countrymen.

Can it be truthfully said that the voluntary system has broken down in Canada when we have sent across the seas a larger army in proportion to our population than has ever been raised by voluntaryism in the world's history? When we remember that our seven and a half millions are scattered over a country as large as Europe or the United States of America, it will be seen that we have done wonders to accomplish this and to keep all our essential industries going at the same time.

Now a word or two with respect to the principle of this Bill. Conscription is, of course, the fair and democratic method of conducting a war such as that in which we are now engaged, but it must be conscription all round. Conscription of everything that is necessary to the winning of the war. It has been well said that you cannot compensate a man, in a monetary sense, for the sacrifice of his life—but that is no reason why all the compensation that is possible to make should not be given him or his family. Those who cannot fight should be willing to surrender all they have, if need be, to win the war, and to compensate, as far as possible, those who offer their lives. On the other hand, it is a great privilege to be able to fight,—a privilege that comes to but a few men, viz., the young, the hardy, and the strong. We shall all die in a few years anyhow and

"Where can man die better than fighting
fearful odds
For the ashes of his fathers and the temples
of his gods."

Is there a man in all Canada who would not die fighting for the protection of his own home, or his father's home, or his neighbour's home, from the ravisher and the destroyer?—and what is the nation but the aggregation of its homes. And in my opinion Canadian homes are being as truly protected on the battle-fields of Europe as they could be protected at Halifax or St. John or on the banks of the St. Lawrence. Therefore, a measure, call it what you like, that places upon everybody the burden he is best able to bear is both fair and democratic. But because it is fair and democratic, it must be conceived in fairness and above and beyond all, it must be administered in fairness. This is the crux of the question, and with all the good will in the world, and looking at the thing as dispassionately as I can view it, I must say that this Government, judging from its record, will not enforce conscription fairly. Therein lies the danger. Men will put up with a great deal of unfairness under a voluntary system, but they will not submit to unfairness and compulsion at the same time, and they would not be Canadians if they did. And is it fair to say to one man you may work in a munitions factory at from three to six or eight dollars a day, and to another you shall risk your life in the trenches and put up with all the discomforts of warfare for $1.10 a day? The people will not submit to such discrimination.

Everybody will admit that this question has been sprung upon Parliament and the people without any education or preparation whatever, and under these circumstances, people will wonder whether it is for the purpose of helping to win the war or whether it is for the purpose of covering up in the excitement and turmoil it is sure to cause, the record of the Government and the record of a minister who, to say the least, is under grave suspicion. If we bear in mind a few facts in connection with the question they may perhaps enable us to form a correct judgment upon this point. From the beginning of the war till the Prime Minister returned from England a few weeks ago, every utterance of the Government was against conscription. Last fall the Director General of National Service (Mr. R. B. Bennett) declared at a public meeting that what he had seen and heard in the West in company with the Premier convinced him that conscription would be followed by civil war. And when the Civil Service cards were sent out, the clergymen who were asked to encourage the people to sign them were told to announce that it did not mean conscription, and they so announced. Last spring the Minister of the Interior issued circular letters inviting immigrants from the United States, and stating that conscription would not be applied in Canada. And during this session on April 30, the present Minister of Militia announced in the House that the Government had never even considered conscription. Now what did all this mean if it was not to prepare the public mind against the idea of conscription, and that conscription in itself was a thing to be avoided? More than that the Minister of Trade and

Commerce (Sir George Foster) and the Minister of Finance went up and down the country telling us that production and more production was the thing that was needed. I will admit that circumstances and conditions might have changed to justify this change on the part of the Government, but where is the evidence of that—we have received none.

Did the British Government suggest to the Prime Minister when he was in England the adoption of this policy? No, they did not. The Prime Minister when introducing the Bill stated—see Hansard, page 2280:

> Some people with a diseased imagination have asserted that I took my present course at the request or dictation of the British Government. No more absolute falsehood was ever uttered by human lips. The subject was never discussed between myself and any member of the British Government. If there had been any such suggestion from them, I for one, would not have tolerated it.

Now, Sir, I do not for one moment pretend to have any knowledge of high statecraft, but I think the man on the street will ask what the Premier went to the Imperial Conference for, if not to give and receive suggestions. Where could the Premier go, if not to the British Government or some member of it, to get information as to what it was advisable or necessary for Canada to do, or try to do? Did the Prime Minister get his information by inspiration on the ship that carried him home across the Atlantic? Would it have been a bad thing if the Prime Minister had not only consulted the British Government, but the United States Government as well, and the best minds in Canada also, as to what we were expected to do, or could do, in the stupendous struggle in which we are all engaged? It appears to me that it would only be by such consultation that our joint efforts could be properly organized and coordinated. But the right hon. leader of the Government knew it all and did not need the advice of anybody.

> Now let us see what the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, who came to America a few days after the arrival of the Prime Minister, thought in regard to this matter. He said that what was needed by England and her Allies was "Food first and military aid later."

Then we have the declaration of Lord Rhondda, Food Controller of Great Britain, on the 19th of last month. He said:

> The Allies rely on Canada and the United States 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."

Later still we have the statement of our own food controller, Hon. Mr. Hanna, who declares that:

> Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium and their European allies are wholly unable to supply the Allied armies at the front, and the quantity needed to maintain the campaign must come largely from this side of the Atlantic. If in a month or so people on the continent begin to note the effects of the war on their breakfast tables they will know that they are curtailing their appetites in a great cause.

Mr. Hoover, the American Food Controller, agrees with these men, and some of the most experienced and practical men in Canada have stated that we cannot take any more men from the essential industries without crippling our productive capacity.

Does the Prime Minister know more than all these men put together? If so he must have got the knowledge he possesses by inspiration, because up till the time he returned from England neither he nor any of his Cabinet in Canada had the remotest idea that conscription would be necessary. And right here a serious question arises—if up to a few weeks ago, and having been at war for two years and nine months, our Government were totally ignorant in regard to what was vitally necessary to sustain our troops in the field at proper fighting strength, then no greater proof of incompetence ever was or could be given to the people.

Another thought that strikes me in regard to this statement of the Premier that he would not tolerate a suggestion from the British Government or any member of it with respect to this matter is this: Suppose Sir Wilfrid Laurier had returned from an Imperial Conference and made such a statement, why Sir, he would be denounced from one end of Canada to the other, and the statement itself would be held up as proof positive of disloyalty. Of course no one would question Sir Robert Borden's loyalty. But, then, I forgot, a Tory cannot be disloyal; the thing would be impossible.

A statement made by the Prime Minister in moving the second reading of the Bill deserves, I think, more consideration than it has hitherto received either in the House or in the country. Here it is:

> 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.

Here we have the plain, unvarnished and tremendously important fact, that the Premier did not hesitate to threaten the Commons of Canada with the wrath of the soldiers if the members dared to exercise their constitutional rights by voting according to the dictates of their conscience and according to what they believed to be in the true interests of the country.

Of course there was no evidence of what the army thought in regard to the matter under consideration, and at the time the Premier spoke there was no certainty as to how the members would vote, but this does not change the gravity and seriousness of the First Minister's threat, but rather emphasizes it. Here we have the civil power threatened with the wrath of the military power, if the civil power dares to exercise its rights and its proper functions. Here is the spirit of Prussian militarism displayed by the Premier, consciously or unconsciously, in all its naked deformity. Here we have the spirit behind the Zabern incident, when the Prussian military officer cut down the lame shoemaker on the street because the latter did not salute the officer in true subservient style. Is the danger of losing our own liberties while fighting to preserve the liberties of the world so remote after all? Even the Montreal Gazette, good Tory organ that it is, in its issue of to-day rebukes the Prime Minister for making a statement calculated to incite the military against the civil population.

In some quarters it is stated that this Bill is aimed at Quebec, that the people of that province having failed to do their duty, conscription is necessary to compel them to discharge that duty. In fact, it has been stated that but for the slackness of Quebec the Bill would not be necessary at all. Here is what the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) stated:

> I might say, however, that if the province of Quebec had done its duty, this Bill would have been entirely unnecessary, and the required 500,000 men would have been raised.

But the hon. the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) the other day said the Bill was not aimed at Quebec so much as at some of the other provinces, and that very few men from Quebec would be called to the colours under its provisions. Remember, this is the man who framed the Bill and who, consequently, knows more about its provisions, and will have more to do with its enforcement, than any other man in Canada. That there may be no mistake, let me quote his exact words:

> We of English-speaking Canada have the kindest feelings towards our French Canadian compatriots. We realize that there are certain considerations having to do with this subject of recruiting that apply to them that do not apply with the same force to us. This Bill in its results will work more lightly on the Province of Quebec than on any other province in Canada.

So we are to have not only favoritism and discrimination as between individuals, as we have had all along, but favouritism and discrimination as between provinces. I ask in all sincerity: Is this a Bill to help win the war, or a Bill to help win elections? Are we gambling with the flesh and blood of the nation?

In addition to this the Bill is not to come into force until it is proclaimed by the Governor in Council, and it may be a long time until the proclamation is issued. So the more the Bill is examined and the more it is explained, the more clearly do we see there is more politics in it than appears on the surface, and the more clearly do we observe the hope that in the noise and the confusion it will cause many many things will be forgotten; that, for instance, the slimy trail of the serpent of grafting and private profiteering which disgraced the country may be forgotten.

The reason I intend to vote for the amendment moved by the right honourable leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is that it is one way of consulting the people—and the people should and must be consulted. Some of the members supporting the Government say that a referendum is not necessary, because the vast majority of the people are in favour of the Bill. If that be so, the referendum is most desirable, because we will then have conscription and a united Canada behind it. Other members supporting the Government, and some members of the Government themselves say they will not have a referendum because conscription would be defeated by a large majority. If that be so, how in the name of common sense do the Government expect to enforce conscription, except by strife and insurrection—and is that the way they intend to win the war? Again, some people say that the referendum is un-British. Well, it was not considered un-British in Australia, but perhaps they are not as loyal there as we are in Canada —not loyal enough to satisfy our Tory friends and some of our lachrymose friends on this side of the House. Nor was it considered un-British in England, because the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, leader of the Unionist party, speaking upon such a prosaic thing as the tariff, said:—

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.

But perhaps Balfour is not British enough for our high Tory friends.

So far as I am personally concerned, what I believe in most of all is a general election, because it, better than anything else, will clear the atmosphere—that is, providing we have an honest election. If, however, the Government tampers with the constitution and holds an election with loaded dice, they will infuse a spirit of unrest and dissatisfaction into the people of this country which will lead to dire results, the end of which no man can see. Only the day before yesterday we celebrated the fiftieth birthday of Confederation—the fiftieth anniversary of our national life, and reference was naturally made to all we had accomplished in the last half century. But, once again I say, this Government, by using arbitrary and harsh methods and following the policy upon which they appear to have embarked, can start a conflagration which will not be extinguished in the next fifty years.

If we have a general election and the Government be returned to power—which God forbid—they will come back, if not purified, at least strengthened by having a mandate from the people. They can then enforce conscription with some show of reason, and I for one, whether in Parliament or out of Parliament, shall give them all reasonable assistance in the enforcement thereof. On the other hand, if they force this conscription Bill through, and also by reason of their majority in this House and in the Senate, force the extension resolutions through, and then try to enforce conscription in the arbitrary and unfair manner I fear they will employ, we shall have Prussianism—naked Prussianism—and I tremble for the consequences. Only a miracle will prevent strife and all its consequent evils. If the Liberals be returned to power we shall have an honest democratic Government in which the people will have confidence; a Government that will employ all the resources of the country towards winning the war, employing conscription for that purpose if necessary, but conscription all around. I do not believe it would be necessary, however, because, the people knowing they could trust the Government to act honestly and impartially, many would flock to the colours with the same zeal, the same courage, and the same enthusiasm that were manifested in the early days of the war.

Therefore, the best thing the Government could do would be to acknowledge their incompetence, resign, and ask His Excellency the Governor General to summon Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The people could then apply to them the saying which was long ago applied to Charles I, that nothing in his whole life became him like the leaving of it.

Mr. JAMES MORRIS (Châteauguay): Mr. Speaker, in rising to ask the attention of the House for a few moments, I have no thought of prolonging the debate, because I feel that it has already been extended a little longer than is necessary. In fact, I do not think there should have been any debate on this question. That is my honest opinion. But, Sir, I feel that I should not give a silent vote on this question. I feel that this question of conscription has been augmented, or made to appear much greater than it really is. A year ago there was no man in this country who was more opposed to conscription than I was, for the simple reason that I had given it very little consideration, fully believing that we would never require it in this country, and I am sorry to-day that we are obliged to resort to it. I feel that it would have been a glorious thing for this Canada of ours had we been able to supply the required number of men voluntarily. But when that failed what was there left for us to do? Of all the speakers whom I have heard in this House during this debate, not one single man has offered a suggestion whereby we could improve on the measure proposed. Therefore, when I come to examine this question and ask myself if there is any other method whereby we can do our duty, I am compelled to answer that there is absolutely none. So I feel that I have a great question before me, which I have to solve for myself. Formerly I was opposed to conscription, but when the question was placed before me, and before the people of Canada, and when I realized that all other methods of raising men had failed, I felt bound to come to a decision, as the Government were bound to come to a decision, as to what could be done. And what could be done?

Not a man in this House offered any suggestion as to how that could be done, otherwise than by conscription. There-

fore, when I saw that such a measure was necessary, I naturally gave it some thought, and the question gave me many anxious moments before I reached a decision. I know full well that I am going to vote against the wishes of a great many of my electors. If I voted otherwise, I would vote against the wishes of many of my electors who hold opposite views. Therefore, I might say, I am pretty nearly between the devil and the deep sea. I felt that, as a representative of one of the most important constituencies of Quebec, I had a duty to perform. I had to come to a decision, and to set aside the wishes on both sides of some of my electors, and it was up to me to do what I believed to be my duty. There comes a time in the life of every man when he must decide between love and duty. Perhaps love did not enter into this question, but personal interest entered into it, and I am ready to lay aside personal interest and do what I believe is my duty in the interest of my province, of the Empire, and of humanity. I will do my duty and take the consequences. It certainly would have been a great pleasure to me, had we been able to raise the required number of men without resorting to conscription, but within the last few months, it has been clearly proven, inside of this House and outside, that the voluntary system has failed, and that we must do something else. Under the circumstances, in my humble opinion, we cannot desert the boys who are fighting for us in France. My hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) thought that we had done enough, and that we should allow other armies to take the place of our Canadian boys. I say the hon. gentleman does not understand the nature of the Anglo-Saxon race, or he never would have made such a statement in this House.

We have heard a great deal about democracy. It is stated that this measure is contrary to the spirit of democracy. I would like to call attention to the fact that alongside of us we have the greatest democracy on the face of the globe. It does not seem to interfere with the spirit of democracy in the United States to pass such a measure as that which we are considering to-day. We hear no complaint from them. They have entered this war quite recently. They are an independent nation and are not under the same obligations as we are, because we are part of the British Empire, and when the British Empire is at war we are at war. The United States is in a different position. To-day the United States has passed a Bill similar to the one we are considering, and I maintain that the spirit of this Bill is more in harmony with the true spirit of democracy than any suggestion I have heard from the other side of the House. The fundamental principle of democracy is equalization of men. One man is considered the equal of another. That is the true spirit of democracy and that is what we are trying to establish by this Bill. I was at first as much opposed to it as any man in this House, but after studying the nature of the Bill, and the manner in which it is going to be enforced, I feel it is more in harmony with the true spirit of democracy than any proposal that has been made in this House. Therefore, to attain the object we have in view, I stand ready to support the Bill, not because I believe it is in the interest of Jimmie Morris, or any other individual, but because I believe it to be a measure of liberty and justice to every man. I shall after supporting the measure return to my home perfectly satisfied that I have done my duty to myself, to my electors and to my country. I am ready, Mr. Speaker, to take the consequences. Furthermore, I believe that, when the nature of this Bill is perfectly understood by the people of Quebec, it will be looked upon by them in a different light from what it is to-day. What are the arguments being advanced at the present time? It is stated to the people of Quebec that we are tearing the children from their mothers and throwing them into the front trenches to be butchered. Is that a proper spirit? Is that the manner in which we should recruit? We have heard a great deal about recruiting, but I say that, since this debate began, I have heard arguments which would render it almost impossible to recruit in Quebec. We have heard a great deal of criticism of certain things that have been said by certain men on this side of the House during an election in Drummond-Arthabaska, and elsewhere in Quebec in 1911. We must not forget, however, that that was during a political campaign, and we are not engaged in a political campaign to-day. We are up against one of the most grave and serious propositions that ever faced this House or the civilized world, with the greatest Empire the world has ever known shaken to her very foundations. Is it not up to every true Canadian to set aside all other considerations in such a crisis? And, Mr. Speaker, the time will come when we will not speak of French Canadians, or English Canadians but "Canadians", regardless of national origin, and only recog-

nizing the distinction of being citizens of Canada. To-day, I am sorry to say, reference has been made very frequently in this debate to the French Canadians. No man in this House has had better opportunity of knowing the nature of the French Canadian people than I. I have been brought up amongst them, and the best friends I have in the province of Quebec, or in the whole Dominion, are French Canadians. They are friends of my youth. I used to go to school with them. There is no class of people on the earth who have a better sense of fair play than the French Canadian people and my presence in this House is sufficient proof of that statement. The French Canadians have a majority in my county, but they have elected me, an Englishman. It has been an understood thing in my county, for many years back, that we should send an English speaking representative to the Parliament at Ottawa, and a French Canadian to the Quebec Legislature, and that agreement has never been broken. Therefore, I am justified in saying that our French Canadian friends have as great a sense of justice and fair play as any people in this whole Dominion.

As far as recruiting is concerned I cannot understand the situation in the province of Quebec. Outside the province of Quebec, French Canadians have volunteered as freely as the members of any other nationality. Why is it that our friends in Quebec have not come up to the mark? I can make every allowance for the French Canadians under ordinary circumstances, but this case I cannot understand. Two or three days after Austria had declared war upon Serbia, the eyes of the whole civilized world were fixed upon England. Nowhere was England's course more anxiously watched than in the province of Quebec, and when the news was flashed across the Atlantic that England had come to the rescue of France, a sigh of relief came up from the heart of every French Canadian in the province of Quebec. I know that deep down in the heart of every French Canadian there is a love of his mother country. How could any descendant of the noble French race deny his allegiance to or his love for his mother country? The love of country comes next to the love of God, and I feel that in the heart of every French Canadian there is an admiration for old France that nothing can erase. Unfortunately, immediately after that news came to this country, the cry was started —by whom or upon whose authority I do not know: we owe nothing to France; she turned out certain religious organizations.

That was not a sufficient reason for inaction; that was a political matter. The same thing happened in other countries—but the spirit of old France remained there, and there it will remain. It is worthy of note that many years ago Atilla, the leader of the Huns, who had set out to overrun Europe, was turned back on the plains of France. Future history will record that in this war the Hun of this day met defeat on the plains of France. That will be another glorious page in France's history. Some men are to-day shouting "a bas l'Angleterre," and that kind of thing; but that does not express the true sentiment of the French Canadian. It does not, at any rate, express the sentiment of the people in the rural districts, where one gets a better idea, perhaps, of the true sentiment of the people. In the cities the people are influenced by men of the type of Bourassa and Tancrede Marsil. These men will disappear in due course of time, but the true spirit of the French Canadian will remain forever.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Will the hon. gentleman tell me in what part of the province of Quebec he heard the words "à bas l'Angleterre"?

Mr. MORRIS: I have read them in the press of the city of Montreal. I have not the records here, but the hon. gentleman knows that the words appear in the press many times. I admit that they were not written by responsible men; nevertheless, the spirit that provoked them was aroused by the men who were at the head at meetings held in opposition to conscription. But I repeat that these words do not represent the true spirit of the French Canadian people.

It has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that Quebec would rise in revolt if this Bill should become law. Mr. Speaker, that is false. From what I know of the French Canadian people, if this Bill becomes law they will submit to it just the same as you or I will. It may not be agreeable to them, but they will see the justice of the Bill when it is properly explained to them. Instead of preaching sedition and treason, as members of this House have done, let hon. gentlemen go out into their counties and do as was done in the other provinces. Let the men who influence public opinion go out and do their duty. Let the clergy do their duty in Quebec as the clergy have done their duty in the other provinces. The matter of the duty of the people has

been taken up in the other provinces by the churches, by the public men, by all classes of the people. We knew what our duty was; the spirit of the Canadian people backed us up; every man went into the fight and did what he could. Had that been done in Quebec since the beginning of the war, we would have had a greater number of recruits from that province than from any other province in the Dominion. From no other province in the whole Dominion could we have expected greater enlistment than from the province of Quebec. But public opinion in that province has been led astray by the false doctrine that has been drummed into and preached to the people—doctrine that for years back has never been denied or contradicted. But the French Canadians are, down in their hearts, just as good as I am; just as loyal as I am.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Thank you.

Mr. MORRIS: But they have been falsely trained. It has been suggested by some hon. gentlemen—and I am not averse to the suggestion—that we give voluntary enlistment another chance. Voluntary recruiting has failed, but the system still prevails. Let hon. gentlemen who are advocating voluntary enlistment get busy, go into their counties, and start a campaign under that system. Let them not preach such doctrine as was preached by the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier), or the member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers). That kind of doctrine will never help recruiting. Let them preach the true doctrine of patriotism and of our duty to our country; the people of Quebec will understand it just as well as you or I understand it. They know what they owe to the British Empire; they know what the British flag means to them; they appreciate the protection that they have enjoyed for many years and the privileges that have been granted to them under British rule. But if the people of that province continue to be under the influence of the false doctrines that have been preached to them we cannot expect any different results from those that have obtained. Many French Canadian soldiers have returned to this country; let them be employed to engage in recruiting campaigns among the people of Quebec and to explain present conditions relating to the war. If this is done the habitants will understand the situation just as well as we do.

I venture to say that those habitants will understand the situation just as well as we do. They have just as great a sense of honour and of justice as any of us have. They know the horrors that have been perpetrated by the enemy just as well as we do, and they are ready to avenge those who have suffered from the barbarity of the foe. But, we have to point them to the proper course, and we have to counteract the effects of the evil doctrine that has for years been preached to the French Canadian people in Quebec.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: The hon. member a few minutes ago told the various Quebec members to do their share in encouraging enlistments. The hon. member is a member from Quebec province. Has he done so himself? Has he asked his people to enlist, and if so, what have they said?

Mr. MORRIS: I am glad the hon. member has brought up that question. Early in the war I had the pleasure of taking part at a recruiting meeting. A young officer who, poor young fellow, is to-day buried in France, was sent to my county, and he came to a village adjoining mine. We called a meeting—and what I say will perhaps bear out a little of the criticism that has been offered as to the manner of recruiting in our province. I do not cast any reflections upon the Government for what was done. They selected the men they thought were proper, but sometimes a man who is appointed for a certain purpose, is not always able to fill the position as it should be filled. At all events I had with me on the platform that night two Presbyterian ministers from my immediate neighbourhood. We laid before the people the cause as best we could. This young officer stated his case, and finally when he had finished, he tied up his belongings and was about to leave the meeting. I said to him: My friend, do not you think it would be advisable for you to go down amongst the crowd and speak to the young men; I know that in the audience are a number of young men who, by the interest they have taken in what has been said, are ready to volunteer. The young officer immediately admitted the propriety of such a course. He went down amongst the audience, and I accompanied him and introduced him to a number of young men. The result was that fifteen young men enlisted that night. Four of them were rejected, but since that night forty others have followed the example of those fifteen young men. That is the spirit of the Canadian people when they

understand the situation. That course was not taken in many other counties in Quebec. In Laprairie-Napierville the people were advised not to enlist and not to contribute to the Patriotic and the Red Cross Funds. They were told: Save your money for some other purpose. Could one expect recruits from a county where that doctrine was preached? That is one of the reasons why recruiting has not succeeded in Quebec. Hon. members speak about what was said years ago, but those are political questions, and it is the leaders of the people in the province of Quebec whom I blame for the want of success in recruiting.

I have said already that it grieves me to be forced to vote contrary to the wishes of a great many of my electors, old warriors who have fought for me twice in my political campaigns, and whom I had the honour of leading to a Conservative victory in my county for the first time since Confederation. But I have a duty to perform, and in coming to a decision, I have given due consideration to the question before the House, and if I should have to give up my life on account of the course I have decided to pursue, I am ready to make the sacrifice, to do what I believe is my duty. As I said I am ready to take the consequences of my action. I am the representative of the old county of Chateauguay, and I do not want the finger of scorn to be pointed at that county. Should I vote against this measure and do as the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) advises us to do, I feel that the finger of scorn would be pointed at me and at my county for all time to come. That hon. member practically advises us to throw up the sponge—to quit. As I have said before, he does not know the spirit of the Anglo-Saxon race or he would never have made such a statement.

There is one feature in connection with conscription that, partly on account of the attitude that I am taking I should explain to the House, and that is the duty that I owe and the duty that every French Canadian and every other Canadian owes to the Empire. Let the people understand that duty and there will be no need for discussion on this Bill; the Bill would be passed unanimously.

I do not attempt to criticise any statements made in regard to the referendum, but there is one phase of the question on which I have not yet received any light. We are told by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) that he was fully in accord with conscription, that he felt it was the duty of Canada to force enlistment, and

that he believed the people in Canada would support a referendum on that question. If he believes that, it is his duty as a representative of the people to vote for conscription. Why refer the matter by a referendum to the people of Canada if the people are in favour of it? Has the hon. member not a duty to perform? What was he elected for? Was he elected to go back to his people every time a question came up in this House, and to ask them how he should vote? I told some of my electors the other day: "Gentlemen, when you elected me, you did not elect me into slavery. I am an independent man; I am going to vote according to the dictates of my conscience, and I am ready to take the consequences." That is what I intend to do on this question.

There is another feature that we must take into consideration as regards this referendum. Some gentlemen have told us that they are absolutely in accord with this Bill. Let us suppose that we take a referendum and that conscription is defeated. In that event, where would we stand? Either those hon. members will have to vote for this measure against the wishes of the people of Canada—and then what will happen?—or else, we shall have to throw up the sponge and say: We will no longer support the men who have voluntarily gone to the front.

If we do that, I say that the finger of scorn will be pointed at Canada for centuries to come. I sincerely trust that it will never be done.

Mr. J. A. DESCARRIES (Jacques Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I propose detaining the House, a few minutes only. I do not intend to discuss all the points which may be raised for or against the question now before this House, to wit.: the passing of a conscription Bill to send 100,000 men overseas to fight Germany and her allies.

During more than two weeks, this Parliamentary hall has resounded with the eloquent accents of representatives of Canada, some demanding conscription, others opposing it. The pledges of the leaders of the nation, assuring the people that there would be no conscription, have been recalled; on the one hand, it has been attempted to prove that conscription was necessary because it was absolutely needed to replace our Canadian soldiers falling on the battlefields; on the other hand, it was stated that Canada has nobly done her share in this war which afflicts humanity and that at all events, volunteering, if it were properly operated, could fill the depleted rosters of

our forces. The partisans of conscription, at least some of them, have in bitter terms attributed to the province of Quebec the so-called failure of volunteering, by claiming that the French Canadians had not enlisted in sufficient numbers; the opponents of conscription retorted by showing that the province of Quebec occupies a very special position in the Dominion and in the British Empire and that if her contribution of men in the expeditionary forces has not been as large as that of other provinces, it was due to the inadequate or defective methods employed in recruiting and to the feelings of hatred as well as the aspersions directed against her people who are in spite of all, loyal to the Empire and to the British crown. Against conscription has also been raised the argument of the economic condition of Canada who, according to a large number of members, cannot make a bigger effort in men and in money without running into bankruptcy or, at least, without putting herself in a disastrous position for years and years to come. It has been further stated that the sending of our Canadian militia beyond Canada, to go and battle in Europe, was such an extraordinary enactment that is should not be done without the consent of the people, expressed by means of a referendum or in a general election, especially so in view of the fact that the present Parliament has exceeded the constitutional lease of life and that it exists only in virtue of an extension granted by its own members, a fact which a large number of citizens do not consider as giving it the power to pass a law largely interfering with the rights of the citizen as regards military service.

Other reasons have been put forth which escape my memory just now for I am making this review off hand, not having had time to read the reports of the speeches made in this House.

As I stated at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up once more the views advocated in the course of the debate and make in regard to them more or less appropriate comments. What I do want is simply to vindicate the stand I take before this House and the country, upon the question now under consideration.

I have already stated, in the speech I made in answer to the speech of His Excellency, the Governor General, at the opening of this session, that I was against conscription and that there could not be any question of conscription to send soldiers out to fight with the Allies.

I have publicly stated, at a meeting in Lachine, which is in the county of Jacques Cartier, which I have the honour to represent, that I was against conscription; can I now change my opinion? Has the debate which has been going on in this House, convinced me that I was wrong in speaking as I have done? Conscientiously, I am forced to answer that my opinion has not changed.

I do deeply regret to find myself under the necessity of opposing the demand made by the leader of my party, the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) I have always had for this illustrious statesman the highest respect and in him, the greatest confidence. But I would be a miscreant if, as representative of the people, I did not follow the dictates of my conscience; I would deserve the contempt of my constituents and of the whole country, if I did not live up to the mandate entrusted to me. I have received numerous petitions, containing thousands of signatures, from the electors of my county, asking me to oppose conscription, but, Mr. Speaker, my opposition will not be a seditious one.

I am not against the assistance to be given to the Empire and to the Allies. I want the assistance given to England to be of a voluntary character. Let efficient means of propaganda be taken, and the 100,000 men, whom you want to obtain through conscription, will soon be found.

As for me, there is a peremptory reason which compels me to oppose conscription. It is that reason I intend to submit to this honourable House. In my opinion, this objection is well worth considering. If well taken the Bill which is now submitted, should it ever become law, would be ultra vires, null and void. I submit that Canada is not a sovereign state. She has no international status; her legislative powers are limited to those granted her by the British North America Act, which is an Imperial Statute. Now, this Act does not enable our Parliament to pass an Act providing for the sending, by conscription, of subjects of Canada, to go and fight in Europe or in other foreign countries.

All that we find in the aforesaid statute is, in section 91 and its subsection, "that it will be lawful for the King, upon the advice and with the consent of the Senate and of the House of Commons, to make laws for the peace, the order and the good government of Canada and, in particular, for the militia, the military service, the naval service and the defence of the country".

Will any one contend that, in consequence of the section I have just quoted, Canada has the right to declare war to any country whatever? Certainly not.

Todd, the well known authority on constitutional and parliamentary law, says at page 388, of the second edition of his work:

> In affairs of peace and war which, are essentially of Imperial concern, this supremacy of the Crown must be everywhere maintained inviolate.

We cannot, Mr. Speaker, address a foreign country without the co-operation of the English ambassador. If you want, for instance, to obtain the extradition of any party from the United States, you must apply to the British ambassador. Canada can only make certain fiscal arrangements, she cannot make any international treaty. Admitting that this Parliament had the right to establish conscription for the defence of her attacked territory, she certainly has not the right to send conscripts into foreign countries, beyond the seas, and make war to assist friendly nations, for such an enterprise would constitute an act of warfare which alone the Imperial Parliament can do.

In order to be able to lawfully send conscripts to Europe, in the war zone, we should have to do as we have done for the extension of the term of this Parliament, that is to say, have the Imperial Parliament, from which this Parliament holds its powers, amend the British North America Act, and authorize us to send conscripts to the battlefields where is being waged this great war which is presently desolating the whole world.

Let us suppose, Mr. Speaker, that England had not taken part in the war, and that Canada had a French majority who would wish to help France fighting against Germany, would not the sending of our conscripted soldiers, for that purpose, constitute an act of warfare which England would be obliged to disavow and to prevent, if she did not want to enter the war herself?

Who can say that England, under such circumstances, would not have the right of so doing, for she cannot allow her colonies to draw her into any war without the consent of the Imperial Parliament.

Now, we do not have even now that approval in the Constitutional Act of Canada nor in any amendment to that Act. Therefore, if the Bill, which is now submitted to this hon. House, should become law, that law, in my opinion, will be ultra vires. Therefore, it might be attacked by any conscripted citizen, by means of a habeas corpus and it would be impossible to enforce it.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add, except that, in consequence of what I have just said, it is my duty to vote for the amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette), because I consider the proposed Bill unconstitutional. If that amendment is lost, I will vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Quebec-East (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) because I consider that a conscription Act to send our soldiers abroad is such a novel and extraordinary measure, that before entering it definitely in our statutes, it should be submitted to the approbation of the electorate of this country. Finally, if this amendment is also defeated, I will register my vote against the second reading of the Bill, as a protest against the principle of unconstitutional enactment it contains.

Mr. WILLIAM STEWART LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, if I speak with some feeling on rising to address the House on this occasion it is because I realize, to some extent at least, the seriousness of the situation with which we are dealing. In August 1914 we were called together as representatives of the people of Canada to deal with the question of taking part in this dreadful conflict. We met here for less than a week and unanimously decided to do our bit in defence of home and liberty. We undertook to do our part and send our men to the front, supplying them with the necessary munitions as far as possible, not at the request of any other nation, but voluntarily and unanimously. No one will deny that our men have done splendidly. Men from my own county have come forward in a wonderful manner. My own province has done magnificently, standing second on the list in the pro rata of enlistment. My home town of about 4,500 inhabitants has suffered over fifty death casualties. The situation is a most serious one. It is in my thoughts day and night, and if I speak with some feeling it is because of my intense interest in the situation in which we find ourselves to-day.

The right hon. leader of the Government comes back from the old land and from the war zone and tells the people of Canada that more fighting men are needed to maintain the standard which we have set for ourselves. He further tells us that the Government of the day are unable to get these men by voluntary enlistment, which is the system we have always had in this country in war time. He has placed that situation before us very frankly, and I shall deal with that in a moment or two. Canada, as I understand it, pledged herself at the time of Confederation to take

part in the defence of her country. It will do no harm to put on Hansard again the words that were used on that occasion by Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George Cartier, George Brown and A. T. Galt:

> We expressed the earnest wish of the people of Canada to perpetuate the happy existing connection with Great Britain, and their entire willingness to contribute to the defence of the Empire their full quota, according to their ability, of men and money.

That is what we are doing to-day; that is what we promised to do in August 1914; and shall we fall down on our pledge? That is the momentous question before the people of Canada to-day. As I see it, we are in honour bound to live up to that pledge, bound to send the men required to fill up the gaps caused by our fallen heroes. How are we to do that? The Prime Minister tells us that he has exhausted all means of getting the men by voluntary enlistment. He now proposes the system of selective draft, which is not altogether a new principle for it has been on our statute-book since the time of Confederation. There was some question, I admit, up to 1904 whether we could send our troops outside of Canada, but, as I understand it, in that year it was made clear by the statement of the Minister of Justice that in the opinion of the Government of that day, if men were needed outside of Canada for the defence thereof, troops could be sent to India, if need be. If that be true, I cannot see that we are very far afield in enforcing this principle. I admit that the principle has never been enforced, although it has been on our statute-book for years, and for that reason it may now appear rather drastic. I confess I do not like the word "force" any more than do my hon. friends who have spoken on this side of the House, and under conditions existing in 1914 and 1915 when we were getting a goodly number of recruits I do not think it would have been wise to enforce a compulsory law. In the early days of the war the United Kingdom did not force their men to go to the front, but got them by voluntary enlistment, and I think we were wise in following their example. If we had attempted to enforce such a measure as this before the need really existed—and the need is present now because we cannot get the men by the ordinary methods—we might have found ourselves in a difficult situation.

I wonder if this principle of compulsion does not already run like a golden thread, as it were, through the statute-books of Canada. Is it not a fact that the State to-day protects my home by force? If I sell a bill of goods to a customer in whom I have implicit confidence, but who for some reason does not do his duty towards me, the State steps in at a certain time and compels him to do his duty. The principle of force, as I see it, appears before us at almost every turn in the statute-books. Not only does the State protect my home, but it protects me when abroad in a foreign land. Let me cite one case which was put on Hansard a few years ago. Hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec know that some years ago in one of the Latin countries of Europe there was almost a revolution because it was thought some prominent man had been executed after an unfair trial. Dissatisfaction spread through the land where the execution took place, and beyond, to Italy.

In Italy we have a Canadian institution, a college for the education of young men for the priesthood. The reverend gentleman in charge of that institution was told that there was danger of a possible riot and revolution, and was asked what he would do in such a case. Listen to his answer; the answer of a Canadian in the city of Rome: "The British flag is my talisman." So I say, the British flag, even in foreign countries, forces others to protect my interests, if my interests are threatened. And we should all do well if we emulated the example of that clergyman; let us ever hold high that talismanic flag. Speaking on the Budget a few weeks ago, and before the Prime Minister returned from Europe, I made the statement, as Hansard will show, that the Government of the day were responsible for finding the necessary men to fulfil the pledge—if I may so call it; I do not know that it is necessarily looked upon as a pledge, but the leader of the Government since coming back has so interpreted it—that had been given; and I said that they ought to make overtures to the Opposition with a view to getting the men, by voluntary enlistment or otherwise. I do not think it was fair—I say so frankly—for the Government first to come to their finding as to what should be done and then make overtures. I think they erred in judgment, I think they lacked in tact in handling this tense situation; they should have approached the leader of the Opposition before deciding as to action; they should have asked the co-operation and advice of the Liberals of the country, as represented by my revered leader. Had this been done, I question very much if

we would have been in the position in which we find ourselves to-day.

Now, as to the future. It is evident that in order to keep three divisions in the fighting line we must have more men than are now being recruited. I do not know that I can prove that better than by quoting the statement placed before the House by the Department of Militia and Defence, and dated May 14, 1917. This statement gives a summary of strength of the units of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in England. At the time of this statement, as I understand the situation, there were three divisions in the fighting line, each divsion made up of practically 27,000 men. That is, we had 81,000 men in the fighting line. Then, we have a fourth division in the rear. Thus we had in France on the 14th May last 108,000 men. In England we had at that date, ready to go over to France, 26,359 men. Perhaps there were in addition some officers. We had in England also 29,927 men in training. These men were not fit then, and probably would not be fit for some months. We had 5,147 casualties in England who were being trained and hardened and made fit for the front. We had, in addition, 3,469 men who were being trained and would be ready to go to the front as soon as they reached the age of nineteen years. Thus we had in France 108,000 men, and in England 61,902 men who would be fit for trench work when properly trained. But the sad part of the story is that during April and May the casualties were considerably over 10,000 for each month. On this basis, six months would take for the fighting line every man we have available in England and would leave us without any reserves in England at all. And, if I understand the situation correctly, it will take about 10,000 men each month to keep up the standard we are now maintaining at the front, and that we are in duty bound to maintain—three divisions of a total of about 81,000 men. If we cannot get these men by voluntary enlistment, I think we are in duty bound to get them some other way.

I am willing to admit that the Prime Minister's proposal is somewhat drastic. But, after all, I cannot bring myself to the conclusion that he is unfair or unreasonable, if the country is in jeopardy, and from the fact I have already stated, I think the country is in jeopardy. More than that, I think the heroic deeds of our boys ought to make the enforcement of a collective draft acceptable in the urgent circumstances in which we find ourselves.

[Mr. Loggie.]

These boys have done splendid work. Let me cite one proof of it. Early in the war it was said by one of the Prussian officers high in authority, that, "If it had not been for the Canadian rats the German army would be in Calais." The words "Canadian rats" were not very complimentary; but the noble work done in preventing the German army from reaching Calais will go down in history and will stand forever to the credit of our Canadian boys.

In order to show the House to some extent how I feel on this situation, let me cite just one short paragraph from a letter written recently in France by my son to his sister:

> What is the news regarding conscription or a coalition Cabinet? I am strong for conscription myself. What does father think of it?

I say that I cannot do other than support the Government in their proposal to enforce the selective draft, as, in my judgment, nothing else is proposed that meets the situation. I am convinced that in the interest of the State there are times —and this is one of them—when the people should speak through their elected representatives in Parliament rather more than yea or nay on a question that has to do with the defence of the State. On general principles, the people must and do rule, but when the State is in jeopardy, it is incumbent on the duly elected members to speak and act for the people.

This brings me to the amendment moved by my beloved and revered leader, with whom I exceedingly regret I cannot vote on this occasion, for the first time in my life. But I give him praise, I give him nothing more than his due, when I say that he has told his followers to act as their conscientious convictions lead them. I honour him for this proper action in this national matter. I also recognize that he too is guided by his convictions, and that his interest in the State is not any less than mine or that of any other hon. member in this House. More than that, he has guided the ship of state during many a storm safely to anchor in the calm waters of peace and prosperity. I am sure that if his guiding hand remains at the helm, even though he be leader of the Opposition, no disaster will overtake us if he can help it.

The object the Government have is to get the necessary men by selective draft, while that of the amendment is to do the same thing if the people first say yes. That is the only difference. My right hon. leader, in addressing the House, said that the

Government said we needed more men, and my right hon. leader in replying admitted that more men were required, but said that he thought the object in view could be better attained in another way. I cannot see it just as my leader does, for this reason: As I said, the amendment is the same as the Bill, except that the people are to be first asked to say yes. The amendment, however, to my mind, does not provide for getting the men if the people, by a small or large majority, say no. But it would have this effect, that the men could not be sent by selective draft to complete the work that we have unanimously undertaken. In other words, the hands of the Government, or the hands of any Government, as I see it, would be tied. I understand that the hands of the Australian Government, so far as selective draft is concerned, are tied to-day, and will be tied until there is another referendum. And so the hands of this Government, or of any Government, will be tied until the nay is reversed to a yea by another referendum vote. I cannot see my way clear to take that risk. I cannot bring myself to believe that I would be doing right to the State in taking the risk involved in the amendment. If righteousness exalteth a nation, then right doing on the part of the members of this House and the people of Canada must tend thereunto. Hence my duty is to vote for the Bill and against the amendment of my hon. leader.

I feel that the young men of Canada who are so situated that they would come within the operation of the conscription law, young men whose removal from their present occupation would not be considered as detrimental to the State, should make the honourable choice of enlisting, if only out of admiration for the brave men who have fallen. I am going to ask whose war this is? I hear the answer from some hon. gentleman opposite: we are fighting for England. I cannot understand on what foundation they base that statement. Where is the logic in the statement that we are fighting for England? England did not ask us to fight. When we came here in 1914 there was not a word said to this country that England made any request from Canada, as I understand. We are not fighting for England, for the United Kingdom; we are fighting for ourselves. We are fighting for the Empire of which we form an important part. I do not think that we ought to have the doctrine spread abroad that we are in this war at the request of England. We are in this war because of the doctrine of the unity of a family. It is true that the centre is in London, but, nevertheless, let me use the statement of my honoured leader, when England is at war Canada is at war, because whatever hurts England hurts Canada. We are a part of a whole, and as I see it we are fighting for ourselves just as much as the English soldier is fighting for the United Kingdom. We in Canada are fighting for the protection of our Canadian people and our citizenship. But, we are doing more than that. Why is England fighting? Why did England enter the war? Because Germany had done a wrong thing, because Germany said she was going to tear a treaty to pieces. She did more than that.

She acknowledged she was wrong, and offered to do the right thing, as far as she could, after the war was over. That was very plausible, but I say that England realized that if Germany would break the treaty in order to serve her own selfish ends, there was no telling what she would do after that, if she got a chance. If her armies got to Calais—and thank Heaven our Canadian boys stopped them from getting there—what would happen? If they got to Paris and to Havre, as they very nearly succeeded in doing, what would happen the cities along the English Channel? I realize that if Germany had made very much more headway than she did, and if our armies had not come along at the critical time, this war might not have been even as favourable to us to-day as it is. It has certainly been a deadly struggle. I do not suppose any hon. member in this House believed, when war was declared in 1914, that in 1917 we would be discussing this question in Parliament. I say we decided ourselves, in this House, without any request from any portion of the British Empire, on the course we should take. We are units of that Empire, and, as a unit, we had to perform our duty in defence of home and the Empire. Then we have this glory that we have never had before, and it is quite an experience to us, that we are not only fighting for ourselves, but we are fighting with the greatest nations in the world, and one of them is that chivalrous nation, France. I do a large business with France, and I find the merchants of that country straightforward and business-like men. I desire to pay the compliment to the French-Canadians in my own county, where I do a large amount of business. I believe they are loyal to the land that has given them birth, and loyal to the land

that protects them, and if the land and flag protects a man, I see no reason why that man should not be bound to protect the flag, in case of urgency or necessity.

Now I come to a more difficult question, because the question after all is really what of the future? The past is history, but what of the future? If the Bill becomes law, what then? The hon. gentleman from Chateauguay, in speaking a few minutes ago, lectured the gentlemen on this side of the House, and told them to go down to their own counties and preach patriotism. I do not think he should have confined it to members on this side of the House, but should have cast his eye around him, and inquired whether that remark could not justly be applied to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House as well. I think it would have been better if he had not made that remark. The question which bothers me is, what is to become of this Bill, and what will be the result of our placing it on the Statute Book? First of all, I have a suggestion to make. I do not know, perhaps, that there is very much merit in it, but no harm will be done by putting it on Hansard. I think there should be a mutual understanding between the leaders on both sides of the House, and that there should be an honest effort made for the extension of the life of Parliament. My hon. friend from the county adjoining my constituency says, "Shame," but I will give my reason for it, and hon. gentlemen can take it for what it is worth. I do not say that one side alone could accomplish anything, and if hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are bringing down a Bill for the extension of the life of Parliament, they should seek the co-operation, in some satisfactory way, with the leaders on this side of the House. If that cannot be done, it is another question altogether. Then, secondly, if the Bill passes through the regular stages and becomes law, there should be a renewed effort made to bring about a coalition Government, and after that is done I think there should be a final effort made for voluntary enlistment. I really cannot help thinking that there are sufficient men with large ideas in this country, on both sides of the House, to bring about this very desirable situation, which I think would be a very happy start for the new half century, but if we cannot have this happy condition, and cannot get the men by voluntary enlistment, I think there should be an effort made on both sides of the House for selective draft. That would not be opposed, at any rate, to any great extent, in any place in Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: That will be taking them by the throat and conscripting them.

Mr. LOGGIE: I do not think it is altogether doing that. It is certainly not doing it any more than they are doing it in England. We as a rule look up to our British institutions and the example of the Motherland. Their case is not any more urgent than ours, and I do not see any complaint from the Old Country that men are being taken by the throat. If the case is placed properly before the men, I do not think you will find many men in Canada who will not do their fair share. The Bill provides for the men necessary on the farm, in the fishing industry, the mine and the munition plant. It is a selective draft. If there be any partisanship in it, it will kill the chances of it being a success. It must be above partisanship, and that is why I would like to see some effort made to bring about an understanding between the two parties, because to make this selective draft a success, I believe it ought to be administered by the two great parties in Canada to-day, and they should be brought together by some means. Whether it should be by election is another question. Personally, while I do not mind an election of itself, I do not like the idea of an election with this question as the battle cry. But if it is not possible to avoid that, each man will have to do his duty, regardless of the consequences. But I wish to make another suggestion, and it is this: If the leader of the Opposition were made the leader of a coalition Government, I believe that with the co-operation of his friends in this House the necessary men could be secured by voluntary enlistment, or, if that failed, by selective draft. My only authority for saying that is my own conviction; I believe that that could be brought about. If my suggestions are not practicable or feasible, I can only say that we had better have an election, and the sooner the better.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LOGGIE: I will tell you what should happen after an election is held. Whoever the winner is—whether he be the right hon. gentleman who sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, or my revered and honoured leader—he should form a coalition Government to manage our state affairs until the war is over. If this can be done by the leader of the party that wins at the polls, a great service will be rendered to the people.

Each member of this House has the right —and a glorious heritage it is—to vote ac-

cording to his convictions. But, Sir, each member should do more than that. He should be vigilant in furthering the interests of his country, in season and out of season. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; it is the price that we must pay to maintain the privileges and the liberties that we have enjoyed in the past in this glorious young nation—a nation within a nation, the greatest Empire in the world.

Mr. A. A. MONDOU (Yamaska) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I have felt some hesitation in dealing with such an important matter as that which is now submitted to the consideration of this House; but taking into account the present condition of public mind in this country, I think it my duty to show the reasons why I am opposed to the government measure! I hope the House will pardon me if I have to go a few years back so as to show in stronger light the responsibilities incurred by the promoters of this Bill towards the electors of Canada. We are urged by the Government to insert in our statute book this proposal concerning a kind of military conscription which is called selective.

On the other hand, the Opposition want this measure to be beforehand submitted to the Canadian people and declares, through its authorized leader, that they will assist the Government in having it practically and immediately enforced should the majority of the people, consulted by way of a referendum, pronounce itself in favour of the measure, whereas my honourable friend from Berthier would have the House dispose of this bill forthwith by refusing, under the guise of the six months' hoist, to recognize its principle. The answer which I shall be ready to give when those several proposals are put to the House will be the direct outcome of my previous stand.

Having never complained of the fact that Canada was taking part in the present war, having, on the contrary, always approved of it in principle, I do not very well see how I could take upon myself to vote against the principle of conscription to-day, before the Canadian people are called upon to render their own verdict. Is it or is it not the wish of our people that its participation which, up to this date, has been voluntary and free, should become obligatory and compulsory? It must be remembered that our Militia Act, drafted by Cartier and revised under Laurier in 1904, states clearly, in section 69, that, should volunteering not answer the purpose, the Government would have a right to resort to conscription. In fine, do the Canadian people think that our soldiers, now fighting beyond Canada, are fighting for the defence of Canada? As far as I am concerned, I cannot deny the people the right to settle by themselves such a momentous and important question. I wish to know what they think of it, and I may add at once that, in accord with the leader of the Opposition, I shall abide by the judgment of the Canadian electorate. Accordingly, as I do not wish to substitute my own will to that of the people, clearly expressed by way of a referendum, and as I confess having no mandate, under the circumstances, to speak out what I think of the matter, I shall vote against the sub-amendment of the honourable member for Berthier. As for the amendment proposed by the honourable leader of the Opposition, it shall have my full support. And, in truth, I am unable to understand why the Government persist in denying the people, conscious as they are of their power and aware of the baneful possibilities of its exercise, the right to decide such an important matter. At this critical hour of our national life the people would give this great question all the attention which it deserves. Besides, be the conditions in a free country what they may, it is for the people to finally decide.

I am perfectly willing to admit that the Prime Minister is actuated by the best of intentions, by an intense patriotism, even; but I cannot admit, however, that he has the monopoly of that quality. Accordingly I think I should frankly state that, having neglected, from the outbreak of this war, to inspire his policy with the Canadian spirit, he would, no doubt, to-day be less fearful and apprehensive of a referendum "somewhere in England." Mr. Speaker, a question of capital importance for the welfare of Canada has been agitated for nearly ten years in this country, and it must be admitted that the proceeding in the course of this and former parliaments has been somewhat stormy ever since. In fact, during the session of 1910 a Naval Service Bill was introduced and adopted by Parliament in spite of the Opposition, then under the leadership of the present Prime Minister, who advocated the idea that the people should be consulted. Just think of it! We were to spend some ten million dollars to build in this country a navy which would be a Canadian navy and could assist the mother country in war time.

I have already said in this House and I repeat to-day that the Naval Service Act was the only cause for which the Laurier Government was driven from power, and as Cartier was defeated for having carried

through the Militia Act by means of which our defence on land was organized, so did Sir Wilfrid Laurier lose power because he had introduced and carried through his Naval Bill providing for our defence on sea. I owe it to history to say, however, that I took no part in the campaign against the Naval Act and its complements, a campaign which was carried on for nearly two years in the province of Quebec, under the paternal and benevolent eye of the present Prime Minister and of his Siamese brother the Minister of Justice. However, I did not suspect, at the time, that this double-dealing had no other immediate purpose than the triumph of the Tory party of old, over the policy of Baldwin-Lafontaine, MacNab-Morin and Macdonald-Cartier. True to the political principles of those men which alone had got me elected to this House, I did not hesitate, on two different occasions, to ask, by way of a resolution, full and complete justice for the Catholic or Protestant minority in the territory of Keewatin which was purported to be annexed to the province of Manitoba. Then again, at the following session, when the present Prime Minister, back from England, expressed, in the speech from the Throne, his desire to change the nature of our constitutional relations with the mother country, I did not hesitate for a moment to urge, also by way of a resolution, that our political and constitutional status should not be changed. That amendment was opposed by the Prime Minister, who stated that be could not accept it, because its adoption, said he, would preclude Canada from raising a finger for the defence of the Empire. During that same session I supported the leader of the Opposition in an effort to defeat the Government measure by which we were called upon to vote $35,000,000 as a contribution towards increasing the naval forces of the Empire.

Once more, on that occasion, I stated the grounds of my stand on that question, and honour be to the Canadian Senate who refused, in that case, to concur in the decision of the majority of this House! But, how fanciful the course of events, and how inconsistent the Tory policy! Those zealous apostles of the rights of the people as against the Laurier Naval Act, were then seen to refuse a plebiscite, or a referendum. and, God help me! general elections on this proposal of later date.

In the early days of this Parliament, Mr. Speaker, always for the sole purpose of remaining true to my promises towards the electors of my constituency, I hastened to ask the Government as to whether they intended to make good the word given to the electorate of the whole country to the effect that the Naval Bill would be repealed as soon as they took office, and on the 4th of March, 1912, I asked the Government the following question:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to propose that the Naval Act be repealed?
2. If so, does the Government intend, should such repeal take place, to introduce another Bill expressing the views of the Government in this connection?
3. If such further proposal is introduced, is it the intention of the Government to submit it to the approval of the people before it is enforced?

To this question the Government answered through the Minister of Marine (Hon. Mr. Hazen) as follows:

The answer to each of those three questions is: "Yes".

I paid no heed to the diplomatic note which the honourable Minister of Marine thought it proper to append to the main part of that answer.

It is now up to the House and to the country to pass judgment as they see fit to do, in the light of the present events, upon a Government so regardless of the most solemn pledges. As for me, I had the satisfaction of having discharged my duty and, I was about to forget it, I had the approbation of a man who, at the time, was a prospective senator of our province.

After all, I was easily comforted, from the 1st of August, 1914, the date on which the present war was declared, by the thought that the present Government which, up to that time, had been unwilling to do anything towards organizing the defence of our country on sea, might at least, thanks to the foresight and political genius of a statesman of our race, and I venture to say the greatest we have had since the days of Cartier, utilize our naval units for the protection of our coasts and provide for our most elementary defence.

Honourable members will perhaps understand a little more clearly that this statement of mine is neither gratuitous nor dictated by circumstances, when they have been made aware of the fact that, speaking at Sherbrooke, the queen city of the Eastern Townships in our province, previous to the present war, that is, on the 14th of May, 1913, I stated that, from the day England was engaged in a war threatening to the destinies of the British Empire, it would be the duty of Canada to assist the mother country. Who will say that the destinies of the British Empire are not at stake in the present war? Who will venture to claim

that, in the present war, England is not fighting for the most rightful and the noblest of causes? Let others give themselves up to minute and perhaps untimely inquiries as to the faults and errors of England; as for me, I have no wish to scrutinize the hidden thoughts of the British statesmen and, in accord with Cardinal Mercier, I take the undoubted fact, the fact which nobody can deny: While Germany was violating clause 7 of the treaty signed at London on the 17th of April, 1839, by King Leopold in the name of Belgium, of the first part, and by the Emperor of Austria, the King of France, the Queen of England, the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Russia, of the second part, England remained true to her oath. This I do not seek to minimize, but would rather seek to magnify, for it becomes a well-born child to commend all commendable acts of his forerunners. Therefore, taking into account the various events which have preceded and brought about the war, I have been and I am still of opinion that Canada should participate in this war voluntarily and freely. However, and I state it emphatically, I do not agree with those who believe that when England is at war, Canada is also at war. Proceeding from a normal and generous sentiment, this participation is one of a special character which it is most difficult to limit, and that is why I wish, first of all, that the Canadian people who, I think, are actuated by those same sentiments, should, of their own motion, determine that limit. It would not be so if the question were to fulfil and to execute an obligation; for, as a limit is necessarily implied in all obligations, that limit would be fixed and determined.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unaware of the fact that the present participation of Canada is helping France, and I am proud to be of French descent; but as England is fighting for England, so is my participation looking to Canada first and then to England the free institutions of which have so far preserved our nationality. That is why, in August, 1914—and I say this purposely—the Parliament of Canada was perfectly unanimous in voting, as a matter of urgency, $50,000,000 to pay the expenses of sending volunteers only. Need I quote, here, the words uttered within the precincts of this Parliament, on the 28th of May last, by A. J. Balfour, the great British statesman and democrat, who appreciated the nature of this participation in the light of the constitution by which we are governed?

> The Government of the Mother Country cannot raise a corporal's guard in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or wherever you will; she can not raise a shilling of taxation; she has no power. (Hansard, House of Commons, May 28th, 1917.)

Unfortunately for Canada, its Militia Department was administered, at the time, by a man whose fitness for filling such an important position, even under ordinary circumstances might have been doubted. Redent developments made his position more important than that of the Prime Minister and it seemed only natural that the management of this department should be confided to some other than the regular representative of the Orange lodges. Nevertheless, and I have no hesitation in stating the fact, in spite of all outside as well as inside clamours, the Prime Minister continued his confidence in the Minister of Militia until the revelations of a commission which was extra-judicial and non-parliamentary—for more would have been known—forced the Prime Minister decidedly to break with the representative of the lodges who had made our military organization sectarian in its character to the extent that not only the French Canadians, but even the Anglo Canadians whose fitness was not recognized by a whole hive of middlemen, wearing, or not, the military uniform, were denied finding favour with the department.

Notwithstanding such difficulties, I may say it to the glory of our people, the system of voluntary enlistment succeeded beyond our most optimistic expectations.

Our military organization, under the direction of the Minister of Militia, was absolutely defective from the outset because it had the defence of the Empire rather than of Canada as its object. In a word, it was sought to have Canada play a leading part in this war, whereas, taking our financial position, our population and our resources into account, our help to England should have been limited to the exact proportion in which Canada could contribute. The Department of Militia was left for three years under the almost exclusive control of the member for Victoria and Haliburton as we may call him so now that he is sitting here with us instead of taking his place in the trenches "somewhere in France," as he gave us to understand that he would do when he delivered a certain speech in New York, in which he first promised—before the Prime Minister did—to send 300,000 soldiers from Canada, and even 500,000 if need be.

Untiring worker, since he left the cabinet he first thought of getting chosen

again as a Tory candidate in Victoria, where he met another opportunity to abuse the French Canadians of this country at a political meeting held recently. A few days after, he came to the House and, in the absence of the Prime Minister, he put on the Orders of the Day a resolution which entailed compulsory service for others.

Are we to presume that, when the Prime Minister was back here, he again yielded to the influence of this evil spirit? At any rate, in the same way that he had supported the request for 500,000 men, so did he introduce, just after his return from England, such a military conscription Bill as the ex-Minister of Militia said he desired.

History must have a very severe judgment in reserve for the men who, to-day, would turn this voluntary, free and generous contribution of our people into an obligation, and who, by the very fact, are paralysing the efforts of Canada while the war is raging, the most portentous war England ever had to wage. In fact, and it should not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, the untimely and, to express the whole of my thought, the unskilful manner in which the Prime Minister submitted this Bill to Parliament has alienated from him certain sympathies which he would now try in vain to get back. I would say, further, that the nature of the debate which has been carried on in this House for a fortnight, has caused every earnest listener to understand that one should rather take interest in the unity of Canada, henceforth, before looking to the unity of the Empire.

Certain English papers of this country, like certain members of this House, vie with each other in denouncing the disloyalty of the French Canadians who. they say, deliberately refuse to enlist and seem to have become unworthy of the consideration granted to all British subjects. Shall I say it? This movement against the province of Quebec seems to be more especially marked in the province of Ontario, which would appear to have nothing more at heart than to see Quebec isolated from the rest of Confederation. Unless I am mistaken about the intention of that province with respect to us, it is not at all unlikely that the conditions might be reversed and that the province which longed to isolate another should be isolated itself.

The Canadians of French descent have done their share in this war, if we consider the impediments of every kind and description which were set in their way. I shall only speak of the nature of those impediments in general terms, as several members have dealt with it more in greater detail. Our people are attached to the soil upon which their ancestors have settled, and in their estimation, Canada is the only country worth while to them. When this country was conquered, the French Canadians were disarmed lest they should not willingly submit to the new régime, and yet, the history of the struggles rendered necessary for the defence of our soil has recorded the names of no worthier defenders than they were. Not so long ago our gallant 65th Regiment did great honour to itself in the western prairies by calming an agitation by which peace and order were threatened in the interior of the country. By the way, may I recall, right here, the order according to which severe instructions were given a few years ago to the effect that this French regiment should present arms no more in honour of the Most High. What a sound military teaching, and what better means than this could be resorted to in order to make the sovereign power of the King of England more respected! The assertion is made repeatedly in certain quarters that the present Bill is aimed especially at the province of Quebec. I yet refuse to believe it. If it were so, now would be the time for us to investigate the real meaning of our political and constitutional status in this Confederation, the fiftieth anniversary of which we have just celebrated. We have attained manhood, and before we reach old age which would imply a heavier loss of the privileges guaranteed to us by Confederation, we shall seriously consider the advisability of asking that the federal covenant be set aside. There must be no superior race or inferior race in this country. Those who have associated together as a confederation must enjoy equal rights, and as to us, French Canadians, we have, so far, respected our obligations to the extent that the province of Quebec—and I do not hesitate to say it—may well be quoted as an example to all the rest of Canada for the fair treatment granted by her to minorities, within her limits, they enjoy all the privileges guaranteed to them by the constitution. Is it so, Mr. Speaker, with the minorities in the other provinces? Was it so in New Brunswick in 1872? Has it been so in Manitoba ever since 1890? Is it so in this province of Ontario? Do our fellow countrymen enjoy a full and complete liberty in the matter of school teaching? As an answer to this, you hold out to us the letter of the law, but we appeal to the spirit of this same law, and adding hypocrisy to abuse, certain members of this House declare, at times, that rule 17 was adopted in

the province of Ontario, in order that the teaching of the French language in that province might be favoured to greater extent. No, long enough have statements of the kind been read by us with an excessive equanimity, and the House will allow me to recall, in this connection, the clatter indulged in by the lodges when the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) thought fit to have a postal card printed in English and French and distributed in Ontario as well as in Quebec. Ontario, have I said, is practically wrong in taking a position so inimical to minorities, because, in due time, all the minorities in Canada might perhaps adopt as their slogan that of the province of Quebec: "I remember". The province of Ontario has been all-powerful with the present Administration, she has made an ill use of that power, even, by the fact that she was instrumental in delaying, so far, the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, a national enterprise above all, and which would have brought about closer relations between the eastern and the western part of Canada, and the opening of the most direct route through the St. Lawrence river up to the head of the Great Lakes.

I should not conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, without stating openly that I am not scared beyond measure by the furious outcry which may be directed against our province—— I say our province, for I am confident that right-minded people of the great and beautiful province of Ontario are with us. We rely also on the farming community of the West to silence the ambitions, inordinate in many cases, of the Ontario manufacturers. As to our good friends of the Maritime Provinces, I do not think they would find any advantage in parting with their good neighbours of the province of Quebec. May the province of Ontario be inspired, at last, with a true Canadian spirit and never compel her sister provinces to adopt measures for paralyzing her action so necessary to our national life, thereby averting the possibility of a central empire being created in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been my pleasure to address this House in the language of the majority, but as long as it will be sought in this province and outside of this House, to preclude the French children from learning the French languague at school, I shall deem it my duty to speak, here, the language guaranteed to us by the constitution, thanks to the efforts of the Liberal-Conservative party, and in spite of the systematic opposition of the Tory party. So that no doubt is left in any mind as to the broadmindedness of the province of Quebec in general and of the electors of the county which I have the honour to represent. I may say that the county of Yamaska elected, for twelve consecutive years, as its representative at the local legislature the only English-speaking and Protestant elector who resided within the limits of that county, I mean the late Justice Wurtele.

Mr. Speaker, any one may call me a Conservative, a Nationalist or a Liberal if he likes; to my mind, a question of this nature admits of no party, we are guided solely by the sentiment which is in the heart of each of us.

However, I hope that after listening to me no one shall doubt that I intend henceforth to support the distinguished statesman who does credit to the Canadian Liberal party which under his far-seeing guidance represents, better than any other, heretofore, the true aspirations of our race.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) has said that in this war we are fighting for Canada. That is quite true, but I think we should take a broader view of the struggle than that. There has been some discussion as to whether or not Canada is in any special danger on account of this war. Canada may not be in any special danger, but the world is in very grave danger. This is a world war, and will have world-wide effects, and the welfare of humanity is of more importance than even the welfare of Canada. We are citizens of the world as well as citizens of Canada, and I believe the real interest of humanity is to do our best in the winning of the war. I have been reluctantly forced to the conclusion that, in order to do our proper part, it is advisable that we should adopt the principle of conscription. I would be ashamed to admit that I had otherwise than reluctantly come to a conclusion that would cause me to give a vote to force men to fight and, if needs be, to die in this terrible war. But having come to that conclusion I do not feel it is necessary for me to offer any apologies for differing from my leader on this question. I heartily concur in all that has been said in praise of the leader of the Liberal party by those who have felt it necessary on this occasion to differ from him. I have more confidence in the judgment of the leader of the Liberal party than in that of any other member of this House; but our actions must be guided by our own judgment and not by the judgment of someone else, and in voting on this question, I will follow the dictates of my conscience.

We on this side have received a great deal of advice from the press of this country on both sides of politics. We have been solemnly warned that we should not play politics with conscription, and we have been warned with equal solemnity of the result to our party if we should vote for a referendum; that is, we must not play politics on the question of conscription, but we must play politics on the question of a referendum. I refuse to play politics on either question. The Journal-Press of this city on the 21st of June made the statement that I justified my willingness

> To make bed-fellows of anti-conscriptionists on the ground that the grain growers' platform which I had signed, had contained the plank favouring a referendum.

I have never on any occasion, either to myself or to any one else, justified my proposed vote on any such ground. I know but one way to justify my vote on this question, and that is by voting as I believe to be right. The Journal-Press continues:

> Even this hon. member would rush to the support of the Government if he thought there was any danger of the amendment carrying and the Government being defeated.

I do not purpose swallowing my convictions to save the Liberal party, and I am not going to swallow them to save the Conservative party. That is not the way in which parties are saved. I believe the Liberal party is well worth saving, but I do not believe the Conservative party is.

We have heard a great deal about the responsibility of the Government for the condition of affairs as it now exists and for the failure of recruiting. I quite agree that the Government is very largely responsible for that condition, but I think that the French Canadian agitators of Quebec and the anti-French agitators of Ontario must share the responsibility. I believe every hon. member of this House feels, from the bottom of his heart, that it is true that the control of the war organization of this country has been rotten with partisanship and patronage, and that is doing a great deal to upset the confidence of the people in the administration of affairs. The sooner that condition is remedied, the better.

I agree also that the failure to conscript wealth has had a great deal to do with the failure of the public to have in the Administration that confidence that is necessary in all cases. Let me quote, with approval now, a few words from the Journal-Press of 26th of June on the question of the conscription of wealth:

> Knowledge on the part of all, that everybody was being made to do the utmost would be an addition of immeasurable strength to our effort.

Nothing can be truer than that statement. It is necessary at all times that there should be public confidence in the actions of the Government, and in the history of Canada there has been no time when that has been more necessary than the present, although it seems to me that our hon. friends opposite have failed to recognize the fact. We are told that we are raising as much from the wealth of the country as is needed to be raised from the wealthy classes for the purposes of the war. I do not believe that; I take issue with that statement immediately. We should have paid very much more than we have done of the war expenditures of the year from direct taxation which should be imposed upon the wealthy men of the country, and we should take less from the poor man through our outrageously high customs tariff. Further than that, we require to raise much more money each year to deal honestly with our men at the front. We are paying them $1.10 a day, whereas unskilled labourers receive much more than that for perfectly safe work. A farm labourer in my locality can earn from $500 to $600 a year; he must get in addition three squares meals a day, regularly served, and he must have comfortable accommodation and bed or he will not stay. Our men at the front are in daily danger of mutilation and death; they are living in every discomfort that one can imagine; they are living in the midst of mud and dirt and surrounded by rats and vermin; they have to undergo all the horrors of war, and still we are not paying them as much as we pay our unskilled labourers. Some of the fiercest denunciations of the prophets of old were hurled against those who defrauded the labourer of his hire, but every day we are defrauding our labourers at the front of their hire, and now we are proposing to compel men to fight, and yet we are not going to pay them a reasonable wage for the suffering they will have to undergo. The fact that the Allies are not paying a reasonable wage is no excuse for us.

We hear a great deal about our duty to our boys in the trenches. The man who speaks most eloquently about our duty to our boys in the trenches is the man over military age, with a good income, who has no sons of military age, either in the trenches or elsewhere, who pays such sums

to the Patriotic and Red Cross funds as do not inconvenience him in the least, and who pays his employees in comfort at home from $2 to $7 a day. Those whose hearts are in the trenches, whose flesh and blood are in the trenches, and in the hospitals and graves of France, cannot speak so glibly about these things. It is time we cut out this sentimental slobbering about our duty to our boys in the trenches until we are prepared to deal honestly with them.

We have heard a good deal about the probable working out of this measure, and I quite agree with the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) in his suggestions as to what the probable working out will be unless the provisions are materially changed. I do not purpose dealing with those provisions now. We shall have an opportunity of dealing with them later on, but they certainly must be drastically changed before this measure will be in anything like workable shape. It may be that the Government, in bringing this Bill before us, is merely playing a political game. I do not know whether that is the case or not, but we are placed in a certain position, and I am not going to discuss the question as to who is to blame for that position. We are placed in it and we must face it. It does not matter to me whether the Government is dealing with this question honestly or not; I must deal with it honestly, and I purpose voting for conscription, because I believe it is the proper way in which to face the position in which we are placed. We have entered into the war for the benefit of humanity, and the obligation is on us to do our best to win the war as speedily as possible. That obligation is just as great upon us as it is upon Great Britain and France, and those countries have found it necessary to adopt conscription, and it is advisable that we should do the same. The call for men, food and munitions is so great that it is necessary to get them with as little economic disturbance as possible, and it is only by selective conscription that that can be done. I have watched the work of recruiting in my own locality. In my own town a friend of mine is in charge of recruiting. Not a political friend but a personal friend. Were he a political friend he would not be in charge. My political friends may go to the trenches but that is the only possible connection with this war that is open to them, and that is true of hon. members on this side generally. I believe that this friend of mine of whom I speak has done his work faithfully and well to the best of his ability. He has been well supported, but the work of late has been most unsuccessful.

The results are practically nil. It seems to me that the voluntary plan is wasteful at the present stage, and has been wasteful for the past eighteen months; it should have been changed at that time. Though I have come to this conclusion I do not propose to criticise those who think differently. Each has to think this matter out for himself, and vote as he believes to be right. I believe that conscription was more needed a year ago than it is now, and that it would have been much more effective if it had been put in force then, but I would not have voted for it a year ago as I was not in favour of it then.

The Government, if they are honest, were opposed to conscription a few weeks ago. The Government are turncoats on this question, and so am I, but I do not propose to criticise those who do not turn their coats at the same moment as myself; I think it would be very bad taste.

We are asked to avoid playing politics on the conscription issue, but at the same time they ask us to be guided by the possible effects on our party of a vote for the referendum. If that is not playing politics, I do not know what playing politics means.

I do not approve of the way this conscription measure was brought before the House. I think it was as badly timed and as badly staged as it possibly could be. Neither do I approve of the way the referendum proposal came before the House. But conscription and the referendum are before us, and I propose to vote on the principle of conscription and on the principle of the referendum, no matter how they were brought before the House. If the Government will pledge themselves to submit the question of conscription to the people by way of referendum, if they desire the principle of the Bill to be first approved, I will support them. My own idea is that the best way should be to approve of the principle of the Bill, and afterwards get it in shape either before or after a referendum. The Bill could even be got in shape while the people were getting ready to vote on the question. I will support the Government in whatever step they take so long as the question is first submitted to the people. I propose to vote for submitting it to the people whenever I get the chance.

It has been argued that if it is right to take a vote of the people on conscription,

a vote should have been taken before we entered the war. I do not want to accuse any one of insincerity, but I can hardly see how any one who advances that argument can think for one moment that there is anything in it. It would have been absolutely impossible to have taken a vote on the question of entering the war; there would have been no time for it. More than that, in August, 1914, the public were practically unanimous that we should enter the war. It would have been utter nonsense to have taken a vote of the people on that question.

Two very large and very important sections of the community are now strongly opposed, not to carrying on the war, but to a certain plan for carrying on the war; they are strongly opposed to conscription.

I was in favour of direct legislation long before I became a member of this House. I placed myself publicly on record in favour of direct legislation before the principle was adopted as a plank of the platform of the Grain Growers' Association of my province. When the naval question was up in this House I suggested that the Government submit the question to the people in the form of a referendum. Later on an amendment was moved by a Nationalist member of the House that the measure be submitted to the people by way of referendum. I knew that a vote for the nationalist amendment would be unpopular with my leaders, but I believed it was right to vote for the amendment, and I voted for it accordingly.

It has been argued that we should not submit the conscription measure to the people by way of referendum because the measure would be defeated. Surely that is a horrible reason, with all respect to those who advance it. The fact remains, however, that for every man who gives that opinion publicly dozens give it privately. I believe the expectation that the measure would be defeated in a referendum is largely responsible for the opposition to the referendum amendment. What does that mean? We say that we are fighting in this war for democracy as opposed to autocracy. Now a democratic government, as I understand it, is government of the people, for the people, by the people, that is majority rule. What is autocracy? Autocracy is the rule of the many by a select few, and some people want that select few to be hon. gentlemen in this House. They want the members of this House to rule whether the people approve or not; that is minority rule. I think those who urge us to vote against the referendum because conscription would be defeated, are placing themselves in a peculiar position. They are asking our boys to fight and die for principles which they themselves refuse to put into practice. They would force our men to go out and kill Germans for fighting for principles which they themselves practise.

The Kaiser claims a divine right to rule Germany. Well, about a half a century ago the people of Germany selected an emperor to rule over them, and they provided means for the appointment of a successor to that emperor after his death. The German Emperor, on the strength of this, claims a divine right to rule. We were elected to this House some years ago. For what? To represent the people of Canada. But now some are claiming the right, not to represent the people of Canada, but to misrepresent them and to rule over them. What is the difference then, between the situation here and that in Germany? In Germany they have one big Kaiser, and in Canada we have a lot of little would-be Kaisers,—that is about the difference as I see it.

We are told that we must lead public opinion. But the proposition put forward is, not to lead public opinion but to muzzle it. I am quite willing to take my part in leading public opinion, but I do not care to take part in muzzling it. We are told that it would be better to have a general election instead of a referendum. No reason has been given for that, and I suppose that is because no reason can be given. Why should we adopt that plan unless for the purpose of finding out what the people want —getting the views of the people? But, if we want to get the views of the people, the simplest way is a referendum. After a referendum has been held we shall actually know what the people want. Why should we have an election? The only reason I can see is to confuse the issue and defeat the will of the people; I have not heard any other reason given. In a general election the issues will be obscured; and, so far as the boys at the front are concerned, very much obscured. If we ask the soldiers to vote for or against conscription, they will know what they were doing; but, with the present confusion of political parties in Canada, in a general election they would not know what they are doing; they might want to vote for conscription but at the same time they would be voting against it. I think that in most English-speaking constituencies the majority are in favour of conscription. But those in favour of conscription are divided into two parties. What would be the result? In the

constituency in which sixty per cent of the people are in favour of conscription and forty opposed to it, what are they going to do? The anti-conscriptionists are not fools altogether; there will be a Liberal conscriptionist nominated and a Conservative conscriptionist nominated. This will divide the conscriptionist vote, naturally anti-conscriptionists would win and that will mean minority rule. I do not know that that sort of minority rule would be very popular, or that it is just, fair and reasonable.

I am in favour of the referendum because I think it is the quickest way to get support for our men in the trenches. I am satisfied as to that, and cannot see an argument in support of any other plan. We could in a very few weeks have the whole question settled by this means; and I am satisfied that if the question is fairly put before the people conscription will carry. I am willing to do my part in trying to have it carried. And I am prepared at all times to trust the people. While I try to make clear here what is the best plan, I recognize that, in this House, as in the country, the majority must rule. If the amendment in favour of a referendum is voted down, I will do what I can to make this Bill workable; and my feeling is that we ought all to do the same. But I say we should trust the people. I would like to make one last appeal to the Government to trust the people. If they do not trust the people how can they expect the people to trust them? And why should the people trust them? If the Government refuse to have faith in the people, I think that the people, at the first opportunity will hurl this faithless Government from power. But if we have faith in the people, we establish democracy in Government, which, we say, is the principle for which this whole war is fought.

Mr. LOUIS J. PAPINEAU (Beauharnois): (translation): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the remarks I have to make about the very important question now under consideration, I will take the liberty of calling attention to the statements made by some of the hon. members of this House.

The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) has told us that, if the province of Quebec had answered the call for volunteers as did the other provinces, there would have been no necessity for introducing a compulsory service Bill. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) assures us, on his part, that the province of Quebec will be the least affected. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Armstrong) asserts as the raison d'être of this measure that the French Canadian has not done his duty. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) also deplores that efficient methods have not been adopted in Quebec, so as to educate the French population to the most important and vital questions raised by the present conflict. La Patrie of June 19, 1917, reproduced the following item from the Mail and Empire of Toronto:

The Mail and Empire admits that the Military Service Bill will affect Quebec more seriously than the other provinces.

> When our volunteers offered themselves, did they make conditions? Did they say, "We will not go unless men from Quebec volunteer in due proportion?" They did not. And is French-speaking Canada, through the medium of recreant partisans of small calibre in English-speaking Canada, to dictate conditions in the matter of compulsory service?
>
> There has not been equality of sacrifice. Quebec, with its large population, has not figured largely in the recruiting of the army. The Military Service Bill will rectify that inequality in so far as reinforcements are concerned. The 50,000 or 100,000 or whatever other number of new forces are to be raised to support our men at the front, will be drafted on a basis equitable to all the provinces. It is a measure to ensure equality of sacrifice. * * *

The hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) has told us there was not one available man in Ontario, and my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) states that in the city of Guelph, there are three or four hundred men he hopes to reach through this Bill.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the object is compulsory service because, according to the quotations I have just read, the province of Quebec has shirked her duty. It is therefore, worth while to examine those various statements and see whether they are well-founded or not. I will try to be brief and say very frankly what kind of a situation has been made to that province, since the beginning of the war, as far as enlistment is concerned. I do not wish to repeat here what has already been said, but I will submit to you, Mr. Speaker, a few observations that may perhaps put the conditions in their true light.

Long before the month of August, 1914, the general impression was that a war, with the enormous armaments of the nations taking part in it, could not be of long duration. Europe, according to public opinion, expected the conflict and years had been spent in making the required preparations. The burden of armaments was crushing the na-

tions under ever increasing taxation and rendered, so to speak, the catastrophe inevitable. So, as soon as war had been declared, the general impression was that, with the modern war machinery, it might last only a few months, six at the most. It has been lasting for almost three years and the end is not yet. However, in August, 1914, that impression of a most fierce and disastrous war, but of very short duration, did exist.

Enlistment and the levy of battalions in the province of Quebec were not conducted in such a way as to encourage and induce the French Canadians to enlist. What were the intentions or the designs of those who organized recruiting? I believe that politics, here again, played a nefarious part.

I understand that, when the first contingent was organized, two French Canadian battalions were incorporated in it, and that five thousand French Canadians who tried to enlist, could find no place in those ranks. Later on, a French Canadian offered to raise a battalion, but his offer was turned down, English Canadians had been authorized to form other battalions and he should have to wait. Mr. so and so and Mr. another must be given the preference before a new authorization could be granted, which by the way, has never been given. There has been, as far as I can see, politics at the bottom of this whole matter. I cite this case, but is it the only one? Who can tell us there have not been many similar ones? I do assert that, even in this third year of the war, they still persisted in thwarting the recruiting among the French Canadians. I know that they may deny what I now say here, because I do not want to be formal and I refuse to give any details. However, I believe that the facts I mention are well grounded.

In his speech, the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir A. E. Kemp) has mentioned the name of Lieut.-Col. A. M. Labelle. He told us that this officer had done all he could towards recruiting. My hon. friend from Saint Mary's (Mr. Martin) told him that Col. Labelle had three sons and that not one of them had gone to the front. I must say that, in fact, this officer has three sons, one aged 13, another 18, and the third, who is 22 years old, is in the service since August 7, 1914.

In 1914, there was in the Militia Department a patronage list, and on November 17, 1914, the name of Lieut.-Col. Labelle was placed on that list, as evidenced by the following letter:

[Mr. Papineau.]

Minister's Office,
Ottawa, November 17, 1914.

Dear Colonel Labelle,

As requested by Mr. H. B. Ames, M.P., I have had much pleasure in placing your name upon the Patronage List of this department.

Faithfully,
(Signed) Sam. Hughes.

Lt.-Colonel A. M. Labelle,
34 Versailles St.,
Montréal, Que.

What was the object of this proceeding? I do not know. What I do know is that Lieut.- Col. Labelle was a good officer who had been 16 years in the Militia before the declaration of war. The Militia Council reports for the years 1912 and 1913 give praise to him and to his battalion. That of 1912 states that the commander of the 65th Battalion is a zealous and enthusiastic officer, perfectly understanding his duties. In 1913, the Militia Council communicated to him the following remarks from the Inspecting officer:

A very fine regiment and, thanks to the wonderful energy and zeal of its commander, it has made great progress at camp.

On September 9, 1915, Lieut.-Col. A. M. Labelle offered to recruit and organize a battalion for service in Europe and addressed his request to the ex-Minister of Militia. He stated that in the district where his battalion was being recruited, there were at least 400 men who would enlist under his command. Many had previously been in active service and all were trained soldiers. He wrote that he had been promised the funds required for the purchase of a machine gun, if he were permitted to raise that new battalion. He added that he had the co-operation of sixteen efficient officers and suggested as second commanding officer Capt. C. T. W. Etches, who had taken part in the South African War. As to his capacity for organizing and commanding this battalion, he referred the minister to his military record. On October 14, 1915, he renewed his offer to the 4th Military District C. O., in Montreal. On October 25, 1915, he received an answer thanking him for his offer and informing him that, for the present, the organizing of a battalion for overseas service could not be considered.

Lieut.-Col. Labelle continued doing his duty and he did what he could, as the Minister of Militia declared before this House, in his speech of June 25. I believe they were wrong in refusing that offer.

Two months later, January 1, 1916, the Right Hon. Prime Minister raised his offer of soldiers for the overseas service to 500,000 men, and on July 16, 1916, the Minister of Militia made him a report wherein we read the following:

At the time you offered the half-million, it was as well known as it is now, that Quebec was not doing her duty, nor were some other parts of Canada doing theirs, although it must be borne in mind that the Acadians have done magnificently and I firmly believe that it is possible to get Quebec to fall into line later.

Recruiting was already ebbling and yet, two months previous, the formation of new battalions could not be entertained. In that same report, I read the following:

So far as recruiting for the future in Canada is concerned, your promise of half a million men could easily be fulfilled. But it will not be fulfilled, if you permit yourself to be hampered by raising little drafts here and little drafts there, sent over in charge of junior lieutenants.

If it was so easy as he said, I regret, and the whole country will regret it also, that he did not attend to it. I have just told you, Mr. Speaker, that in October, 1915, recruiting was not progressing. However, about that time, not later than January or February, 1916, a new battalion, the 206th was authorized. It was during the period when the Government authorized recruiting in localities where they could levy 25 men or more. That is what the ex-Minister of Militia mentions as the 3rd recruiting method, in his letter of July 5, 1916, which he quoted in the course of the debate. According to this system, I understand that the recruits were left in their own localities, if they were 25 or over and could board there. They were paid $1.10 and 75 cents for their daily allowance. As these men were given to understand they would never leave the country, the proposition was an alluring one. And so the recruiting went on fine, but it did not last long, and in June, at Valcartier, a large number of these recruits unfit for service were discharged. One of them had swollen veins; another was flat-footed; another was ruptured; one or two were maimed, having been the victims of some accident a few yers before their enlistment. I know that one of these had two fingers of his right hand missing. The battalion was disbanded, and a Montreal paper informed us that about ten of its officers were liable to pass before a military tribunal. I add, without further comment, that the commander of this battalion was an ex-Conservative candidate. There have also been other abuses and I wish to particularly refer to the enlistment of more youths of fifteen, sixteen and seventeen years of age, without their parents' consent and knowledge. Here are a few cases I may quote to the House: Israël Sauvé, enlisted in June 1915, at 16, in the 69th; Alfred Martin, No. 2158489, born May 23, 1901, enlisted March last in the 230th battalion of Ontario. It is a Forestry battalion, as I understand it. Armand Martin, born March 29, 1900, No. 1090400, and Adelard Faubert, No. 1090401, born January 26, 1900. All of them are French Canadians of the province of Quebec and are in battalions of the province of Ontario. I consider that these youths ought not to have been accepted, and that before long they will be returned home for the work is too much for them and they will probably be a burden to their families and to the State.

I mention these few facts in order to demonstrate how recruiting was carried on in a portion of the province of Quebec. Whence I infer that if volunteering has given only the results obtained and which are being so harshly criticized to-day—it is because the Government has not taken the proper means to obtain better ones, and did not care to do so. Complaints are being made, and rightly so, I believe, about the treatment given to the soldiers returned from the front, if I can judge by a case which I happened to come across quite recently: Private Jos. Delisle was wounded at Ypres. He has his discharge, his conduct has been good. He received a bayonet wound in the right fore-arm, and a piece of shrapnel tore off his right elbow. He was laid up for eleven months in various hospitals and convalescent wards. He returned to the country and was discharged at Quebec, on January 31, 1917. This soldier is twenty-six years of age and a married man. The Pension Commission, upon a report of advisers, which declare that his elbow-joint is anchylosed and that this incapacity is probably a permanent one, grant him a pension of $8 per month. He maintains that his elbow was torn off by a splinter of a shell, and I believe he ought to know what he's talking about. I do not intend to discuss this case, but I refer to it in order to establish, with the other facts I have already related, that you cannot expect to get soldiers with such treatment. I do not want to take up the time of the House in repeating arguments against conscription, from the legal or the economic point of view, both of which have been so well and so thoroughly discussed. I will take the liberty of making only one remark upon this subject. Recently, I received a letter informing me that the Government intend calling in Chinese to take the places of the men they want to compel and send over to the front. My correspondent asserts that his representative, my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Morris) has stated in

his own presence that the Government had already sent for 35,000 of them; that he had seen some of them at work and had been surprised to find them such good men. We are told that we need soldiers to fill the gaps, that we must go and relieve those who have gone away. We have promised to send them all the assistance in men that they might need, and for that, we must have conscription.

Who ever thought of conscription when these soldiers left? Who spoke of it? Nobody even thought of it. They went away as volunteers and they could not expect any but volunteers like themselves to join them at the front. If they ask for more than that, their demand is extravagant. And when the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) intimates that, if conscription is not adopted, the soldiers returning from the front may perhaps commit excesses to take revenge for not having received the desired reinforcements, if however they did desire any, I say that such language is an incentive to riot and to civil war without any plausible motive, and that he is uselessly trying to intimidate the country by such talk. The Right Hon. Prime Minister has on that occasion, spoken in terms unworthy of the high position he occupies.

I find it strange, but I am not surprised, when some honourable gentleman who boils with indignation at certain utterances of my honourable friend from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier), finds fault with the speech of the Prime Minister which lends itself to some such interpretation.

We have in France and in England about 240,000 men, that is twelve divisions. There are four divisions, comprising 80,000 men, on the firing lines. If we deduct two more divisions for the auxiliary services, there still remain 6 divisions or 120,000 men on the reserve. It seems to me that in continuing the voluntary recruiting system, it would be an easy matter to supply the required number of soldiers, without resorting to conscription.

The New York Times of June 29 last, commenting on the fact that the American troops will be commanded by their American general and independent of all other control—but this General consulting and acting in concert with the commanders of the French and British armies, says that this will prevent jealousy and discontent, as was the case for Canada, because our soldiers, under the orders of the British authorities, have suffered hardships.

Are our soldiers sent more often than in their turn to the most exposed points? One might believe it. If such were the case, we must expect not only a levy of 50,000 or 100,000 men, but that many others will have to follow, and sooner than is generally expected.

After having announced his conscription policy, the Prime Minister proposed to the leader of the Opposition to form a coalition ministry, in order to have this measure adopted, and afterwards call for a general election to have this Act approved by the electorate. The Right Hon. Prime Minister contends that the seriousness of the situation made his coalition proposal not only desirable but even necessary. The parleying came to nothing, the Right Hon. leader of the Opposition stating that he could not accept a coalition having conscription as a basis. These negotiations were continued from May 24 to June 6.

The debate upon the second reading of this conscription Bill was opened June 18. On the 19th, the ex-Minister of Militia made this assertion:

> It is a well known fact that up to two weeks ago, distinguished members of the cabinet stated that there would be no compulsory service.

So, while negotiations were going on to have a coalition based upon conscription, having conscription as its essential condition, some ministers were declaring that there would be no compulsion. During these coalition negotiations, the Government entered on the Orders of the Day the Railway Act, which they had already introduced and then withdrawn in 1913. They might have even added the Naval Act, as a guarantee of their good faith. These two measures, being the most controversial of this Parliament, might well have been included in the henceforth famous coalition scheme.

Mr. Speaker, if conscription had been, I will not say necessary, but only useful to maintain Canada's effort in this war, it should have been easy for the Prime Minister to demonstrate that fact to the hon. leader of the Opposition. Had there been urgency, as it is said, it would have been so much easier to show it. Under such circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister had no need to offer a coalition government; in my opinion, it was an insult freely given, and a miserable political manœuvre for purely political ends. No, there was no necessity for a coalition of the political parties. I very well know, and nobody doubts it, in this House and in the country, that if the conscription measure proposed by the Government had been nec-

essary, the Right hon. leader of the Opposition would have so declared it, and while demanding that it be submitted to the people, he would have at the same time asked the people to approve it. The Opposition leader's patriotism is not based or dependent on either coalition or any political combination whatever. In truth, the idea of proposing the coalition of the political parties to pass a conscription Bill and then, by means of this union of both parties, resort to elections in order to enforce it on the people, is distinctly Tory. And, indeed, it did come and it could only come from a Conservative government. If the proposition to adopt this Act and then have an election to have it ratified is reasonable and for the general good of the country, and not merely a political manœuvre, why do not the Government adopt that policy? They have only to consent to consult the people and the Bill will go through to-morrow.

In moving his amendment to the amendment, the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette) stated that he had received from the various parishes of his county resolutions or petitions from his constituents demanding the referendum or elections, and he inserted in Hansard the very text of one of these resolutions.

The Government having stated their intention to have this Act adopted without referendum or elections, it seems to me that, if the hon. member for Berthier wished to comply with his electors' demand, he had only to vote in favour of the referendum proposed by the Right hon. leader of the Opposition, or else ask for general elections. But no, that did not suit the hon. member's purpose. His electors ask him a popular consultation, referendum or election, and he does not want them to decide the question themselves.

As this Parliament has no longer any legal existence and as we are here because we have voted ourselves an extension of time, it seems to me that the request of our electors, or rather of the electors of our counties—they are no longer electors, strictly speaking, since the month of October last—it is we who have appointed ourselves their representatives, it seems to me, therefore, that we should strictly comply with the requests they may submit to us, especially upon such an important question.

I have also received, Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Berthier, resolutions from the electors of my county, demanding a popular consultation. They ask that the question now under consideration be submitted to their own decision. I consider this demand entirely legitimate and reasonable. I shall not assume to decide it for them and, consequently, I will vote against the amendment to the amendment, in favour of the amendment asking for a referendum, and against the adoption of this Bill, so long as it has not been submitted to the Canadian people for approval.

Mr. DONALD NICHOLSON (Queens, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, my apology for addressing you at this late hour is that I do not desire to give a silent vote on this important question. When we look at the flags of the Allies with which this Chamber is decorated, we are reminded that at the commencement of the war, if the British Empire, to which we belong, had stood aside and remained neutral, permitting the German Empire to crush France, we and the Empire generally would have been spared a great loss of our manhood and a great outpouring of our wealth. But if the Empire had taken this course, would we, as Canadians, have been proud of our connection with the British Empire? No, Sir, I think that if the Empire had taken such a course, the feeling in this country would be in favour of tearing down the British flag and starting out as an honest independent and self-respecting nation. We as Canadians would never have endorsed such a course.

The object of the Bill now before the House is to obtain further men for the battle-front. Marshal Joffre, when in Montreal, emphasized the need of Canada sending more men. Sir Arthur Currie, the present commander of our forces in France, sent out a call to Canada to come over and help relieve the over-worked battalions who have been subjected to a great strain for the past two years and longer.

The number of voluntary enlistments in Canada has been a source of great pride to us and has far exceeded our expectations; but, at the same time, there are quite a number who could be spared and who would go if a campaign to secure further enlistments were started by the members of this House, with the object of winning the war instead of trying to obtain party advantage. The mover of the amendment which calls for a referendum (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said that Canada was not in danger of being invaded, which strengthens my opinion that he is not heartily in sympathy with sending men to Europe. The hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) stated that he was against the Bill but favoured

the amendment owing to the fact that he wished to follow his leader. This reminds me of an incident at the battle of Killicrankie. Scotland was invaded by a foe and the Government mustered the clans and appointed a leader. On the day of the battle two of the clans did not appear. Instead they hid behind crags and on the moors, and acted as the hon. gentleman is acting, simply because their chief, for certain reasons, refused, on the day of battle and trial, to join heartily with the rest of his country. We have here two regiments; some of the Liberals from the lower provinces and the province of Quebec are like snipers; they stand back when the country is invaded and refuse to take their part in its defence, simply and solely, according to their arguments, because of their great respect for their leader. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) insinuated that the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sevigny) was responsible for the poor recruiting in Quebec owing to alleged statements of six years ago, and he emphasized the fact that the minister was at that time thirty years old. We remember the time when the hon. member for St. John was forty years old and ran a campaign in St. John against his present leader, when he would not support Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Conservative party, in the elections of 1896, nor would he support the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—he wanted to become the leader of a party of his own. I wish that at some time he would explain to this House his reasons for that course. He now appears to have a great admiration for the right hon. gentleman. Judging from the speech of the hon. member for St. John, everything in connection with the war is being done wrong. You would imagine that the hon. member knew considerably more than General Haig or General Joffre, judging by the way he lectured the Government on their conduct of the war.

Much has been said about conscription of wealth and the imposition of an income tax. That is a serious problem that at an early date will have to be faced. Let me remind you that Canada to-day is practically on its own resources as to borrowing. We have large debts maturing, and these we shall be obliged to finance ourselves. Last year the revenue taken from the people was $230,000,000, almost $1,000,000 more than the usual amount. In addition to that, during the last two years there has been a very large contribution of money by the people of Canada; about $500,000,000 has been invested in war bonds by Canadians. I fear that before long there will be a stringency in the money market, so it is not wise to withdraw too much money from the people of Canada to-day. That is why it is not desirable at this time to devote too much money to the retirement of maturing debts.

When this war is over we will have increased taxes, and it will tax the ingenuity of the Finance Minister and Parliament to provide ways and means. I would suggest that an increase duty be placed on cigars, cigarettes and imported raw leaf cigar wrappers as high as 200 boxes, so as to encourage the growth of that style of leaf in this country. Twenty years ago the United States placed a duty of $1.85 on cigar wrappers. Now the best wrappers in the world are raised in Connecticut, owing to protection provided. The climate of some parts of Quebec is well adapted to raising that kind of leaf. In fact, it has been demonstrated. There is another suggestion made by Mr. W. F. Maclean, of York, and, if the facts are as he alleges with regard to nickel product, a large revenue could be obtained by imposing an export on that commodity, which is indispensable for the manufacture of certain articles.

In conclusion, I would appeal to my friends from Quebec to hold another caucus and place their great leader in his proper place amongst the statesmen of the Empire, by withdrawing the amendment and supporting the Bill. Let us all go to our constituents as serious men facing a great emergency. If you do not do so you place your leader and yourself in a position of antagonism to the rest of Canada, yes, further, to the United States, leave England out if you will, but what of France? We have heard Viviani, also Marshal Joffre, whose emphatic call was for men.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this Bill, because I remember the Lusitania incident, where that ship was torpedoed without warning, and men and women were heartlessly drowned. I remember, also, of the cruel murder of Edith Cavell, an angel of mercy, who was taken and heartlessly executed by this cruel German power. I remember, also, our friend, who used to sit alongside of me, who is now in a grave in France. I refer to our late colleague, Mr. Harry Baker, who sacrificed his young life in the interests of his country. There is another voice, Sir, in connection with this question, and that comes from Germany. It is not the Kaiser nor Hindenburg, but the voice of a colleague in this House, who was taken from his young bride, and in-

carcerated in a German prison and held there three years. When his wife died, they would not let him view the remains, even if accompanied by a guard. Things like that make me feel that I should support this Bill, in order to send men overseas to assist to break down the power of that nation, which is a menace to civilization. I am rather surprised at the tactics of the Opposition. It is well to have two political parties in this country, but I do not think the Liberals, especially those from Quebec, are treating their leader properly, and he is not treating the country as he should. He has been loyally supported in the lower provinces. At one time he had a solid eighteen supporters from Nova Scotia. Gentlemen rise in Parliament and blame his defeat on what? On Mr. Bourassa. They say he is the man who defeated them. I desire to say that I would not be in this House now, were it not for the issue that was placed before the country by the Liberal party in the election of 1911. The county I represent was in favour of the Liberal party, but that party was defeated solely on the reciprocity issue. The people of this country, not only in the lower provinces, but in Ontario and Quebec, largely turned against the Government on that question. It appears to me foolish for a gentleman to state that the people of this country are carried away by appeals to prejudice. I do not believe that anything of that sort will have any weight, and I do not think such appeals will place the country in a better position. What will be said when the vote is taken to-morrow night? Supposing one corner of Canada is against the remaining provinces, you are putting your leader up against the sentiment of the whole country. What will be said in London after the vote is taken? Surprise will be expressed. What will be said in France? Berlin, no doubt, and Vienna will be pleased. Constantinople, especially, will rejoice. You are backing up a power which has massacred the Armenians, and, by your conduct in voting against this measure, you are upholding the rule and power of Turkey.

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that I am desirous of addressing the House after the learned member who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Nicholson, Queens, P.E.I.); but in view of the lateness of the hour it seems to me that it may be deemed a hardship to detain the House any longer. Therefore, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think the hon. gentleman had better proceed a little while according to the arrangement.

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: What arrangement?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We desire to conclude the debate to-morrow night. However, my hon. friend from Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) desires to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Under the circumstances, I think I will consent.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. Thursday.

Thursday, July 5, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORTS.

Report of the British Columbia Hydrometric Survey for the calendar year 1915: Water Resources Paper No. 18 of the Dominion Water Powers Branch, Department of the Interior.—Mr. Roche.

Report of Special Trade Commission to Great Britain, France and Italy.—Sir George Foster.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

APPOINTMENTS UNDER O. C., 1 JAN., 1917.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. How many appointments have been made to date by each department of the Government under the Order in Council of January 1, 1917, amending Section 22 of the Civil Service Act.
2. How many of said appointments are temporary, and how many permanent?

Mr. SEVIGNY:

Department of Interior: 1, four; 2, all temporary.

Department of Mines: 1, two; 2, one permanent and one temporary.

Department of Militia and Defence: 1, Fifty-four; 2, all temporary.

CAPTAIN ALFRED LEFEBVRE.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

Why is it that Captain Alfred Lefebvre has signed a declaration respecting the separa-

tion allowance to his wife in which he stated that he was not in the employ of the Canadian Government before June, 1916, and that the said allowance was paid from February 10, 1916, to April 30, 1917?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. Capt. Alfred Lefebvre did not sign such a declaration. He did, however, sign a certificate that he had not been an employee of the Government since 1st June, 1916. The over payment of separation allowance to his wife was due to a clerical error of one of the untrained clerks in the Assigned Pay Branch. This clerk has been dismissed. As already explained, steps have been taken to obtain a refund of the overpayment.

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Since what date has Alfred Lefebvre been employed by the Government as sub-collector of Inland Revenue at Valleyfield?
2. What amount has he received for his services in this capacity during the fiscal year ending April 1, 1917?
3. Has the said Alfred Lefebvre been always occupied in this employment since his appointment?
4. If not, for what reason and during what period has he not been occupied in such position?
5. Has he received any salary during his absence from service?
6. What is his salary or compensation per annum?

Mr. SEVIGNY:

1. April 16, 1912.
2. $771.20.
3. No.
4. Enlisted as captain in the 206th Battalion, which battalion was later amalgamated with the 163rd Regiment, from February 10, 1916, and returned to his duties as deputy collector on July 16, 1916.
5. Received the difference between military pay and civil pay.
6. $1,200.

PRIVILEGE—MR. MONDOU.

Mr. A. A. MONDOU (Yamaska): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to raise a question of privilege. The Montreal Gazette, in its edition of this morning reports my speech last night in this House in part as follows:

> Mr. Mondou paid a typical eulogy to Sir Wilfrid Laurier as the greatest French Canadian statesman since Cartier, and concluded: "Whether they call me Liberal, Conservative or Nationalist, there is no party in a question of this kind. However, after my address tonight, no one can doubt that from now on I intend to support that great French Canadian statesman, who has done more than any other man to realize the aspirations of our race."
>
> [Mr. Papineau.]

Hansard shows the statement that I made, which is as follows:

> However, I hope that after listening to me no one shall doubt that I intend henceforth to support the distinguished statesman who does credit to the Canadian Liberal party which under his far-seeing guidance represents, better than any other, heretofore, the true aspirations of our race.

I understand that the Journal Press and the Citizen, both of Ottawa, have made comments to the same effect, as the Gazette, and I take also exception to what those two papers have stated in that connection.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

DEBATE CONTINUED ON MOTION FOR SECOND READING AND ON THE AMENDMENTS.

Consideration of the motion of the Right Hon Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. 75, Military Service Act, 1917, and the amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto, and on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Barrette, resumed from Wednesday, 4th July.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, in politics very queer things happen, but there are also troublesome things, necessary things, disagreeable and sometimes even pleasant things. In the political world, we are called upon to make sacrifices of all kinds, but I willingly condone all that my opponents have done against me. If there be a moment of satisfaction to me, it is now that I have the honour and pleasure of rising before this honourable House to discuss such a momentous question; it is a great compensation for every sacrifice that I have willingly made in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to greet new friends, to see them sitting in our midst and I hope that there will be many more ere long.

I have listened most attentively, with a great deal of pleasure, and I will even say dutifully, to all that has been said on either side. I have read and read again very carefully all that has been written; I have scrutinized the situation and pondered over the pros and cons, so as to properly ascertain my position. To-day, being called to speak for the electors of that fine and large county of Montcalm, it is a pleasure to me to be able to declare my views and my convictions on behalf of those good electors. A great many hon. members of this House have supported the conscription Bill and a great many others also have taken exception to it. In discussing this mo-

mentous question we are bound to respect the opinions of everybody, while bringing into the debate as much impartiality and fairness as possible. I would have been remiss in my duty had I not discussed this Bill, and now I hasten to state that I disapprove of it and that I strongly support the amendment submitted by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and I will endeavour to state why I share the views of my revered leader.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather ticklish to begin a speech after the hon. members who have spoken on both sides of this subject, for it is almost entirely exhausted. How can I find a new argument? What can I do, in order to not sift anew everything that has already been said? That is a pretty hard undertaking.

We have, on the right side of the Speaker of this House, most distinguished men, lawyers, scholars, old parliamentarians, in a word, as I said at the start, men of the highest distinction, who have discussed this Bill under all its aspects, in all its forms and phases. On the other hand, we have on the left men just as distinguished who have also spoken on the same subject, and I am afraid that I may not be equal to the situation; I fear that I cannot do full and fair justice to the people I have the honour to represent and that I may annoy the hon. members who have both the task and obligation of hearing me through. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I shall do all I can to fulfil my obligations.

The electors of the county of Montcalm have sent me petitions in large numbers; every parish in my county, and there are quite a number of them, have signed these petitions and all of them contain a great list of signatures, asking me to oppose this Bill. I laid these petitions on the Table, Mr. Speaker, and I have the assurance that they have all been duly received, even if they have not all been welcomed. At all events, I have done my duty, as you have done yours in paying due respect to these petitions I have laid before the House.

I have visited the county I represent and discussed the situation with my good electors; I listened to the arguments made by many of them and I may tell you that those in favour of this Bill are pretty scarce and that it is a hard job to find them. The opinion is formed in a decisive way and the people are most determined. There is no possible mistake, they disapprove of that Bill and when you will have to enforce it, I greatly fear you will find it a difficult, not to say an impossible task.

I have been all over the county where I have had the honour to live for the past thirty-two years, I mean Jacques-Cartier county, the old time Conservative county, which has been in days gone by represented by the most important, the most influential and the most worthy men of the province of Quebec, I might perhaps say, of the whole Dominion, I wish to allude specially to the hon. F. D. Monk, who represented this county from 1896 until his death. I still hear him, when from his seat in this House before he had resigned as member of the Cabinet, before the struggles of 1910 and 1914, declaring in this House: Mr. Speaker, we owe nothing to England who owes us everything; it is she who is indebted to us for having preserved for her, in its entirety the finest of all her colonies, Canada. I hear him again, from his seat, when he declared: No, never shall we spend a cent for the Laurier navy before consulting the people.

How times have changed! I did listen to those words, and I saw the hon. members now sitting on the right, applaud, rejoice, clapping their hands as loud as they could, when the late lamented Mr. Monk uttered these words. I do say, Mr. Speaker, how times have changed! It is very right to say that the years, the months, the days follow on but that they never are the same. And when I peruse the Hansard, when I read over again the debates of those days and find out what was then said by hon. gentlemen of the other side, who were then sitting on this side, what a change!

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let us respect the opinions of every one, we are in a free country—as regards the past, at any rate,—and let every one express his convictions, his opinions; but do not criticise more than you should. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I have really the right to say that the times have materially changed. To-day, Liberals, Conservatives, Nationalists are hand in hand, they are agreed to fight this Conscription Bill; not all, however. I would prefer seeing a larger number on our side. I would have wished that all the members of the fine province of Quebec, of the grand old province of Quebec, were united and had acted as the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou). Honour be to him! As did the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet). Every other hon. gentleman from the province of Quebec has joined us in our protest against this Bill, and it seems to me that my immediate duty is to offer, on behalf of my constituents, my most sincere thanks to these good gentlemen, and I would want them to take one more

step forward, I would like to see them cross over to this side of the House, one after the other, and come and stand with us under our grand Liberal flag. That flag so grand, so wide, without—I was about to say something which would probably have displeased those gentlemen, but I will not say it—this flag so wide, so grand, that it can shield and cover every man of good-will, and I am sure that none of these gentlemen would have regretted having made that splendid move just executed by the hon. member for Yamaska. He is really a brave one!

Just so. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Achim) should not be left out. He is a young man, and courageous. Though a staunch Conservative, and loyal to his party, he did not fear to come and sit with us. For a half day's work, that is not too bad. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that there is a third one. When it starts, it's like snow-rolling, it swells quick, and before I take my seat, I hope there will be others. The French Canadians of the Dominion, the well-thinking Englishmen, and English Canadians, the Irishmen are with us.

Ah! how proud, Mr. Speaker, I felt a few days ago, when I attended an exclusively Irish meeting, made up of the most representative, the most influential and financially the strongest men of the large city of Montreal, the Queen of the Dominion, although Toronto people may think otherwise. I was proud of being among these gentlemen—not as an Irishman but as a mere spectator. There were present, the ex-Mayor of Montreal, Dr. Guerin, who is an authority at home; my colleague on the bench, Mr. Joseph Walsh, ex-member for St. Ann's, who was replaced by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) a distinguished gentleman whom I would like to see on our side, and I regret that he is not, for he would have expressed, had he been there, the unanimous sentiments of the division which he represents as an Irishman. How proud I was, Mr. Speaker, to see St. Ann's division bringing together all the best men of that district. Its representative was not there, I don't know whether he had been invited or not, but the hon. Minister of Justice was not there. He should have been present, it would have given him an idea of what was going on; he would have realized the unanimous sentiment of his own electorate, protesting and condemning this proposed legislation.

The hon. Minister of Justice is jointly and severally responsible for this enactment, being a member of the Cabinet, but I do not think he ever gave life to that child. I know the hon. Minister of Justice, he is a distinguished citizen, a legal luminary, an ex-professor of the great McGill University, for a long time a judge of the Superior Court of Montreal, a credit to himself, to his compatriots and to his country. Were he on this side of the House and giving his support to what his good electors of St. Ann's are demanding. I was reading over this morning the resolution adopted by the electors of that division, absolutely condemning this law. It seems to me that, had he been there, he would have given in to that sentiment and, instead of occupying a seat on the other side, he would be on our side, I am sure of it. It many yet come to pass.

I have attended, Mr. Speaker, several meetings held in Montreal, that fair metropolis, under the patronage and the immediate guardianship of the distinguished member for St. Mary's (Mr. Martin), who is familiar with the feelings of the electors he represents, and when I speak of the St. Mary's division, I am speaking of all Montreal, from north to south, from east to west, the outskirts and the heart of the city, no one wants that law.

Mr. Speaker, if you attended any one of these meetings, you would stare in surprise; you would return home, I am satisfied, with something of that feeling, which is unanimous in Montreal, that this Act is condemned by all that is most worthy and most representative throughout the great metropolis.

I have taken a part in several of these meetings. You cannot find a discordant voice: "No conscription; down with conscription, we have done our duty, nobly done our duty, and nobody will thus lead us to be slaughtered!" That is what was heard.

You have in Quebec—Quebec, the source of patriotism, the source of true Liberalism—in Quebec it can be nothing strange, for they have as their mandatory the most distinguished leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier—there have been meetings held in Quebec, in several places, unanimously condemning this Bill. Three Rivers, the capital city of my hon. colleague, Mr. Jacques Bureau. You must have perceived, Mr. Speaker, that Jacques Bureau is not the man on the street. You have listened to him religiously, you have followed his arguments, as we have also done on this side of the House—these gentlemen across did not say much, but by their very silence they approved him. What a masterly speech was that speech delivered by the hon. Mr. Bureau! The strongest arguments,

irrefutable arguments, to which no one has yet replied, and I do not think any one can go counter to his statements. I was delighted to hear him, my friends are almost beside themselves, so proud were they of him, and rightly too. Jacques Bureau has enormously gained in the estimation of all, and it must have been the best day in all his political career, I am sure of that, any way.

We have also heard in this House the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier). I fully endorse all the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe has said. He has been reproached for having gone too far; he has not gone any farther than he should; what he said was not intended as a threat, but as a protest, a warning to ministers should they persist in putting through such a Bill, and especially should they insist on enforcing it, so well satisfied am I that this legislation cannot be carried out, and in a few moments, Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to show why.

Meetings were also held in Sorel, the country of the strong men. When I speak of Sorel men, you had better stand aside, Mr. Speaker. Meetings took place in Joliette—the land of the Babys, the Godins, the Oliviers, all the wisest men of the North country—and here I must say that it was an inspiration to me to see the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Guilbault) leave his sick couch, impotent, almost dying, making superhuman efforts in order to come here to protest personally against this iniquitous law; I pay due homage to that generous heart who did understand the full responsibility impending, and who, in spite of all, realized what his duty was, and fulfilled it. I say: All honour to him.

I held a meeting in Lachine, and I can tell you that among those present there were many French Canadians, Englishmen, Irishmen and even Jews, and I must say that there was not a single dissentient voice in the protest voiced against this Bill. I was asked if any French Canadian could be found to support this law. I told them that there was not a single dissentient voice in were few and far between; and if ever any of those French Canadians should come to Lachine, I would let them know that the canal is not far distant.

Another similar meeting was also held in Sherbrooke. You must notice, Mr. Speaker, that Sherbrooke does not only count French Canadians, but that, on the contrary, its population is rather mixed; at that meeting, which was largely attended, all energetically protested against conscription.

Another meeting was likewise held in St. Jerome, the county of the men who were to have their wrists cut off. I remember that in those days they held public meetings to protest against that enactment of the hon. leader of the Opposition. We shall repeal that legislation, did they say, we shall destroy the statutes containing it, and, if we do not succeed, we will cut our own wrists off. I defy any one to go and see if any wrist is missing to-day. I must add that the promoter and leader of that wrist-cutting operation has his own more steadfast than ever, especially so since he is in the Government manger, drawing quite a handsome salary. I respect him, for, after all, he is perfectly entitled, like anybody else, to be a railway commissioner, but it is a remarkable fact that, since he holds that position, he no more talks of having his hands cut off, and yet that Act is still on our statute books.

I have held two big meetings in Ville-Emard, and I can assure you it was quite a sight to look at those working men, that laborious class of people, that class who only ask for protection and for justice, protest as strongly as they could against this iniquitious conscription Act; I am glad indeed to speak to-day on behalf of the electors of Jacques Cartier, the county where I will have the honour of making my next political fight. Some of those good Conservatives on the other side of this House, declared that the hon. member for Montcalm should be shelved. They tried to put me out of this fine Montcalm county, but they couldn't do it. They then thought it over and decided that the best means was to do away with the constituency itself; that is what they did, but I shall get even with them by capturing another county from them. I will capture Jacques Cartier, I am confident I will, and when I do return to this House, it will be on behalf of the electors of that county. Some may observe that the votes are not yet counted. That is true, but after my own calculations, it should give an overwhelming Liberal majority.

The town of St. Laurent where I have the honour to reside, the town par excellence, with respect to education, with its college, its convent and its numerous schools, has also protested energetically against the Bill now before this House. Most recently, after divine service, we have seen, in the church of St. Laurent, a whole population kneeling down and imploring God to enlighten the men who are governing us so that this conscription Act

be not adopted. Afterwards, tables were placed in front of the church, so that all the people, men, women and children, might sign the petitions which I laid before this House as a protest. I repeat it, Mr. Speaker, in that section of the country, there are not two opinions; the conscription Act is absolutely condemned.

Other meetings were likewise held in the city of Maisonneuve, which contains thousands and thousands of workingmen among its population; the same in the city of Levis, in St. Henri, near Montreal, and in Ste. Cunégonde, where thousands upon thousands of men employed in the large local mills have most strongly protested and signed numerous petitions.

In Berthierville, it was the same. In the town of L'Assomption—the heart of our venerated leader Sir Wilfrid Laurier must beat more strongly when I mention L'Assomption and its classical college where he spent the best years of his life—and the Laurentian town did protest. Here, I delay, when I speak of St. Lin; one should stop one moment and cogitate; it is the cradle of the Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Well, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there also, as everywhere else, they have protested, they have done all they could possibly do. In the town of Pointe Claire—where next Sunday your humble servants shall be present, being specially invited to speak and protest against that enactment; in the town of Dorval; at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, in the city of Nicolet, I met there a few days ago a clever young man, a confrere of great distinction, I refer to Mr. Chassé, a Montreal lawyer. Mr. Chassé, had accepted to be a candidate in Nicolet county, as standard-bearer of the Conservative party, and when he learned that the Conscription Bill was before this House, his candidature came to an end; he sent his resignation as a Conservative candidate, entirely repudiating the law which his old friends had just laid before this chair. Will he run as a Liberal candidate? I do not know, but a sure thing, he will never support this Act, and he can never support the men who have conceived it.

Mr. Speaker, have you had and have you seen or heard of any contradictory meetings held in favour of this Act? Not at all. Not a single meeting has been held, to my knowledge, in favour of the Bill now before you.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this Bill is illegal, unjust, that it is discriminating oppressive, vexatious, unconstitutional, and in no way applicable, as I shall endeavour to shhow. In the first place, I say it is illegal, because those who wish to pass it have not the right to do so; they have no mandate, and I have only to refer to the arguments made by the worthy leader of the Opposition to prove it. We are not at present legislators, we are only administrators. To be a legislator, you must have a mandate authorizing you to make laws. Well, we have no such mandate. The hon. members who have previously spoken have clearly defined the situation. The Hon. Mr. Murphy, ex-Secretary of State, has well explained it; the Hon. Dr. Pugsley has well discussed it also the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald); Mr. C. A. Wilson, of Laval, has discussed it; the hon. member for Iberville, Mr. Joseph Demers, has well discussed the question, as all honourable gentlemen who have preceded me and they are no newcomers, they are men well versed in constitutional law, and when I see hon. gentlemen of such standing risk their reputations as parliamentarians, as lawyers in their respective districts, when I see these men taking upon themselves the defence of such a position I feel I am in good company, and I have no fear to ratify what they said. I know there are hon. gentlemen on the other side who have made much noise, who have spoken about the constitution, who have spoken of laws. I have much respect for all these hon. gentlemen, but there are many among them who do not know much about law; they are greater experts at the plough.

One hon. gentleman who made a big flurry, found it very odd that the French Canadians of Quebec should not be of his opinion. I readily believe that he has studied some, and that he has a certain fund of information, but, after all such is not his mandate, such is not his profession, and one can certainly take exception to what he says without offending him. I will say to this hon. gentleman: I prefer believing what the right hon. leader of the Opposition has said, I would rather accept the statements of the hon. Mr. Pugsley, or those of the hon. Mr. Murphy. I prefer going by what the hon. members of this side of the House have said upon this question, than those other gentlemen. Dr. Edwards, member for Frontenac, is a most distinguished man, but he knows more about pills than about the constitution. I would not like to hurt his feelings, but let each one stick to his trade, to his profession. I believe this gentleman has yet a great deal

to learn about the constitution, and with all due respect, I may be allowed to differ from him. I say that this Act is illegal, because we have no mandate to pass it. In the first place, it is unjust. Why is it unjust? Because, as a result of that Act, you mean to impose obligations we are not held to assume. We have indeed agreed to help, and I still wish to help, but from that does not mean that we will agree to do what you now want us to do, when we are in nowise obliged to do it and I say: your law is entirely unjust.

This Act is discriminating. Why? Because we are asked to do in this country what is not demanded from other countries. The law is discriminating, because it is not universal. I very well understand, if the Empire should ask every British subject to do, each and every one of them, one and the same thing, that would be equality; but, in the present case, Canada is asked to do what they dare not ask any one else to do.

I was reading, this very morning, that the Premier of Australia had just declared that enlistment would remain voluntary. So there is no compulsion in Australia, another colony of the Empire, but they must impose it in Canada first, in this dear old Canada they love so well, they are so fond of, yes, Canada will be first. Well, I am chary of your preference, of your favours, of your gifts, I am apprehensive when you thus ask Canada to do what others are not asked to do. I say it is a discriminating law.

What would you say, Mr. Speaker, if, in a city like Montreal, the mayor, who is here just now, would have his municipal government pass a regulation by which he would say: the carters of Chaboillez Square will pay so much a piece, the carters of St. Mary's ward another amount, and the carters of St. Jean Baptiste still another amount of money? He would be told: You are mad; you should know and you must know that, be it in virtue of a law or a by-law, all must be treated the same way, no favour, no favouritism, no privileges, every one has equal rights. Well, then, I say that we, the British subjects of Canada, we are not put on the same footing as the subjects of the other colonies, by the imposition of a law which they do not want to impose elsewhere.

I say that every discriminating law is unconstitutional, and the power of disallowance, of which we are so jealous, and which His Majesty has the right to exercise, His Majesty may, at any given moment, exercise his right to annul such an Act. The laws enacted here, Mr. Speaker, must be ratified on the other side. The laws of the province of Quebec are ratified within two years by the Dominion Parliament. The laws passed by the Dominion Government must be sanctioned by His Majesty, by the Imperial Government. Well, I wonder if the Imperial Parliament would sanction such an unjust, such a discriminatory law as this one. I do humbly say no. This law is unconstitutional and should not be adopted, because such was the understanding, when the lease of life of this Parliament was extended one year.

I was reading, this morning, the speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and I found therein a most serious charge made against the Government. The right hon. gentleman states that this extension was granted with the formal understanding that it was only for the guidance and the good administration of the affairs of the country and that the proposal would never have been entertained, if this Bill had only been mentioned. I do repeat it, that is a very serious charge, in my humble opinion, for it means that the hon. leader of the Opposition and his followers, who have agreed to this extension, have been deceived. In other words, it means this: you have induced me to grant you an extension of time and to ask my followers to support you on this question, and you have deceived me. "Well, Mr. Speaker, if we cannot find any good faith in those who govern us, if honour and integrity cannot be found in our rulers, I now ask you the question: what will be the outcome? I do hope that the hon. Prime Minister will give us some explanations on this subject.

I say that this law is vexatious for us French Canadians, as well as for the English and Scotch Canadians of this country. Is it not sad, indeed, to find that, in spite of the sacrifices made, after contributing to the Canadian expeditionary forces more than 423,000 men, we are nevertheless charged with not having done our duty? Is that what the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Morris) calls the failure of voluntary enlistment? Let him beware of failure for himself, of the discomfiture which awaits him in his county? A man may go into bankruptcy and still the sum of his assets be greater than that of his liabilities; he may be in straitened circumstances only temporarily, but I don't believe that is the case of the member for Chateauguay. He will have to give a strict and true account

to his electors and may he beware of being more than temporarily crippled, for he should not forget that in Chateauguay the French Canadians, who compose three-fourths of the population, will ask him to account for his vote in favour of conscription.

I have stated the reasons for which I consider this Act unconstitutional and vexatious, let us now see whether its enforcement is possible. I say no. You cannot attain the desired object with a law so drafted. What is the penalty imposed by the Act upon those who will not submit to it? The Act says: If you do not submit, you will be sentenced to jail! Well, then, what will they do? They will go to jail, that's all. I owe to Sir Lomer Gouin, Prime Minister of the province of Quebec, my sincere congratulations for having had the clever idea of having had proper cells made at Bordeaux for our future state prisoners. You will send to jail those who do not obey; but you must not forget that this will not send them to war. After having spent three years in the state prisons, they will be free. Then, what becomes of your law? Can you force these men to go to the fields of battle? Will the Government have gained anything after they have quartered, clothed and boarded, for three years, at the expense of the state, these men who want to evade the law at any price? I say, Mr. Speaker, that a law the execution of which is impossible in its very principle is good for nothing, because its application would not be practical and it could not attain its object. The only result of this Act will have been to cause trouble in this country.

Our mandate has expired long ago. The mandate which I have obtained in 1911, in that struggle, one of the fiercest I have had to sustain in all my political career—for I had to contend against both the Conservatives and the Nationalists—that mandate, Sir, was good for five years only. I must confess that, in that contest, I had quite a hard time of it, but I hope that, in the future, these good Nationalists will be with me, since I shall be with them. Just as in the case of all the hon. members of this House, my mandate has lapsed; we have remained in office only by virture of our own vote. Is that a mandate? I contend that we are duly empowered to carry on the ordinary business of Government; but that does not give us the right to send a whole people to slaughter; and the people of this country contend, as I do, that we have not the power to do it. Personally, I would have no objection to remain as a

[Mr. Lafortune.]

member without undergoing an election; that costs less and it is much easier; but we are living in a country where the people have the right to choose the members they wish to represent them and to be governed by whomsoever they deem fit for the task. It has been said that, in a stable it is not always the best horse that eats the most, and the same thing may be said of politics. The people are the master, to them belongs the right to judge in the last resort. Besides, you know this as well as I do: nothing is so uncertain as politics; I might even venture to add that it is as in matters of courtship, where one must be very careful until the young lady has given her assent.

I would not care to recall sad memories to my right hon. leader, but I will mention that momentous struggle he fought when he was elected by an overwhelming majority; the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie honoured him later by admitting him into his cabinet. At the next election, they succeeded in defeating him, the village merchant, a Mr. Bourbeau, being elected in his stead; a perfectly honest man no doubt, but who, after all, should not have been preferred to the noblest and most eloquent man to be found.

But Sir Wilfrid Laurier took a signal revenge; he turned towards Quebec, the old Capital, and, as experience has well shown, it is not an easy thing to wrest it from him—Yes, Sir, the people should not be ignored, I know that through my own experience, for I also have suffered defeat. I then say Mr. Speaker, that the mandate, if it may be called a mandate, which we now hold, does not go beyond purely administrative matters. There are in our Constitution three powers: The legislative, the executive and the administrative power. The legislative power has disappeared with the lapsing of our mandate, the executive power is continued in force for ordinary matters; therefore, all that is left us is the administrative power and we can only expedite public business in the people's interest, until the people give us a new mandate. Therefore, I have no hesitation in asserting that the State prisoner, the one who will have been arrested for having refused to obey that Act, will enjoy adequate protection under our laws.

There are under our laws five writs of royal prerogative. The British Crown maintained, at the time of the conquest, these writs of royal prerogative which are still extant for our protection, thank God. We have the mandamus, the certiorari, the quo warranto, the writ of prohibition and, last but not the least, the habeas corpus.

When these gentlemen will arrest a British subject for having disobeyed the Act, they will send him to Bordeaux; but, first, they will bring him before the magistrate, and the prisoner relying on the constitution, will appeal to the court. He will say: Let them show in virtue of what principle I have been arrested and imprisoned. If the law invoked against me were constitutional the authority entrusted with the duty of applying it would say so, and this man will be told: Sir, you are free this legislation is void even should the Prime Minister and all his fellow workers, even should the Premier and all the other councillors of His Majesty declare our law is valid, the Courts whose duty it is to carry it out would hold otherwise.

The hon. Minister of Justice has been a Judge of the Superior Court, and he knows that I am right—Should I go before him with a man arrested in virtue of an unconstitutional law, the hon. minister would be the first to set that man at liberty. He knows the law, he knows the constitution. Why does he take a hand in such legislation as this? I respect his opinion, his conduct, his convictions, but I am sure if he were not in politics, if he were still in the sanctuary of Justice, he would not hesitate for a moment and would immediately confirm what I have just said, that this law is unconstitutional, is not worth anything and that a writ of habeas corpus, issued in the King's name, asking the reason wherefor I am arrested and sentenced, would undoubtedly restore my rights. But politics is a cloak for many misdeeds.

Mr. Speaker, I have, everywhere I have gone, pleaded the cause of the people; I said, everywhere I went and had the honour of being heard, that there would be no conscription. What were my reasons for saying so? My reasons? Why! What the Prime Minister had declared in the speech from the Throne, on the letters addressed to the archbishops and bishops; on their declarations.

I see in his seat, Mr. Speaker, a man to whom I have something to say and I take occasion of his presence to offer him my most sincere congratulations, I mean the ex-Secretary of State, hon. Mr. Patenaude. He has, indeed, done an admirable feat. He held a high position in the cabinet. Young, with a grand future in sight, full of hope, taking a keen interest in his duties, he sacrificed everything in order to keep his pledged word. That is really grand. I say to the hon. ex-minister, all honour to you, sir. The people shall give you credit for that; the people have seen in you a statesman, a strong man, a man who does not hesitate to break away from his former friends, from his party, from his high position. You do honour to the pledged troth, honour be to you. I would have liked to see the others follow suit. They have not willed it. It is their own business; but the people shall remember it. Beware. When the people kick, they kick for good. No one has the right, Mr. Speaker, to fool the people. Everyone has the right to hold opinions contrary to those of his opponents; everyone has the right to change his convictions; everyone has the right to abandon a leader, if he does not approve of him; every one has the right to condemn his policy, if it does not suit him; but, none have the right to deceive the people. You would not forgive a servant who lied to you; no one forgives a servant who would say anything but the truth; and our public men, those who govern, those who direct the people, those men to whom are entrusted honour, wealth, integrity, uprightness, all that we hold most precious in this world, would be permitted to play false. I say, that is not what I have been taught in my country, and I say to the hon. Mr. Patenaude, ex-minister: Why not come with us, come and sit with your old colleagues, you will be well cared for and be given due justice, because the stand you have taken was a most honourable one, and it must be a great satisfaction to be able to say to yourself that you have been faithful to the call of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I was present in my own country church, when our learned parish priest ascended the pulpit and said: "My children, I have just learned that the National Service cards are not being signed; you are probably afraid that it may be the first step towards conscription, well, I tell you now, from this pulpit, that we are duly authorized to say to you that there will be no conscription. We have the pledged word of those who govern that you can sign the National Service cards without any apprehension, that there will be no conscription." Then, every one, or almost every one, did sign. This same scene took place in every church, throughout the province; the parish priests mounted their pulpits and advised their flocks to sign, because those in power had given assurance that there would be no conscription. The cards had scarcely been signed when conscription came. Where do you find sincerity here? Where do you find frankness? Where do

you find honour, soliciting the citizens through their pastors' own lips, to sign the National Service cards, with the guarantee that the rulers of the country had just declared to these reverend gentlemen that there would be no conscription. The archbishop of Montreal, Mgr. Bruchesi, almost died of grief when he learned he had been so grossly deceived, after having given instructions to the whole clergy of his diocese to speak of those cards from the pulpit. He has taken the trouble to write over his signature that he has been deceived, odiously deceived. Well, here now, we have come to the point of disbelieving what our own bishops tell us, the archbishop's word is not to be accepted, for he is himself deceived. Do you think this thing will last very long, Mr. Speaker? Have you got to stand such a rule much longer? I do hope not. I hope that, ere long, we shall have an Administration we can take some stock in, upon which we may depend, for truly it is more than painful, in a country like ours, to be compelled to openly declare to all the people that there is no longer any trust to be placed in those who govern us. They say: by means of the Act we want to pass we will gather the military forces and send them beyond Canada. The honourable members on this side of the House have demonstrated that such an Act could not be passed under our constitution. The matter has been well discussed, from every point of view, the most able men have stated that military forces could not be raised here to be sent beyond Canada. I read and read over again, Mr. Speaker, the British North America Act, as well as the 1904 amendment, and there is no equivocation, no ambiguity possible, no possibility of a doubt. When the law is not clear, when an act is unsatisfactory, when there is ambiguity or equivocation, when a double interpretation can be given to a law, the spirit may be taken preferably to the text, but authors who expound the rules for the interpretation of statutes tell us: You cannot and you must not substitute the spirit to the letter of a law when its text is formal.

When the text of an Act is clear, positive and precise, when there is no reason to doubt, to substitute to the text the spirit of the Act would be a violation of every legal principle; the spirit may be substituted to the text, only in case of open doubt. But, in this case, the law is so plain that it is impossible to show the shade of a suspicion and it takes the vast and powerful imagination of the honourable gentlemen on the other side of this House to find even a subject of discussion. You cannot ask Canadians, our Canadian militia, to take any part, against their will, in wars beyond Canadian territory. But do they say, it is Canada's war which is now being waged in Europe. I say no; it is not Canada's war. Canada has not made any declaration of war to anybody whatever; Canada has not been attacked and it is Canada's war only in the Government's mind and in that of their friends.

As I have said a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, Canada has nobly done its duty; it has contributed more than 423,000 soldiers; it has spent almost fabulous sums of money and the sacrifices of all kind and nature it has imposed upon itself are countless; we have gone even beyond our means, I contend it is sheer madness to say that Canada will give her last copper and her last man to save the Empire.

What a fine argument! Must then Canada be ruined, that bankruptcy be completed, in order to save the Empire? "Save the Empire!" such is the cry of these good gentlemen; it pays them so well. Who will contend that when two houses are on fire, your neighbor's and your own, that you should go and save your neighbour's house first, and let your wife and children perish with every other thing you held most dear? I am, indeed, very fond of those Englishmen across the sea; I have never seen them nor met them, but I do really love a great deal more the children of my own country. I have no kin in England, Mr. Speaker, but I have in Canada generations and generations, whilst these gentlemen just landed here immediately want to take the best places around the table. I am quite willing to give them a fair opportunity in this country, but I mean, before all, to preserve my kinsmen and my friends, as well as this parcel of land which is, so to speak, a portion of my own existence, and upon which I have spent so much labour. They may say that we should give our last cent to save the Empire; as for me, I shall say I have no more to give.

When the treaty of peace will be signed, what compensation will Canada get? Do you believe Canada will be invited to share in the spoils? One would have to be very silly to so believe. For my part, in spite of the tremendous sacrifices we have made, I am convinced that we shall be completely ignored at the hour of the final settlement of accounts. England will have her share; Belgium, her own; France, Russia

and the other nations will likewise receive their share of indemnity, but Canada will have absolutely nothing. Where then will we stand? We shall have taxes to pay for a hundred years to come; we shall have to provide for and relieve all our invalids and maimed, not mentioning the pensions we shall have to pay for hundreds of years to come. Therefore, in order to meet those obligations, I say that we must preserve a portion of our property, whilst if we do ruin ourselves to day, we will never be able to meet such obligations. Mr. Speaker, I do really like the Empire, but I love my own country far better. I may be wrong, but such are my sentiments, all the same.

We have now come to the point of tearing up our railway tracks. They are no longer content with throwing away millions after millions of dollars; here now comes along our Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) who is shipping our railroad tracks over to Europe. I would not be in the least surprised if, before long, we should be forced to come to Ottawa on foot and all that, just to please the Empire. I am actually wondering when and where we are going to stop.

Mr. Speaker, we are just now passing through a most serious period of financial stringency. Business men who had, until now successfully speculated, have found themselves suddenly ruined; business men of the highest standing have found themselves in such straits that they could no longer meet their liabilities. I repeat it, this crisis has been most disastrous, most painful, and it is in such a time that we hear these hon. gentlemen say that it is for us to give our last cent for the Empire. As for me, I must describe their conduct as extraordinary and extravagant.

In the political world, we are told that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has rather bad grace asking for a referendum on the conscription Bill seeing that he did not offer any in connection with the Naval Act. That is really the main objection that is raised, as far as I can see. I will take the liberty of thus answering that objection. The Naval Bill was voted upon and I am one of those who voted in favour of it. On March 29, 1909, the proposal of the hon. Prime Minister—who was then Sir Wilfrid Laurier—was submitted to the House and unanimously carried. The late hon. F. D. Monk, who was not present in the House, when this measure was submitted, when he did return—in explaining his absence, on March 29, 1909, when the resolution had been voted —added that, had he been present, he would have voted in favour of it. Such is the declaration of the late member for Jacques Cartier, and any one can read it, for it is inserted in the Hansard.

The principle of the Naval Act having been practically accepted by both sides of the House at the time, can the present situation be compared with the one then existing? When the people, represented by both sides of the House, agree; when the members agree that the principle of a law is acceptable, why make an appeal to the people? Such is my contention, Mr. Speaker, and I believe my answer is a good one. More than that, when the Naval Act was voted, we were within the limits of our mandate; we had only served three years of our term, therefore, as members, we were not, according to the expression of the worthy leader of the Opposition, a moribund Government.

There is nothing very nice in being told such things, to have this Government called a moribund Government, and do the honourable gentlemen on the other side fret over it? They don't seem to be in any way offended; they accept it as a dainty. A moribund Government! Were I the Prime Minister, I would really be offended, if anybody told me that, but as I am not the Premier, there is no danger.

Then I say that there is no possible comparison with the stand taken by the members on your left demanding a referendum upon the present Act, while none was asked for the Naval Act. A third reason, Mr. Speaker, is that the Naval Act was no conscription law; the Naval Act was a free law, a voluntary law, nobody was forced to enlist. it was all volunteering; but in this case, attention! They want to enlist us in spite of ourselves, without a shadow of resistance, saying: Enlist to go and defend the Empire, the Empire is in danger. Well, it is the honourable members on the other side of the House who say that. Those who speak on behalf of the Empire don't say that, they do not ask us men, they do not ask us soldiers, they do not ask us to go and fight over there. They may have asked us potatoes, wheat, oats, eggs, ham, bacon, etc., they want to have provisions, and in lieu of provisions, the Premier and his friends substitute men. Well, I prefer taking the word of the Right Honourable Mr. Balfour, who came here and from your chair, Mr. Speaker, spoke to us in this House; I would rather take his word, I say, than the talk of the honourable members on the other side of the House. The Right Honourable Mr. Balfour said:

"What we need the most, is food, munitions". He knows his business, he is a man from the old country, he knows what is going on overseas. Well, Mr. Speaker, I prefer taking the word of that honourable gentleman than that of these gentlemen here who say: "We want young men, more young men, and still more young men." Well, let them send their own sons across the seas!

I remember, Mr. Speaker, the fight made against the Laurier navy. I was a candidate at the time, and I had against me distinguished citizens, the most popular speakers, the strongest men, tribunes of great repute, I had against me, may I say, men whose slogan was: "cursed navy, down with the navy; accursed law, hateful law, iniquitous law, down with the navy." And several of our friends were defeated by means of such appeals; several lieutenants of Mr. Laurier suffered defeat as a result. Not I, they couldn't beat me, I cannot be beaten, but many have left their bones, many were the victims of such a campaign. Well then, Mr. Speaker, as I have said: how times have changed. They no more say: Cursed marine. Down with the marine. The day after the victory, they cried: Hurrah for the navy, long live the navy. And we saw entering this cabinet, men who had fought us most bitterly, men who had the most violently assailed that Naval Act, who henceforth accepted it, and instead of tearing the page of the Statute which contained that infamous law, that cynical law, that accursed law, as they used to call it, put a stop to all opposition, and have not protested since. You may be sure, they won't touch it.

I say to these gentlemen: Beware. Curses, like chickens, come home to roost. You have defeated us by running down the Naval Bill in every way, the people shall never believe you henceforth, the people will say: we have no faith in you; we cannot trust you; you have deceived us and if you have done so once, you may do so again. It's just like the drunkard: Once a drunkard, always a drunkard. They have no more confidence in you, and when I hear the hon. gentlemen state that the province of Quebec has not done her duty, that the province of Quebec has not given enough volunteers, I have the right to answer: if you only knew the heart of the people of Quebec, and if you could realize what a memory they have; if you did know that no one can lie to us with impunity; if you knew that we remember what you have done, when those who were opposing us boldly told us, Mr. Speaker: the children and the grandchildren of the members who voted in favour of this infamous law shall curse their fathers; that the children and the grandchildren would curse the members who had dared to vote in favour of that Naval Act—that we would be accursed by our own children, because we had followed the dictates of our conscience, because we had relied on our own judgment, because we had voted according to our convictions. These gentlemen told us that our children would curse us, because we had listened to the voice of conscience, because we had taken counsel with ourselves, and such was our reward. I say: no, our children will not curse us when they will come and kneel down in the parish churchyard, to pray and drop a tear; they will be grateful that their father had had the hear to do what a good citizen should do; use his own judgment, according to his conscience.

In those times, I tell you, it was mournful to hear these gentlemen say: Mr. Laurier has gone to London and has bought two old tubs that had been discarded, and were lying in the London dockyards, two old ships which are not worth the iron they were built of, those old tubs are valueless. However, they were very glad to have those two old tubs to protect themselves when war broke out. At any rate, the Laurier navy was a Canadian navy. In spending what was necessary to purchase those two ships, our assets were not reduced, we had the equivalent of the few hundred thousand dollars which the Government paid for them; to-day, when they are spending millions on millions, when they are ruining the country without any compensation, it seems to me I have the right to say: hold on! stop there! that won't do! leave us something for a rainy day, a crust of bread for the hard times to come, we will help as much as we can, but don't ruin the country utterly for the Empire's sake.

Mr. Speaker, I will now say a few words about coalition. I have always understood that a coalition scheme was a kind of partnership scheme, a partnership in which Liberals and Conservatives would join in to do business together. Well, when it is a question of going into partnership with anyone, you begin by taking stock, you look into the moral value of the association of your new partners, you examine the financial standing of the new associates, you try to find out the honourableness, the character of the fellows who want to contract with you. If one's moral standing is not good, I will not enter into

partnership with him, because I would be considered no better than him; if his financial standing is not good and I become his partner, he will ruin me; if his character, honour, integrity, responsibility, are not good, I will have nothing to do with him.

Well, I say that it would have been more than a blunder, it would have been a crime on the part of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to have entered into a partnership with those gentlemen under such circumstance. What! to go into partnership with those ruined men, lost in the estimation of the public several of whom are discredited, men who are not fit to remain in the cabinet, whom the Prime Minister is bound to turn out. To join in with men like those, that would have been a crime on the part of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. We only associate with men whose moral and financial standing, whose character and respectability are on a par with our own. We cannot associate with people who are fallen or on the point of falling.

What! The Prime Minister asked Sir Wilfrid Laurier: Do come and help me, Sir Wilfrid, I can't stand it any longer, I can no longer do anything, I am sinking, I am going into bankruptcy, do come to my rescue, I will take your hand and settle matters. The honourable leader of the Opposition might have agreed to that, but your humble servant would certainly not have given his consent nor would he have associated with the Government.

Everything is going from bad to worse in the cabinet. Let us take for instance the late Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes); they just told him: Get out of here; they have just told the honourable Minister of Public Works (Mr. Robert Rogers) that his conduct is so honourable that he must temporarily withdraw from the cabinet; but as a consolation, they add that two Superior Court Judges will do their very best to whitewash him; and it is with men of such a character they would have us associate. Was it not taking Laurier for a school-boy? If my honourable leader had fallen into such a trap, I would have despaired of my race, of my country and of my chief. No, Mr. Speaker, there is no possible association with people in such a bad plight with people who are always at loggerheads with one another and who have no confidence in one another. I say that it is preferable to spend your whole life in the shades of Opposition than to find yourself in such bad company.

The general demand to-day is to encourage the farmers to promote agriculture and to increase production. That's very easy to say, but you must have the means to do it. How do you want the farmer to increase his agricultural production? How can the farm increase its revenue? Labour is getting scarcer all the time; farm labourers are demanding excessive wages and even if you are willing to pay the price, you cannot get them. Labourers living near the large cities, prefer working in the factories and mills of every description, the farmers being unable to pay them sufficient living wages. It is the same with people of various trades, they quit their workshops to go into the shell and munition factories, for the good reason that it pays them far better. Those who are familiar with farming can speak knowingly, and they will tell you that if you send any more of our Canadians overseas you simply expose agriculture to complete ruin, and the farms will be deserted. Upon this topic, Mr. Speaker, I can speak from experience, for I have been operating for the past thirty-two years a thirty acre farm near Montreal. I have made great sacrifices towards improving that property; labourers work it year in and year out, and I tell you that, presently, farming is seriously shackled for want of hands. I say, moreover, that it is an impracticable undertaking to try and take away more men from this country for service abroad. Should we not begin by providing for our industries and the operating of our manufactures; how shall we do it if we have not the required hands? The Government certainly must know that the country is already suffering from this lack of men. Frequently, we see steamers coming into port with some 700 or 800 young Englishmen on board; we see them strutting, with a new walking stick, along the streets of Montreal. They come over to our country to fill the places of our French Canadian boys who are expelled from our stores and our mills, in order to force them, in a sense, to enlist.

Mr. PAQUET (L'Islet) (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me one question?

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. PAQUET (Translation): Has the hon. member information to justify his assertion that the French Canadians are replaced in the munition factories by Englishmen just come from the British Isles?

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Translation): Certainly, I am not afraid to assert it.

Mr. PAQUET (Translation): The charge is a most serious one.

Mr. LAFORUNE (Translation): Most serious, I admit it; but I do, nevertheless, declare that, in many cases, French Canadians are turned out of doors and that their places are given, a few days later, to your Englishmen just landed from London. The very thing happened in a shell factory in my own village; these French Canadians were told: "Why don't you enlist? Why don't you go and help the Empire?" They were thus forced to sacrifice themselves and to give up all they held most dear, in order to save the Empire.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion of the learned member for L'Islet, when he stated in his eloquent and so moderate speech—that if recruiting had been conducted in a sensible way in the province of Quebec, it would have been most successful. Men have been sent to do recruiting in Montreal who certainly were not qualified for such positions, men who could not speak a word of French. Was that the right means to take if you wanted to induce our Canadians to enlist? In the province of Quebec, although the English population is very small, we employ on our police force only men who can speak both languages and my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Mr. Martin) who is also mayor of Montreal, and whom I see in his seat, can confirm this assertion. In the face of these facts, I am actually surprised that the French Canadians have enlisted in such large numbers.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for L'Islet has done justice to his compatriots of Quebec, when he stated that if recruiting in Quebec had not given the expected results, it was not the fault of the French Canadians themselves, but that it was rather on account of the methods which have been adopted.

Before I take my seat, you will permit me a final observation. Is it true, as have declared several hon. members on the other side, that the French Canadians have not done their duty? To those hon. gentlemen, I will say: You are mistaken. The French Canadians have never shirked their duty, as have said and repeated several members on this side of the House. I say that it is not among the French Canadians you will find cowards and timorous men. Besides, we have proved it before today, fear finds no place with us. When struggles have been started for what the Canadian holds most sacred; his country, his language, his religion or his schools, you have seen all these noble hearts ready to defend those rights. I will even go further, I will say that all far-reaching reforms have originated in Quebec; her citizens have always taken a hand in forwarding great movements.

When we see in the province of Ontario that the French language is shackled, and by those who cast aspersions on us, who abuse us for not doing enough for the Empire, I may answer to these Ontario people: Deal fairly with us, if you wish us to help you. Do justice to the French Canadians, to those who speak French over there. Try, if you dare, to blot out the French words which are on His Majesty's coat of arms: "Honi soit qui mal y pense." Try it then, and see if you can replace them by English words. French is the language of the great nations; French is the language in which are drafted all important social and political documents. You cannot, I say, replace those words.

It is no fault of mine, if you do not understand our mentality; it is not my fault if you do not understand what we are.

When I see Quebec men, like the honourable Mr. Cochrane, like the honourable Mr. Rogers, also from Quebec, who allow us to be insulted by the men of Ontario, I say to them: You do not love your province, you are not equal to your task, you who have risen from the ranks of the province of Quebec. I understand that, with you, politics smothers your better feelings. As for me, as long as I have a seat in this House, I shall never be afraid to say to the men of Ontario, I will never be afraid to say to all who are good enough to listen to me, that the men of Quebec are just as good as the men of Ontario.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune), who has showered me with some compliments, and who made some observations with regard to me not quite so complimentary, will pardon me if I do not undertake to take up seriatim the different matters which he has dealt with in his somewhat prolonged address. The question with which we are concerned presents itself to my mind from a very different point of view from that from which the hon. gentleman evidently looks at it. I may have occasion to refer, as I proceed, to one or two of the subjects to which he has adverted, but he will forgive me if, before doing that, I say something that seems to me vital to be said in connection with the consideration of this very momentous question. More than one hon. gentleman in this House

has already said—and many of them among those who are supporting this measure—that the idea of compulsion in itself was repugnant to them. Some of them have gone further and claimed to entertain a special and superlative repugnance to it. Let me say that none among them more than I find it repugnant in itself. And when I say it is repugnant in itself, let it be understood that I do not mean to say merely that it is repugnant to me, looking at it from the point of view of my being the person, or among the persons, to be subjected to it. It is repugnant to me in that sense, but it is vastly more so to find myself in a position where it becomes my duty to be one among those who say that now, and at this time, it is necessary that compulsion, in the manner provided in this Bill, should be imposed upon others, in order that Canada may do her entire duty, and that she may do it in the method which shall so operate as to make the performance of that duty impair, in the least possible degree, the performance of other duties that are incumbent upon her and her people to-day, and impose upon her—although that is a secondary consideration—the least possible sacrifice.

5 p.m. Mr. Speaker, duty is the subject of my story. I have listened to a large part of this debate, I have read the remarks of those hon. gentlemen whom it was not my privilege to hear, and let me say to you in all frankness, that I have waited till this moment in this debate before speaking myself, to see whether, among all the able men who have taken part in it, among particularly the many able men who have spoken in opposition to this measure, any one of them would advance a reason that would justify me in saying that it was not my duty to continue to give the Bill my support.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY: If, with all the great intellectual power that these gentlemen possess; if, with all the research that they have given to the examination of the question, if with all the zeal that inspired them to find that sufficient reason, they have not succeeded in finding it—and I would have welcomed that reason—it looks to me clear, as it did when this measure was proposed, and as when I gave my assent to the suggestion that it should be proposed, that it was the duty of this Government to propose it, and that it still is the duty of this Government and of the members of this House to support it. I respect the views of every man, and I have no quarrel with those whose consciences inspire in them the belief that their duty lies in another direction. For me the path of duty is absolutely clear with regard to this question, and it is because that path of duty is so clear that I find myself to-day impelled to intervene in this debate at this last moment.

I have said that duty is the subject of my story. If I intervene in this debate, it is because I fain would emphasize, so far as it may be possible for me to do, the necessity—I would rather say the obligation—that in my judgment lies upon one and all of us to concentrate our minds in our dealing with this question upon that one thing: our duty to Canada. So concentrating our minds, let me say, Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be well for all of us to try, for the time being at all events, to put aside many considerations which might naturally influence each and every one of us in arriving at a conclusion as to what our own individual course of action upon the question should be. Let me not be misunderstood. I am not undertaking to criticise what other hon. members may have considered it their duty to say, as supporting one view or the other upon this measure, but I permit myself to say that it has been a matter of very great regret to me, as I have sat here listening to this debate, to see how far and to what extent it had drifted into inter-provincial and inter-racial—shall I say recriminations? I do not want to use any harsh language, but I think perhaps that word is not stronger than may be properly applied. It strikes me that there is no question, considered by itself, that it should have been so possible to debate, without any reference whatsoever to the race of any man, or to the province from which he came.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lafortune) who has just resumed his seat has found fault with one gentleman and another, whose names he has mentioned, on this side of the House, because, as he said, they sat silent and said no word in defence of the province of Quebec. May I be permitted to say, Mr. Speaker, that in this wide Dominion there is no province, in my judgment, of which a man may be more proud to be a citizen than my native province of Quebec. I have no apologies to make for her. She holds her place in this Confederation, and it is good for this Confederation that she does. We live in that province, men of different races

and creeds, and may I be permitted to suggest that we be left to ourselves to deal with the faults and the virtues of the province of Quebec? That is equally true if you reverse the situation. May I not say to my friends from the province of Quebec that in the discussion of this question, perhaps it was not necessary that we should refer to the faults and the virtues of our fellow Canadians from the province of Ontario. Can we not for the moment forget those things? Can we not too forget the differences of race that exist? Things have been said from one point of view and from the other that, frankly, I do not think it could have been pleasant for any Canadian to hear. It does seem to me that it was most unfortunate that it should have been thought necessary to say these things in the discussion of a question whose decision is of such vast import to this our common country, and in regard to which it is of such prime importance that whatever that decision be, it may, when it is once reached, be presented for acceptance to a united people.

We are of different races in this country, but we are all Canadians. I have suggested that we forget for the moment that we are of different races. I do not want to suggest that it is desirable that we should drive from our memories the history of our progenitors. I firmly believe that there is no greater or more overpowering influence that directs the actions of men than the race feeling, and no call which men respond to more readily than that of the blood. It works for great and good results. I am not here, therefore, to suggest to anybody that it is his duty to forget those from whom he descends, or to repudiate the race to which he belongs. But, there is a time and a place for everything. Here, to-day, when we are dealing with a question, a right or a wrong decision on which will carry with it consequences that none of us can foresee—consequences that will have to be borne, not by ourselves alone, but by our children and our children's children for many generations—am I not right in saying that it is incumbent upon us to concentrate our minds upon the one fact that we are all Canadians, and that this is a question of what is the duty of Canadians to Canada here and now.

I would have made no reference to the matter of which I am about to speak if the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Lafortune) had not taken upon himself the responsibility of telling you, Mr. Speaker, and this House, not only what my constituents in the division of Montreal, St. Anne, thought about this question, but that he has come here to tell us the settled conviction of every Canadian of Irish blood within this country, and he says that they are all convinced the same way. The hon. gentleman will allow me to question his authority for making that statement. The men of my blood speak for themselves, and the men of my blood who have the glorious privilege of being Canadians, are as thorough Canadians as breathe within the limits of the territory of this country. They do not need the direction of my very good and very highly esteemed friend from Montcalm to tell them what they ought to think about this subject. The hon. gentleman was eloquent about the lack of mandate with regard to a great many other things, and as he spoke I asked myself whence came his mandate to speak in this House for all Canadians of the Irish race. There was not one exception; he knew all about it. Then he bewailed my sad fate: that I should be standing alone, separated from them all. I thank him for his sympathy, but I do not feel that I need it.

The people of my race are as intelligent a people—I am paying them a high compliment when I say that—as the people of the race of the hon. member for Montcalm. That means that they are quite capable of judging for themselves, and that they will consider this matter from the standpoint of Canadians anxious to do their duty. I do not doubt that there will be differences of opinion among them; some will reach one conclusion, and some will reach another. But they will not, as the member for Montcalm says they will, in one body pronounce themselves absolutely on one side of a question, with regard to which there are argument, serious arguments pro and con. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken when he undertakes the responsibility of making that suggestion. He will allow me, further, to submit that he is a little rash in assuming that responsibility simply as the result of attendance at a meeting convened by gentlemen, all of them my very good and very highly esteemed friends, but all of them members of the Liberal party in Montreal. The member for Montcalm went to that meeting and, in consequence, apparently considers that to him has been handed over, as it were, the entire Irish race in Canada, and he comes here and represents that the Irish race in Canada are throwing their weight and judgment in one scale in regard to this matter. That is not exceedingly modest on

his part; moreover, I do not know that it is quite respectful to the people for whom he undertook to speak. Nothing is more dangerous than for a man of one race to speak for the people of another, unless it be for a man of one race to undertake to instruct the people of another in regard to their duty. I should have made no reference at all to the race to which I belong if it had not been for the somewhat extraordinary undertaking of the hon. member for Montcalm. When I go back to my constituents to render an account of what I have said, what I have done, and what I purpose doing on this question, I shall go to meet them all as Canadians, of whatever race they may be, and I shall make my justification to them all. It would be a matter of great regret to me if these Canadians of my own race should disagree with me upon this question. But they will exercise their judgment, and they will credit me with the sincerity for which I give credit to them and to the men of any other race who may reach a conclusion different from my own. But I shall not ask the member for Montcalm to intervene or to mediate between me and my constituents, of whatever race they may be. I shall go forth with a good conscience; I shall meet all my friends in St. Anne's and whatever their view may be they will greet me as they have greeted me in the past, notwithstanding this judgment upon me by the hon. member for Montcalm. Down in St. Anne's we do have differences of opinion, differences of race, differences upon political questions. But I am proud to say that we live together as good friends, having confidence and trust in each other, and that we can maintain that condition of affairs without the kind attention of the hon. member for Montcalm.

I have said that we ought to get rid of all consideration of the fact that we are of different races or different creeds, or that we come from different provinces, because at this time one great question concerns our common country, Canada. I have said a word about my feeling for my own province of Quebec; I felt that I owed it that. But since we have had questions of race, may I add one word about the race that has been criticised in this House. I question no man's right to say what he believes to be pertinent and relevant; and I am in the judgment of every other member of the House whether what I say be proper or not. But in view of what has been said, I desire to dissociate myself — I go further and say that I absolutely dissociate this Government — from any suggestion that anything in this measure is directed against any one part of the country, against the province of Quebec, against any one race in the country, or in particular against the French Canadian people. I have heard the criticism, and I have heard the defence. To me, there is one overpowering, all-answering defence, and that is that we proceeded to recruit under a voluntary system. What does recruiting under a voluntary system mean? It means that this Government and this Parliament and the Canadian public practically unanimously took the position that upon the question of recruiting each man was absolutely free to act according to his own judgment and his own conscience. Nobody took the responsibility of indicating that a man had any duty to discharge one way or the other. The principle of voluntary recruitment means that every man has the right to decide for himself; that his responsibility is to his own conscience. That being the case, I do not think that it is within the jurisdiction of any one to condemn a man because he exercised a recognized right. On the other hand, I have heard much that was said as against the criticisms made; and, frankly, a good deal of that I would be just as glad not to have heard. I do not undertake to determine whether these contentions were well founded. At any rate they did not seem to me to be quite necessary; sometimes one may be on the defensive, and still overlap a little into unnecessary offensive. I should like to get out of that atmosphere; I should like to approach this question purely and simply from the point of view of a Canadian.

What is the question? The question is: What is Canada's duty at this moment under conditions as they exist now? In August of 1914, Canada went to war. It is not very material now to discuss why she went to war. She went to war of her own volition, as was evidenced by the unanimous action of the membership of this House, enthusiastically endorsed by the voice of practically all the people of Canada. Since then she has been at war, and to-day in the first place the question is: Should she withdraw from that war? In my opinion that is the one question, because we must either go forward to enact this Bill or we should withdraw from the war. I know that other people whose opinions I respect do not look at the matter in that way, but that is the way it presents itself to my mind. Why do I say that? We have

a certain force at the front. I have not heard it suggested that the force that has gone to the front is greater than represents Canada's fair share in this common enterprise into which we have gone with Great Britain and the Allied Nations. This measure proposes what? To send an additional force, to add people to our force. This measure purposes providing reinforcements so that the force that is at the front may be maintained. It seems to me either we must provide those reinforcements, or we must withdraw from the war, because our force at the front is, day by day, being depleted. There are people who say that we never should have gone into the war, and people who say: Now we have exhausted our effort we should go no further; let our battalions disappear, and let Canada cease to be known as an active participant in this great struggle for the defence of Christian civilization upon this globe. Those men, in my opinion, are absolutely logical when they say: No conscription. I do not say they are right, because I do not agree with their premises. But the men who say that we ought to go on with this war, but that we ought not to take to-day, under the conditions of to-day, the step that this measure purposes taking, are, in my judgment—I speak with all respect—absolutely illogical. I say that for two reasons. In the first place, I do not know and I do not care whose is the fault or what are the causes that brought it about, but I do know that persistence in the voluntary system is not bringing us the men as fast as they are required. I have not heard that statement seriously controverted. The second reason comes to me from the arguments I have heard against conscription. As I have said I have listened and I have read attentively and carefully, looking for the reason that would justify my withdrawing from the position that I have taken, and I have not found it. But among the reasons that I have listened to, the one that struck me as having very considerable force, was the argument based upon the assertion that, under present conditions in Canada, we need and we can use every man for purposes of a nature to give more valuable and more effective support for the armies of the Allies than we can give by sending him to war. I have been impressed by that argument. If the facts upon which it is made to rest were established to me, I am not at this moment prepared to say that I might not think that was the reason that would relieve me of this duty that to-day weighs so heavily upon my shoulders. But I say that out of that argument has come to me the conclusive reason why we should proceed, (if we are not going to drop out of this war and send no more men) to obtain our men by selective conscription. If the statements of fact upon which some hon. members advanced that argument, be absolutely sound, what will this measure do? It will establish their soundness. I wondered often as I listened to the discussion in this House, and I wondered more as I read discussions out of this House, to what extent this measure had been read and its principle grasped by the people of this country. In the face of what I have just stated, this measure is strenuously resisted by people who say that we must not send another man because we cannot spare another man. If hon. members have confidence in their affirmation, why do they so strongly oppose our finding out whether it is true or not? For my part I am quite satisfied that they are mistaken. I think, as has been said repeatedly in this House, we all of us have before our eyes to-day the evidence that they are mistaken.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: Does the Minister of Justice mean by his statement that Lord Shaughnessy was mistaken when, on his coming here from England, he said that the only thing to do was to produce for the Allies?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not suggested that we should not produce for the Allies, and I think if the hon. member will wait until I get through he will see there is no contradiction between what I am saying and Lord Shaughnessy's proposition, even as he states it, though I am very far from believing that he states it correctly. Lord Shaughnessy and a great many others—and I have no criticism to make—have insisted upon the importance of our producing to help the Allies. I am not aware that Lord Shaughnessy has ever said that that was the only thing we had to do. We have many duties in this matter; we are trying to deal with one of them now, and at the proper time and the proper place I trust we shall be able to overtake all our duties. But the way to get all those duties done is not to tie this House up indefinitely in resistance to the measure that is proposed to do one duty, and the one which seems to us to present the most imperious call upon us.

To me the second and the conclusive argument why we should proceed to get the men we want by this measure of selective conscription rather than by voluntary en-

listment—even if voluntary enlistment were producing men as fast as it did in its best days—lies in what those hon. gentlemen have put forward as the very basis for their affirmation that we should have no conscription at all. Just to the extent that they are right in their facts, just to the extent that we cannot spare men from Canada, does it become imperatively necessary for us to see that when we send more men we shall send those and those only who can be spared. This is a measure to ascertain who can be spared, and because they argue that nobody can be spared, gentlemen get up and say: "You must stop right here; you must not find out who can be spared. We tell you nobody can be spared, so stop your measure." What are they apprehensive of? Can they be so convinced that nobody can be spared, when they are so frightened of inquiry being made whether anybody can be spared? I do not agree with them in their statement that nobody can be spared. I am absolutely confident that there are still many men whom we can spare for this great work which is essential for the maintenance of Canada's honour. I am willing to take the risk of having the matter fully and carefully investigated as under this measure it is proposed to be investigated and I shall have to take the consequences if that investigation proves me to be wrong. So I say that just because it is true that we have reached the stage where we have to scrutinize carefully just whom we can spare and whom we cannot, it has become the duty of the Government of this country and of the members of this House and of the people of this country to say to the voluntary system: Halt there. We cannot afford to let who will go. Many of those who would go, we need at home and as the Act says, it is more in the national interest that they should remain at home than enlist: Canada needs those men. If we continued with the voluntary system, what has happened in the past would undoubtedly be repeated in the future; the men most valuable at home would go, as they have gone before, and the men who might make excellent soldiers but who are doing no useful work at home would stay in Canada and help consume the very products that we are urged to save so as to send them to Great Britain and the Allies.

To me at least it seems quite clear that we owe it to Canada to see that there shall be a selection of the men who are to go, and that those go who can be spared, and those stay who are absolutely needed at home. As I have said that reason has come to me as the result of reflection on the strongest argument put forward as a reason against sending anybody at all, namely, that we could not spare a man. I do not believe that latter proposition, but I do believe that there is this element of truth in it: that the time has come when it behooves us to carefully scrutinize the men who go and the men who stay. That being so, it becomes the duty of those who are responsible for seeing that Canada does her full duty in this war, to take steps that will bring about the result that the man most useful as a soldier shall be a soldier and that the man mose useful for the great work of production and for maintaining our people here at home shall be utilized for that purpose, or at all events that he shall have the opportunity of turning his energies to the fulfilment of that purpose.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that it might be absolutely true that we need in this country every man for the work of production, agricultural and industrial, and it might be true at the same time that there were many men in this country whom we could let go, because, unfortunately, every man who is at home here is not helping in the work of industrial and agricultural production, and so far I have not heard it suggested that there is any method by which the men who are doing nothing can be compelled to work in industrial or agricultural production. It is quite possible that the men who are not so engaged, whether that ought to be or not, might, under military discipline, make good soldiers. Canada cannot abandon her effort, and I am not going to discuss that, because, if what has already been said in this House has not convinced those who heard it, that Canada cannot in honour abandon her effort, then for my part I abandon hope of carrying that conviction to their minds. That is my starting point, and I think that the general sense of this House is that that is true. If we are to do our duty there is only one course open to us, and that is that we should provide additional men by selective conscription, not to save this man or that man from going to the war, not as some hon. gentlemen are at pains to insinuate, because we are looking for a method of discrimination between one man and another, but in order that we may see to it that both of Canada's duties are performed, one of which duties is that to which my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Mr. Martin) attaches such great importance.

Let me say just a few words on what this measure means. It has struck me, in listening to this debate, that it might not have been a bad idea if we had departed from the usual practice and first examined the provisions of the Bill in order to grasp and thoroughly understand its principle. Had we done this, I think we should have been in a better position to discuss the measure. Much of the debate has been upon a principle of conscription, assumed to mean a system under which every man from twenty to forty-five years of age, without regard to condition, domestic relations, occupation, or the distress which might fall upon an abandoned family, was to be taken by force and marched out to the war. And a great deal of the public opinion that my hon. friend from Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) sought to show by promenading us from parish to parish in the province of Quebec, is based upon the representation that that is what is proposed to be done. But when you look at the Bill you find that it restricts the number of men to be raised to one hundred thousand. Note, that is not a minimum, but a maximum. In the second place, the Bill provides means intended to enable us to ascertain, as I have already said, who can be spared. We have had some criticism of the proposed system. Some hon. gentlemen say it will give an advantage to the rich man at the expense of the poor. If I am not mistaken the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said it was a system under which discrimination of all sorts was possible; that the measure had been prepared for the very purpose of making discrimination on racial, or provincial, or religious lines, or discrimination as between the rich man and the poor. That was far from the minds of those who drafted the measure. And, more than that, it has been stated by the Prime Minister that suggestions for the improvement of the Bill will be welcomed. Let me say to the hon. members who are at such great pains to have it go forth to the people that there is a desire to discriminate against the poor or against any other class: Come with your suggestion, and it will be welcomed; if you have a better method, to make it sure that there shall be no discrimination, let us know what it is. There is no other desire in the heart of anybody who stands behind the Bill than to find the most effective method of preventing discrimination of any kind. Under this Bill the rich man's son will go under the same conditions as the poor man's son; the man of any province the man of any race, the man of one religion,

[Mr. Doherty.]

will go absolutely under the same conditions as the man of another. There is, from beginning to end of this Bill, nothing upon which can be based what I venture to call the unworthy suggestion put forward that there is hidden in it somewhere the germ of unjust discrimination. But I repeat what I have already said: If any man suspects the existence of that defect, let him tell us how to remove it. The men who have made these suggestions are able, astute, capable men; surely they can find means to make more sure the purpose we have in mind. The suggestion to which I have referred, I say, is unworthy of the men who made it, not only because, in my judgment, there is nothing in the measure to justify it, but because they know that if they have a better suggestion, it will be acceptable, and because they know also that statements of that kind can have but one effect—to add to the already too-much inflamed condition of a public mind which is not yet thoroughly informed upon the imperative necessity of this measure, and more particularly not yet thoroughly informed upon what the putting into effect of the measure will mean throughout the country. I register my most emphatic protest against that sort of insinuation. It is unfair to us who stand behind the Bill—but that is a minor matter—it is the contribution of the hon. gentlemen who make it, to add to the already disturbed condition of public opinion.

Here is a measure that is far from being what it has been represented to be, viz., a measure of conscription which is going to take away man, woman and child. We have had pitiful descriptions of the husband snatched away from his wife and children, and of distressful conditions that, it is said, will surround the enforcement of the measure. We want one hundred thousand men, and before any married man is asked to go under the terms of the Bill we shall have exhausted the supply of men from twenty to thirty-five years of age who are unmarried and fit to go. I shall not go into figures which have been given already, but it would appear to be beyond peradventure that this married man, whose fate we have been asked to bemoan, will not be called upon under this measure; he will certainly not be called upon until every man of the class I have described has been called upon and has given his services. But the picture that has been drawn is really the picture of what has happened under the voluntary system. The

man with a wife and young children, who, because he was of high heart and had a strong sense of duty, responded to the call that his heart and conscience put upon him, or yielded to the pressure of public opinion that necessarily existed under what we call the "voluntary" system, went under the distressing circumstances so pathetically enlarged upon. How many and many a father has left this country and gone over, to give his life in this great struggle, or to return crippled and unable to support that family; while men with no dependents, men of leisure, men with money, men who did not need to devote themselves to production, men without ties, with no one dependent upon them, sat at home—and, under the voluntary system, sat at home in the exercise of their absolute right. I say that this is a measure for the protection of the family; it is not a measure that threatens them with the dire consequences that have been spoken of.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) (resuming): When the House rose I had been dealing with what I conceived to be the principle of the Bill, and I had endeavoured to make clear what some of its principal dispositions were. I had taken occasion to make some observations in regard to certain insinuations that some of its dispositions revealed a desire to create or make possible discriminations in the administration of the Act. May I just add upon that subject one observation? Hon. gentlemen suggest that the measure, in some of its terms, makes discrimination possible and they impute to this Government therefore the intention to bring about that result. Do they quite realize that the first thing this Government did, after the Bill was drafted, was to make a proposition that hon. gentlemen from the other side should come into the Administration, displacing a number of those who are here now and that, unless they were going to be parties to the working out of this discrimination which they say the Government contemplated, it would be absolutely impossible. Could there be any more manifest evidence that there could have been no ulterior purpose at all events in the working of any of these dispositions than the readiness and willingness to confide their administration to the newly constituted government which would be equally representative of what is now the Opposition and what is now the party that happens to be in power and that would be not merely composed for one-half of it, of gentlemen who would be nominated by the present leader of the Opposition, but if my memory serves me aright, would be composed for the other half of gentlemen who would sit in that Government subject to the veto of the right hon. gentleman who represents the Opposition? Surely, at all events, we can claim that we have an absolute defence against this insinuation of some ulterior purpose hidden or—I do not know whether hon. gentlemen go so far as to say —apparent, on the face of this measure. Furthermore, this invitation, of suggestions to meet possible objections to any particular provision, or series of provisions, has been extended and certainly will be acted upon.

Before I pass to another phase, may I just, by way of transition, say one word upon the fact that certain hon. gentlemen have taken occasion of the discussion of this measure to refer to what they consider the numerous sins of omission and commission of this Administration. How can that bear upon the question we are called upon to deal with, the question of whether the method proposed is necessary and advisable and is the one which the conditions in which we find ourselves impose upon us the duty of adopting? Again, I point out that simultaneously with the presentation of this measure the Government offered to disappear and allow it to be administered by a newly constituted Government composed in the manner which I indicated a few moments ago. Surely that makes it evident that we have just one question to deal with, and that we may pass without further observation from the objections, grievous as they may appear in the eyes of some hon. gentlemen and which have no bearing upon the question as to whether this measure should or should not be adopted.

Now, I pass to the consideration of another matter that calls certainly for an observation from me and which has arisen out of this debate. We have heard a great deal about pledges and promises. We have heard something about broken faith and we have listened to very eloquent denunciations of this Government whose pledged honour, hon. gentlemen say, has been violated. I think we even heard something about scraps of paper. I, in particular, had the pleasure of sitting here and hearing the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), the hon. member for Laval (Mr.

Wilson) and the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) to-day refer to a matter in regard to which I desire to say a word. The affirmation was made that conscription was a bad thing for Canada because of what the Minister of Justice had said to a very distinguished prelate in Montreal whose name I would not think of introducing into this discussion. It was alleged that I had said a thing which was not true. The hon. member for Rouville was delicate in his expression in that regard but I think he fairly conveyed that meaning. My hon. friend from Laval was less delicate. Before he got through with me he told this House that I had made all sorts of false representations to this reverend gentleman. Then, we go on up in a crescendo. The hon. member for Montcalm did not make any bones about it at all. I do not know whether he felt called upon to go one better than the hon. member for Laval but he did not hesitate to state that I had lied to the archbishop. As far as the pledges of this Government are concerned, it is not for me to deal with this subject. Hon. members have heard recited what have been described as the pledges of this Government. It takes a good deal of determination to find a case of broken promises, to read into the declarations which these hon. gentlemen have read, a promise of future action under all circumstances no matter what might happen. Is a Government never to be free to state what its actual policy is, never to be free to state that it has not certain things in contemplation without being held to have bound itself that never in the future (no matter how conditions or circumstances may change, no matter what knowledge may come to it that it had not at the time that of statement of policy) would it take any course different from that which it was actually following and had then in contemplation? That is the proposition.

We hear about the bankrupt honour of this Government and about its broken pledges. I am told that I made all sorts of false representations, and that I lied to a very distinguished gentleman and a very valued friend of mine. I have adverted to the statements that were made on behalf of this Government. Let me say one word as to the statements which I made, wherein I am told to-day that I lied. In the first place, let me say that I would not dream of contradicting any statement made by the distinguished gentleman to whom I refer, as to what I said to him. I accept his statement as to that as unquestionably true, and I have no doubt that I conveyed to him the meaning which he now attaches to it. It looks as though the desire of the hon. gentleman was to put me in contradiction with this distinguished gentleman, who has my respect and veneration. I say with truth as well as with pride, that I count him among my most valued and respected friends, and if that be their desire, they certainly shall not succeed. I have no hesitation in saying that what I said was true at the time, and is just as true to-day. I said that the National Service cards had no connection, near or far, with conscription. I say that to-day, and it is true. Gentlemen have been through the province of Quebec who were so fond of talking conscription that one would almost believe that they sighed for the day when it might come, or, at all events, might be proposed, in order that they might use the fact to further their political advancement. These gentlemen had been making statements in Quebec, and I shall not say they lied. I have more consideration for the hon. gentleman from Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) than apparently he has for me. They have been stating what perhaps they did not know to be false, but what they certainly did not know to be true, namely that the National Service cards were a step in the direction of conscription. I stated at the time that that was untrue, and I say to-night that it is untrue and I defy any body to establish the contrary. And because, forsooth, I told that truth, hon. gentlemen talk about my having lied, and they talk about my broken faith and about all sorts of representations that I made. I expressed my absolute conviction, as a conviction and an opinion, that conscription would not come in this country, and I believed it absolutely. If the gentleman to whom that statement was made understood it to be a promise, and said that I made it, let it be well understood. I am not denying that what I said may have justified the view he took of it, though I venture to say nothing was further from my mind, at the moment, than that I was making a promise. Let it be clearly understood I made no such promise. Had I undertaken to make such a promise, hon. gentlemen would have a right to reproach me, not for the breaking but for the making of it. I recognize that that would be a grave offence. Mark you, I refer to a promise such as the one I am reproached for having broken, and such as the hon. leader of the Government is reproached for having failed to keep. I say that if any public man should undertake to promise that he would not adopt a cer-

tain course, no matter how clearly circumstances might make it his duty to adopt that course, he would be gravely to be condemned for making such a promise. And, when circumstances which he did not control made it his imperative duty, in the interests of his country, or brought home to his mind the conviction that it was his imperative duty in the interests of his country, to take the course that he had promised not to take, would hon. gentlemen contend that he should say, "Yes, it is quite clear now, the salvation of my country depends upon a certain course being taken, I am the man who is in a position to take it, I alone, can set on foot the measures to bring it about, but I made a promise, and I must stand by it, and see the honour of my country lost, and see the soldiers of my country left unsupported, and see possible defeat come to those to whom I have pledged my assistance, and see the cause that I thought of such importance as to justify my plunging my country into war go down to disgraceful defeat, because, forsooth, I rashly and unwisely made a promise?" I say, Mr. Speaker, that a man who, in those circumstances, would feel that he was withheld from doing that which was his clear duty, gravely as he had offended in making the rash promise, would offend more gravely by keeping it. I see my hon. friend from Montcalm smiling at me in a calm way. I put a case before him. I have heard people speak in the strongest way against the use of firearms. I have heard men say that never, under any circumstances, or under any conditions, was a man justified in carrying a firearm, or in using it against his neighbour. Suppose a man, having made that declaration and pledge, finds himself in a situation where his house has been broken into by a powerful ruffian, who, perhaps, proceeded to outrage his wife and his daughter; the firearm lies right by his hand. Would the member for Montcalm say that the husband should fold his arms with the remark: oh, I made a promise; I shall not interfere?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: I never said that.

Mr. DOHERTY: The member for Montcalm—and the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) also, if I may judge from what he said the other evening, with his hands in the air, about the "broken faith" of this Government—would stand behind that husband and say: beware, your broken faith, your broken faith! And he would expect that husband to drop his firearm and take no action. After the ruffian had carried out his operations to his own satisfaction, and this promiser, his house looted and his family murdered, was himself ready for the grave, I suppose the member for Rouville would conduct the victim there in admiration and would see to it that a monument was erected to his memory. I suppose he would inscribe upon that monument the words of the poet about a man who acted not dissimilarly: "Faith, unfaithful, made him falsely true."

I say again that I never made any promise. If it is said that I made such a promise, I am not questioning the statement of the gentleman who so understood my remarks. If I had made any such promise, I would have done a thing that I should not have done. If the circumstances be such as the Prime Minister says they are to-day on the other side of the water, and as I absolutely believe them to be; and if the reasons which I gave this afternoon prove that the only effective way of meeting these conditions is the adoption of this measure, then I say that had I made such a promise, my only course as a man of honour would have been to do that which my position here, the exigencies of the case and the needs of my country called upon me to do.

So much for pledges and promises. The member for Montcalm to-day gave great credit to the ex-Secretary of State (Hon. E. L. Patenaude) for his action in leaving this Government. To what did the member for Montcalm attribute that action? He said that the former Secretary of State would rather leave this Government than be a party to the breaking of these pledges, and he expressed the wish that other gentlemen had felt likewise. I should like the member for Montcalm to remember the expression by which he qualified the statement that he attributed to me. As I do not like to get beyond Parliamentary rules, all I ask him to do is to take it that I am making a similar statement with regard to the statement of his; that the ex-Secretary of State left this Government rather than break his pledges. Did the member for Montcalm read the letter of the ex-Secretary of State? Does he still persist in saying that the reason he gave why the ex-Secretary of State left the Government is correct? I will not try to qualify his action if he does so; the member for Montcalm would have just the word to use —but I shall not use it.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: I have not a word to withdraw.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is exactly what I said.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: I have my archbishop with me.

Mr. DOHERTY: I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the company in which he says he finds himself, but I am not afraid that he will succeed in destroying the confidence of that gentleman in myself. The ex-Secretary of State did not leave this Government because he had made a pledge that he thought this Government was breaking. The member for Montcalm, who has waited so long to discover his innate admiration of the member for Hochelaga (Mr. Patenaude), certainly does not entertain a higher opinion of that gentleman than I do. It was a loss to the Government when Hon. Mr. Patenaude thought it his duty to withdraw from it, and it would be a great loss to the public life of Canada if he should permanently withdraw from it. I sincerely hope that wherever it may seem to him that the path of duty lies, he will continue to follow that path and to give his valuable service to our country. But the ex-Secretary of State knows precisely all the facts with which we have been dealing and I leave it to him whether there was any question of broken promise or broken pledge on his part or on mine. Moreover, I leave it to his letter of resignation to contradict the unfounded statement of the member for Montcalm that he resigned rather than break a pledge that was given and that reproach should be addressed to me because I had not done likewise. Hon. gentlemen who appreciate what honour means should be careful not to impugn a man's personal honour as mine has been impugned by the member for Rouville—I give him the credit that his language was more delicate than that of the member for Laval (Mr. Wilson) and the member for Montcalm. This subject is not as important, from the public point of view, as these hon. gentlemen seem to think it is, but it is of vital importance to me, because it touches my personal honour.

Let me advert for a moment to the use which the member for Laval did not think it beneath him to make of an answer given on behalf of the Government to a question put by the member for Russell (Mr. Murphy). I have not the slightest doubt that the member for Russell got an answer to the question that he intended to put. I know the member for Russell too well and have too high a respect for him to imagine that he would try, under the guise of a Parliamentary question, to pry into the private correspondence of a gentleman because he happened to be a member of the Government. The member for Russell asked whether there had been any correspondence between this Government, or any member of the Government, and any prelate of the province of Quebec. We would not have done to the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) the injustice to suppose that he was trying to ferret out private correspondence between members of this Governement and their friends. The hon. member for Russell is a gentleman, and I am quite sure he never meant to try to do anything of the kind. Such action would be beneath contempt. How it should be more justifiable to try to ferret out the correspondence between a gentleman, because he happens to be a member of the Government, and another gentleman, who happens to be a clergyman or a prelate or a bishop in the church to which that gentleman happens to belong, is something that I cannot understand. I want to be just, and I am only just to the hon. member for Russell when I say I am satisfied he had no such idea in mind, and equally am I satisfied that he never conceived of the use to which the hon. member for Laval (Mr. C. A. Wilson) would be willing to put the perfectly proper answer the hon. member got, that there was no official correspondence by the Government, and that the Government did not charge itself with investigating the private correspondence of its members. The hon. member for Russell never can have foreseen the use that that answer would be put to. The hon. member for Laval, the other evening, in the presence of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), who did not condemn his action—I am satisfied if he thinks about it, he will condemn it—proceeded in this House to find fault with this answer and, having satisfied himself from it that there was private correspondence, to draw this extraordinary conclusion: "there was private correspondence because the Government said there was no official correspondence—which was the only matter at issue—and moreover, it has been said that a minister made a promise to an archbishop; by this system of reasoning I have arrived at the conclusion that there was private correspondence between the minister and the archbishop; therefore, it is proved, as clear as

day, that that minister made that particular promise to the archbishop." My hon. friend from Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) smiles. He is an expert on proof, and I am satisfied that he is absolutely convinced that that is proven. The next time he wants to prove that I have announced my intention of setting fire to the Parliament buildings, it will be the simplest thing in the world for him to do so after this fashion; an hon. member will ask this Government: "Has there been any correspondence between any minister, say, and his wife with regard to the Parliament Buildings?" The Government will answer: "This Government has had no official correspondence with the lady, and it does not investigate correspondence between its members and their wives." There is, of course, nothing further to be said. It will be conclusively demonstrated to the hon. member for Montcalm and the hon. member for Laval, that I wrote to my wife a letter, in which I announced my intention of burning down the Parliament buildings. Was it worth while to try to make an utterly contemptible use of a fair answer to a fair question, for the purpose of arriving at that conclusive demonstration? So much for the pledges.

I wish to advert for a moment to the condition which, in our judgment, made it imperatively necessary to provide without delay an additional number of men. I desire to read to the House a paragraph from a letter which came under my notice to-day. I do not know the writer beyond that he is apparently an American in the Ambulance Service writing home from France. His letter describes so accurately a condition of affairs that this House has had intimated to it by the Prime Minister in terms as clear as it would be becoming for a man occupying his position to use, that I venture to read it here. The writer says, as descriptive of the conditions on the French front to-day and as indicating the need for men:—

> France has up to this time fought with a bravery unprecedented in the history of the world. Her men have sacrificed themselves with almost reckless abandon. Her losses have been tremendous. Now France is tired out, dead tired. Most of her young men have gone, and the older classes are being called out to fill their places; and this work is simply too much for men of advanced years. Then America enters the war. A new dawn appears to these old men. At last they can get back to their field, or go into some less strenuous back line work. At last there is a chance that some members of this wonderful nation will survive this war and continue this race which has stood for so much in art and literature. But what is America doing?

And then the writer goes on to criticise the action of America in sending ambulance corps which can be useful behind the lines and in not sending men to go into the front trenches. He goes on to say:—

> If America wishes to see France stagger and fall from loss of blood; if she wants to go into the future with the stigma that she moved too late to save France, let her continue to send automobilists to joy ride along the French front and consume French food and fuel. If she wants the name of a fighting nation, let her send shiploads of aviators and planes and follow these with a backbone of artillery. Also let her provide some means by which her sons in France now serving as ambulanciers or in other positions may get into some more warlike work and fight as good Americans should.

That is not addressed to us, but has it no message for us? After all, what is it more than the message that the great Maréchal Joffre, who, with very little English at his disposal, emphasized again and again to the soldiers in Montreal, as he passed them in review: "Send us more men; send us more men?" Did Maréchal Joffre know what was needed, or perchance does the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) know better? That is the situation over there. It is only another man's expression of what we all knew, but it describes the situation very aptly, and, I have not the slightest doubt, very correctly. The Prime Minister, in terms fitting for him to use, has told this House of the crying need for men. Perhaps some of us have heard the story more in detail. Perhaps some of us have heard things that it might not be wise to give to the public. Perhaps some of us have a more keen sense of the critical nature of the present situation than the people of Canada, before the visit of the Prime Minister to England, had conceived. I am no pessimist; I have no desire to create unnecessary alarm; I have no desire to say anything that would create the impression that conditions were more desperate than they are.

But I do venture to say that to my mind—I give this, of course, for what it is worth as my own conviction—this war to-day is anybody's war. I do not say that I have no longer confident hope; I have, but that confident hope rests upon everybody who is in this war doing his utmost. We have been told: Oh, the United States has come into the war. That is given as a reason why we should let up. I have a great admiration for our friends of the United States. I have faith in their bravery, faith in their resources, faith that they will do their utmost. But when they have done their utmost they will be proud men if,

by doing that utmost, they shall have placed themselves in a position to equal the great effort that France has made, but which, alas, she can make no longer, or at all events with the same effect. Is it consonant with the honour of Canada to say, as we have heard it said here: Oh, it is not our 100,000 men who are going to make the difference. But our 100,000 men are, in proportion to our population and means, what ten times that number would be to the people of the United States. If the people of the United States say Oh, it is not our 1,000,000 men who are going to make the difference, and if Great Britain lets up and says: Oh, it is not the more men that we may gather who are going to make the difference—if we and the United States and Great Britain say that, all the difference in the world will result. Surely we have pride enough to say: Having put our hand to the plough, we will not look back at this critical moment. Surely we have regard enough for our young men who have gone forth so willingly and so readily to say to them: So far as it depends upon us at home, your task will not be made harder than it need be.

Do hon. gentlemen realize what reinforcements mean? Do they realize that when reinforcements are lacking, double or treble stress is put on the man at the front? You are exposing him to double or treble danger; you are sending him again and again into the trenches to meet death. In addition to that, when he has done his double or treble duty, he gets but half or one-third the time for rest he would get if his comrades at home were doing their duty. When it is for this purpose that reinforcements are needed, are we going to sit back and say: Oh, well, let the Americans do it; let the Englishmen do it; let the Frenchmen in the present exhausted condition of France do it; we have no interest in our boys more than we have in any other men who are fighting in this war. I did not intend to go into any development of the reasons why this thing ought to be done, because that has already been treated of very much more eloquently than I could hope to do it, but there are some things a man cannot touch without being carried away.

Now to proceed to the suggested referendum, which is the method proposed for meeting the emergency, for remedying the condition of which I have spoken. Mr. Speaker, no man is a greater stickler for the people's rights than, I venture to say, I am. There is to me, as a representative

of the people, only one thing more sacred than the people's rights, and that is the people's duty. To the individual man, his duty is or ought to be something much more sacred than his right. The public man ought to be more anxious about whether he is doing his duty as a public man than whether he is hewing just absolutely to the line what he has a right to do. I am anxious that the people's rights should be respected, but I am also anxious for the honour of my country that the people's duties should be done. It is all very well to talk of devotion to the people, and I suppose that there are occasions when that talk is useful for getting votes, but there comes a time—or all government is vain imagining—when it is the duty of the people's representatives and of those who have been entrusted with the government of the people, to see to it that the people do their duty. And, that is the position that confronts this Parliament tonight.

Let me eliminate for a moment the question which I shall deal with later on of whether there is any distinction between this Parliament and any other Parliament. Is it my right hon. friend's (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) conception of popular or democratic government that those whom the people elect and to whom they entrust the power of governing them, and with the power the duty of exercising it, shall never govern the people when the people do not want to do their duty. I am not saying that the people of Canada do not now want to do their duty, but the principle that underlies this referendum motion is that if the time ever comes when the people of Canada do not want to do their duty, those entrusted with the government shall throw up their hands and say: We will not govern, we will go out and say to the people—on the hypothesis that they do not want to do their duty—please will you be good enough to tell us whether we, your delegated authority to govern you, ought to make a law to compel you to do your duty.

When I studied mathematics long ago there was one form of argument described as the reductio ad absurdum. When you wanted to show that a proposition was absolutely indefensible you pointed out the absurdity of the consequences to which it would lead. It seems to me that the referendum proposal is intended to support an argument directed against democratic government to show its utter futility and utter uselessness by means of the reductio

ad absurdum. If that is not reducing to the absurd the consequences of government by the people, then I have no comprehension of what the absurd means.

Let us understand each other about government by the people. Under our constitution we have government by the people in this sense: that it belongs absolutely to the people, to determine who shall govern them. But it is a novel proposition that government by the people necessarily involves enactment of legislation by the people themselves, and that is in practical effect what is suggested by this referendum. There may be circumstances when it is proper to do that. But now, when the whole question involved is not, mind you, whether the people ought to do a duty, but whether there ought to be a law enacted to compel them to do that duty, it is proposed that we should go out and ask the people, who do not want to be compelled, if they want to be compelled. Surely, if the people want to be compelled it is the clearest evidence that they do not need to be compelled; for if they do want to be compelled they will go out and do the duty without compulsion. So, when you ask the question, you must assume that they do not want to do the duty. Therefore, the proposal is that we should go out and say to them: Gentlemen, you do not want to go to the war; will you be good enough to tell us if you want us to make a law to compel you to go to the war you do not want to go to? What answer is expected, I do not know.

It may be said that it is the majority of the people who would determine that question; and I quite understand that a large part of the majority will not be liable or not unwilling to go to the war. Their votes will compel the liable but unwilling, and what I am suggesting is not true as an absolute proposition governing the whole of the people. But it remains true that in the majority, whichever way it votes—and certainly in the majority if you have a majority saying they do not want a law to compel those who do not want to go to the war to go—you will have the vote of every man who does not want to go to the war; you will have the vote of every man who, if any body ought to be compelled. is the man who ought to be compelled to go to the war. And you are told that this is a necessary consequence of democratic institutions. If I were called upon to make an attack upon government by the democracy, I do not think I could find a stronger argument than to point to that as one of its necessary consequences. We are asked to trust the people. Mr. Speaker, I trust the people; I trust the people far and beyond where many hon. gentlemen on the other side trust them. I trust them miles beyond where my hon. friend from Montcalm trusts them. He gave us a pathetic description of the efforts that would have to be made to enforce this law and of the ways that people would find to evade it. And I must pay him—I wonder if it is safe to call it the compliment—of saying that he gave us some of the most original law it has ever been my fortune to listen to. There are many things in which originality is a very good quality. I do not want to discuss at the moment how far originality in law is a good quality; but I give the hon. gentleman credit for producing some most original law. He has laboured to show how easy it is for the people of Canada—who, of course, according to him, do not want to obey the law—to evade the law. I trust the people more than he does. I trust the people that, after this law shall have been enacted, and when they understand and know just what it is and just how it operates, they will recognize it as the proper method of providing both that those who should not go to the war shall be exempt from pressure to go, and that those who should go shall come forward to do their duty. I have not the apprehension the hon. gentleman has expressed, for I trust the people. I trust to their mature judgment; I trust them when they shall have had time to reflect. But

9 p.m.

the suggestion is that we do not trust the people because we will not take their judgment at the first moment when a proposition of this kind is made to them, when they are unprepared for it, ill-informed or mis-informed upon it. Reproaches have been cast upon the Government in this matter, I am not concerned about that, because I think we have come to the day when the personal reproach that an individual may earn, and the question whether a particular Government is deserving of condemnation or the contrary, or whether a particular party has always been on right lines, or the contrary, are matters of absolutely no consequence. I am quite satisfied that the people of Canada are not in the remotest degree interested to-day in the past sins or past virtues of the existing Government or of the present party to which I have the honour to belong, nor in those of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. Whether the people of Canada are for this measure or against it, there is

one thing I am absolutely convinced of, and that is that they have not the slightest interest in the discussion of the merits of political parties at this moment.

I was about to say, when I was carried into this digression, that I am prepared to trust the people, to trust the sane judgment of the people; to trust the judgment of the people after they have had proper opportunities for information. But to-day we are dealing with a people upon whom this proposition has come unexpectedly, and they are not prepared for it. I think that members of Parliament should be guided by the opinions of the people, but by the opinions of the people arrived at and formed after opportunity for consideration, and expressed at the proper time and in the proper manner under the provisions of the constitution. The hon. member for Montcalm took us nearly all over the province of Quebec, and told us of meetings that he had attended that were against conscription, including one in my own constituency. He further warned us that it would not be safe for us to go there and say a word for conscription, because the Lachine canal is near. Well, let me tell the hon. member in turn that, when he wants to make the statement that I lied, it would not be wise for him to go back and make it in St. Anne's hall, even at a Liberal meeting, because the Lachine canal is very near.

Now, I was saying, I trust the people. I trust implicitly to their judgment when they have had opportunity for information and consideration. But I do not conceive the functions of a representative of the people to be to go around to meetings throughout the country addressing people who have not the necessary information, stirring them up to express an opinion in a certain sense, and then walk into this House and say: There is nothing more to be said; I am here to express the opinions of the people. The question what the function of a member of Parliament is under the British system is not a new question. I am not going into that question, but I would suggest to these hon. gentlemen who are so anxious about the opinion of the people that they should take a few minutes some day to read a famous speech of that great English statesman—I should rather say, that great Irishman whom Ireland gave to England to be one of her greatest statesmen—Edmund Burke. That will tell them what is the proper position of a representative of the people. Let me read a few lines. Burke was being reproached for not having followed the opinion of his electors—the subject is not material. He said to them:

> For, gentlemen, it is not your fond desires, nor mine, that can alter the nature of things; by contending against which, what have we got, or ever shall get, but defeat and shame? I did not obey your instructions. No; I conformed to the instructions of truth and nature, and maintained your interest, against your opinions, with a constancy that became me. A representative worthy of you ought to be a person of stability. I am to look, indeed, to your opinions; but to such opinions as you and I must have five years hence. I was not to look to the flash of the day.

We owe a duty to the people and that is not to look to the flash of the day, not to be governed by the opinions of people described by the hon. gentleman as being in a frame of mind where they throw one into the canal if he express any opinion other than what they may happen to entertain at the moment. Speaking for myself, and having respect for the people who were at these meetings, I can quite understand that at the first flash this proposal, ill-understood and worse explained, does not commend itself to their judgment but when it is brought to their attention and properly explained I am satisfied they will give it their approval. I am satisfied that if, by any mistake on the part of this Government and Parliament, we should decide to let this question be settled at this moment by a vote taken without further preparation, upon the submission of this sole question to the people when they are being appealed to in the most powerful way and by the most eloquent gentlemen to resist and reject this proposal, that if we should subject the honour of Canada to being soiled by the possibly unfortunate result of a vote taken under these circumstances by the people ill-informed and without proper explanation, these very people themselves, when they saw the result, would never forgive us for what we had done. They would tell us, in the words of Edmund Burke: You should not have been governed by the flash of the moment; you should have waited for our opinion one year, two years or three years hence when we shall be in a position to appreciate the possible results; perhaps even to know the actual results of the decision you are called upon to make.

Now, I feel that I owe the House and yourself, Mr. Speaker, an apology for the length at which I have allowed myself to be led into going in connection with this most important question. I do not know that I can flatter myself that what I have said can alter the views of any man but at least I feel that the best thought that I have been able to give to the most im-

portant question that I have ever had to consider has inspired me to say what I have said.

In conclusion, let me just say one word as to what has been called the constitutional lack of power of this Parliament to pass this Bill and the absence of a mandate on the part of its members. I wonder if hon. members remember what happened in January, 1916, and I wonder if their memory goes a little farther back to August, 1914. In August, 1914, nobody could question the mandate of this Parliament and nobody could speak of this Government as being moribund. I do not feel quite so shocked about that expression as the hon. member for Montcalm thought I ought to. The best of us, even my hon. friend from Montcalm himself, will come some day to be in a moribund condition and still he marvels that we do not rise in wrath at the very mention of it. I do not know what we are expected to do or to say when we are described as a moribund Government as we have been by the leader of the Opposition. Well, we have to stand that epithet. Could this Government be described as a moribund Government in 1914? Had this Parliament a mandate in 1914? What did this Parliament do in 1914? We had a three or four days' session. I think we all look back with pride and pleasure to those three or four days because in that three or four days' session we realized to the full the condition which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) the other day recalled to us as having been described by an English poet in words put into the mouth of a Roman of old lamenting the disappearance of those days "when none were for a party and all were for the State." In those four or five days we realized that. I hope that we will still, notwithstanding the difference of opinion that exists between us as to this particular measure, be in that frame of mind. There could be no doubt about it at that time and what did this Parliament, then in the full enjoyment of its mandate, under the impulse of that common sentiment, realize? Was it wondering about the rights of the people, was it wondering whether it should have a referendum, was it anxious even about the rights of the people's representatives? Not a bit. This Parliament did at that time, and under the inspiration of the impulse that prevailed then, something that was absolutely unprecedented in the annals of Canadian Parliaments and, I am not quite sure whether one could not safely say, in the annals of any British Parliament. Parliament then handed over to this Government, that was not moribund then, absolutely its entire legislative powers in so far as matters pertaining to the war were concerned. Conditions were so critical that the people's representatives were willing to forego their control over legislation and to hand it over to the Government, a Government that had not been elected to deal with these matters in particular. Parliament then realized that what would be necessary would be prompt action and it thought it was worth while to sacrifice even the right of the people to make their own legislation through their own representatives in order to ensure that needed action would be taken at the proper moment and that there should be no delay. That is what Parliament did then, a live Parliament, a Parliament that had an unquestioned mandate. I am not going to claim now that the Government might do what it chose. I think it might have done what it believed to be right, but this Government, in carrying out its duty, has been truly conservative in the exercise of its powers. But, I have referred to their wide scope as indicating what this Parliament in the vigour of its life, when its mandate was undoubted and its motives of the highest, thought it proper to do on behalf of the people. It was absolutely like the action that the earliest democratic peoples realized, in very ancient times, to be the proper action in like conditions. We all know that when the State was in peril, when the enemy was at the gate, when civil commotion threatened, in the old Rome of the Republican days, the people, ever jealous of their rights, stood not upon them, and the Senate said to the consuls: Take care that nothing of evil befall the Commonwealth. Caveant consules ne quid detrimenti Republica capiat," and left to them the plenitude of power.

And in virtue of what Parliament did then, in the full vigour of its life and unquestioned mandate, I venture to say the Government might have proceeded upon the authority so conferred to enact the present measure. We have not sought to do so, nor would we dream of going that far. I refer to the legislation merely to show what this Parliament thought was the proper line of action in the day of its fullest vigour. In 1916 what did this Parliament do? Parliament voted that it was desirable that, though, under our written constitution our mandate expired in October last, the mandate of Parliament should be extended for another year, and to-day the

hon. gentlemen who supported that motion, who felt that the good of the country imperatively demanded such action, now say one after the other, "Oh, we did something we had not any right to do; although we did it with our eyes open, we had no right to do it, and therefore we do not now represent the people."

I was amazed to hear members make speeches in this Chamber on the strength of the fact that they did not represent the people. I desire to say one word with reference to that proposition. It is quite true that, under our written constitution, this House was elected for a fixed period of five years. But the constitution of this country is susceptible of amendment, and the people may express their will tacitly, just as clearly as by their vote, and when, in 1916, this Parliament, composed of representatives about whose mandate there was no doubt, gentlemen who represented the entire country, unanimously said that the safety of the country required that there should be no election, but that the life of Parliament should be extended, and when the people of Canada from one end to the other ratified that decision, I say, Mr. Speaker, that we then modified the constitution in the most regular and normal British way, that is by what is done and accepted as being the needful thing to meet new and unprovided for conditions. It is true we have a written constitution, and it can legally be altered only by the Imperial Parliament. The Imperial Parliament sanctioned the Bill passed in 1916, and that rendered legal what had been decided upon by us. I can say that when the Parliament, under those conditions, and with the absolute ratification of the people—and I am satisfied that will not be disputed—passed the Bill extending the life of Parliament in January, 1916, a Parliament was constituted with all the powers that ever belonged to any Parliament in the Dominion of Canada. Our right to sit as a Parliament was questioned by the hon. gentleman from Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) as being illegal. That is part of the original law that the hon. gentleman gave us this afternoon, but when it is said our existence is unconstitutional I can only say that while this Parliament is not here by the will of the people, expressed in the ordinary and usual form, it is here by the unmistakable assent of the people, who were convinced that the expression of their will in the usual form would be detrimental to the best interest of Canada. I, for one, have no doubt of the validity of my mandate, nor have I any doubt of your powers, Mr. Speaker, in this House. We can do anything and everything that a lawfully and constitutionally elected Parliament can do, and, therefore, I have no doubt of my right to sit here and perform my duties as a member of Parliament. I have already endeavoured to point out Canada's duty at the present time, which is quite clear. Here we have in our hands the mandate, and on our shoulders the responsibility, for seeing that Canada does her duty. Mr. Speaker, I for one—and I am satisfied the great majority of the members of this House will be with me—will not shirk this responsibility to-night upon the mere plea of undue anxiety about the rights of the people.

In conclusion, to go back to where I began, let me suggest that we all endeavour, in the decision to which we may come, and the action we may take in pursuance of that decision, to join together, with the realizing sense that there is but one question in reality before us, and that is: What is the duty of Canada to-night? What is her duty to herself, to her honour, to her Allies, to her voluntary soldiers who have died, and are dying and facing death to-night? Let us forget that there are different provinces. Let us forget all the reproaches one race may think it has to make against another. Let us forget all the petty quarrels which may have occurred between us, by reason of political divergence, or differences. Let us forget that there are any political parties. Let us forget that there are any Government or any Opposition. Let us remember just one thing alone; that there is come to us the great privilege, carrying with it the heavy burden of responsibility, of determining for Canada to-night the most important question that any Canadian Parliament has ever been called upon to determine, a question upon whose right decision, and upon the proper action following that decision depends the honour of our country, Canada.

M. THOMAS MacNUTT (Saltcoats): I wish to place on record my reason for polling the vote I intend to poll to-night. I am a believer in the referendum, as a general thing. If any large questions come before the House and before the country, for which there is no mandate by an election, I think the situation should be laid before the people, and that they should be consulted. But, Sir, I do not see how this present proposal can possibly be a fair referendum. The men who are most interested in the carrying out of this Bill are

the soldiers at the front to-day. At the time the Soldiers' Vote Bill was passed, it was recognized that it was desirable to poll the soldiers' vote. Very strong opinions were expressed at that time that it would be impracticable. Other opinions from hon. gentlemen, for whose judgment I have great respect, were expressed to the contrary. One of those opinions I cannot pass by; I refer to the opinion of the Prime Minister, who was behind the Soldiers' Vote Bill, who believed it was practical at that time to take their vote, but he has been across the water in the meantime, and looked into the matter, and he has made a statement in this House with respect to it. I wish to quote a couple of sentences from his remarks:

> The men at the front will be not only practically, but actually, disfranchised if an election does take place in this country while they are in the trenches. That is my conviction.

Further, in connection with the Soldiers' Voting Act of 1915. he said:

> I am not disposed to think that the arrangements made in that Act or in any other Act that could be devised are such as to enable those men to vote, or at least any considerable number of them.

We must have in this country a great many men who are available for service at the front. Some of them are what we call "slackers"; others are opposed to Canada's participation in the war. These men would have the right to vote, but a great many of the men who have bravely gone overseas to defend British institutions and who are calling for reinforcements would be debarred from voting. If only 10,000 of them were debarred from voting, I would still not support a referendum, having regard to present conditions. The men who are fighting for us overseas are specially interested in this matter, and they are the men who should be first considered.

It has been contended that the voluntary system could even now be made successful. Well, the present Administration have had that matter in hand and it is likely that they will continue to have it in hand for some time. They declare that they cannot do much more along the line of voluntary recruiting. What are we going to do about it? It is all very well to make recriminations and to say that they should have done better or that under different conditions they would have done better. But, Sir, discussion of that kind can very well be left for a while; what we have to face now is the present situation. We require men at the front, are there any men in Canada available for that service? I believe that there are. The slogan at the beginning of the war was: the last man and the last dollar; it is nearly time that we tried to put that into effect. It was not anticipated that the war would be such as it turned out to be, but the country has to continue to perform its part, even if it takes the last man and the last dollar. At the same time, there are many men who are not available for service at the front. An authority has stated that out of the 100 per cent only 25 per cent of the energy required to win the war is represented by men who can be classed as combatants, the remainder being made up of those who take part in agriculture, transportation, the manufacture of munitions and so on. On the other hand, many men are employed to-day in non-essential industries—piano and automobile factories, and so on—who could be sent to the front and their places filled by others, including returned soldiers. Any one who visits a lacrosse or baseball match is struck by the number of athletic, able-bodied young men who play these games professionally for the amusement of the crowds, in order to make money. This is the kind of man that ought to be at the front. They do not seem to want to go, and it strikes me that they should be made go to defend the institutions of their country. Other men attend these games and gatherings—they are sometimes called rooters—many of whom could be sent forward. As a matter of fact, many men are available who could be well spared, and if they do not know their duty, it should be pointed out to them. I do not think, however, that a single man should be taken from the farms. I do not say that because I am a farmer, but I know that though we may manage to get the crop in, the outlook for saving it is not very bright. If many more men are taken from the farms, production will be made much less, and production is as essential as the sending of men to the front. Great judgment will have to be exercised in selecting the proper men to send forward.

I think that there should be another form of conscription, that which has been referred to as the conscription of wealth. There are many men in the country who have large incomes—professional men, promoters, commission men, men who have inherited large sums of money. The lives of these men are in no danger; they cannot go to the front; they should, therefore, be called upon to pay out some of their surplus money to assist in feeding and equipping the men at the front. How

many men of this kind there are, I do not know. Other men have a considerable amount of capital invested in businesses that are not touched by the present taxation. Why should not a man who has $25,000 or less in a business pay his share of taxation as well as the man whose business is capitalized at $50,000? If he is allowed profits of 10 per cent, he will get $2,500 a year. If he makes only 10 per cent, he could be exempted from taxation, but he could well afford to pay into the treasury one-quarter of each additional 5 per cent earned, one-half of the next 5 per cent earned and three-quarters of any further profits earned. When a domestic loan is floated, most of these men are glad to invest their money in 5 per cent non-taxable bonds which will be a charge upon the whole country for a long time and which will be a charge even upon the men who are at the front. Why should we send to the front a young man who has only his life to give, and leave behind, out of danger, other men who have large incomes which are taxed not at all or comparatively lightly? These men should at least be called upon to pay a large proportion of the money necessary to equip and maintain the men at the front.

One of my reasons for speaking to-night was that of making a few remarks with regard to a matter that has not been brought up in this debate and which relates to the foreign-born citizens of Canada. We have an enormous country in the West that required people to work and develop it. Very properly, the Government invited settlers from all parts of the world, and many came from what are now enemy countries. These men are not at all to blame for the war; they settled in our country; many of them took up third-class lands that nobody else would take, and have made good.

From my experience with these people I can say that they are good and industrious settlers. I notice a smile on the face of an hon. gentleman opposite. These people are not all Liberals. In some parts of my district there are a number of foreign-born settlers, and in some of the polls in these districts there is generally a Conservative majority and in others a Liberal majority. I am not talking politics at the present time. These men are citizens of this country, and they have a perfect right to have their citizenship respected. They have, however, been looked upon as enemies. I do not know of any recruiting meetings having been held in those settlements, but I do know that a considerable number of foreign-born settlers and sons of foreign-born settlers have enlisted or have endeavoured to enlist, and many of them have been turned down because their country of origin was Austria or Germany. In that way an antagonistic feeling has been built up which should not have arisen. These people are not responsible for this war. Perhaps there were agitators and sedition-mongers amongst them, but they have been looked after, and I might say that they are not the only people amongst whom there are agitators. I am satisfied there is a field for recruiting which has not been worked. I am rather curious to know whether this Conscription Bill, if it passes, as no doubt it will, will be applied in the foreign-born settlements, as they are called. Although we cannot expect these people to be as enthusiastic as our British-born people are, they are not disloyal; in fact, many of them we may consider as very loyal indeed. To give an instance, an influential German-born citizen who came out here when very young told me not long ago that he had made an offer —I suppose to the Department of Militia— to raise a battalion amongst his own people if they were allowed to go and fight the Turks. That showed, of course, a perfectly natural feeling on his part. He said: "We do not care to volunteer to go to the front, and perhaps shoot our relatives there, but we are ready, if they send us, to go and take part in the fight against the Turks." I told him that a number of German officers were in command of the Turkish army. He said that did not matter, that they had no relations amongst the officers. This man had a younger brother wounded about three weeks ago fighting for the Allies. I could give a number of similar instances.

I do not think I am out of order in speaking along these lines. I want, if possible, to remove some of the false impressions that there are in regard to the foreign-born settlers in the West. In voting, as I intend to do, it may be that I shall render myself unpopular amongst some of my electors, but I am willing to take the risk. At the same time I believe in fair play and in stating what I know to be the truth in regard to these people or to any matters that may be under consideration. On frequent occasions I have been invited to and have attended Union School picnics, where, perhaps, thirty or forty children from each of fifteen, sixteen or eighteen schools for foreign-born settlers meet for an outing one day in the year. It would probably open the eyes of some of our friends in the East if they could attend some of those picnics.

They would find the children bright and well-dressed marching around, every one of them waving a Union Jack and singing patriotic songs, and I do not think you could tell very much difference between them and the children of British-born people. I noticed the other day in a local paper the description of a concert, which I shall take the liberty of reading, as it has a bearing upon this question:

On Monday, June 4, a patriotic school concert was held in Goodeve Town Hall, in aid of the Patriotic Fund. Not only did the children show a thorough mastery of the English language, but entered into the patriotic choruses, drills and recitations with an enthusiasm which showed that they are real young Canadians, heart and soul. Every child was of foreign-born parentage, Ruthenian, Polish, German and Austrian; yet these parents went to much expense and trouble to equip their children for the concert and to help it along in every way. Mr. Riley, the teacher, acted as chairman, and introduced the programme with a speech in which he paid a high tribute to the patriotic work which the foreign-born are doing in this district. "Give these children only a chance," he declared, "and before the present generation has passed they will bless British institutions, and produce men of whom Canada and the British Empire will be proud." He added that loyalty can never be driven into any human being with a sledge-hammer. It is a tender plant whose root is in the heart. It will blossom and bear fruit in the sunshine of sympathy and kindness, but persecution and insult will only wither it. The other items on the programme were: Choruses—"O, Canada," "The Land of the Maple," "Rule Britannia," "Britannia, the Pride of the Ocean," "Wake, Says the Spring-time"; recitations—"Britannia," with thirteen characters to represent various parts of the British Empire, and "Fair Canada," which the children printed letter by letter on a maple leaf; drills—the boys (12 in number) gave the British Empire drill and marched and executed turnings, etc., with the accuracy of veteran soldiers. The Flower drill, sixteen girls each dresed in pure white with a flower wreath, marched at first and then executed slow graceful movements to the accompaniment of the Flower Song. A supper and dance followed the concert. The total cleared from the concert was $80.

I know this settlement. The people came out very poor; the parents are very proud of the manner in which their children have got on, and they appreciate very highly the institutions of this country. I believe many of them are prepared to defend those institutions, if they are required to do so, or even if they are requested to do so. They have been discouraged from enlisting, and that is one of the reasons why recruiting has, to a certain extent, fallen down. It may not have made a large difference, but it has made some difference. Every man recruited is of assistance, and these people would prove good fighters; they would be fighting for something that they valued. I do not know that many of this class of people can be spared from the land, but under different circumstances many of them would have enlisted before. I repeat that if we are to produce—and we have to produce—we must interfere very little with the men, of whatever nationality they may be, who are working on the land. I do not think it is necessary for me to discuss that matter at greater length. I could give instance after instance to show that the extract I have read is only a sample of what occurs at nearly every point that I know of in the West where there are foreign-born settlers, or descendants of foreign-born settlers.

I intend to vote against the amendment to the amendment. With considerable reluctance I shall also vote against the amendment. I am reluctant because I have the honour to be a supporter of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and it goes pretty hard, I can assure you, to vote differently from him, but he would be the last man to say we should not vote according to our convictions. I intend to vote for the second reading of the Bill, but I do not promise to vote for its third reading. I want to have some assurance that in conjunction with the conscription of man-power there will also be conscription of wealth. I believe that a partial assurance has already been given, but I hope that before the third reading the Government will definitely assure us that wealth will also be conscripted.

Mr. FRANCIS N. McCREA (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I wish to take up a little of the time of the House in expressing my view on this measure. I have been debating in my own mind for the last two or three days whether I could square a silent vote with my conscience, and I have concluded that I cannot. If I could have done so I would much rather have said nothing, because I think on matters of this kind too much time is wasted in long discussions which do not amount to very much in the end, and which certainly do not change very many votes.

Almost invariably, when we on this side of the House criticise the actions or motives of the Government we are accused of disloyalty. I think that the men who make this charge cannot really mean what they say, because on inquiry we find that practically as many Liberals have gone to the front as Conservatives. For instance, the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Power) has three sons and two sons-in-law at the front. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr.

Marcile) has two sons at the front, and there are many others that I could mention. The only son I have of military age and who is physically fit is now in France. I might mention that he is not over in England with a commission, floating around London enjoying himself, and drawing officer's pay and separation allowance. He is a private. When he got through his college term in July of last year he enlisted as a gunner in the McGill Siege Battery. He told me he had made up his mind to go to the front, and I asked him whether he was going to try for a commission. He said: "No, I don't want a commission. If I go to France I want to do some of the fighting, There are already a number of men with commissions who found no openings when they reached England unless they stepped down in rank and went over to France as privates. Many of them did not want to do that, and consequently they are now in London drawing military pay and wearing military dress, but doing nothing. For my part I want to do some of the fighting." I therefore feel at liberty to speak on this measure without being accused of disloyalty or of being a traitor to my country.

The Prime Minister of this country recently visited England. He went over, I presume, to get information, to exchange suggestions, and ascertain what the conditions were. He comes back and abruptly tells us without any notice that it is necessary to have conscription in this country, as more men and more money are required. If it be true that the voluntary system has failed, that more men are needed and cannot be got except by conscription, we will have to have conscription. Personally, I am inclined to think that the voluntary system has not been fully tried out. I do not wish to be harsh in my criticism, but I feel it my duty to criticise where criticism is due. If in any statements I shall make to-night I shall seem a little harsh or even personal, my object is not to knock the Government, but simply to give honest straightforward criticism where I think it is due.

In any large enterprise, war or anything else, where millions of men and millions of money are engaged, there is something else also required. If any hon. member of this House were engaging in a great enterprise involving millions of men and millions of money the first thing he would do would be to organize. He would get together men in whom everybody had confidence, men of ability who were willing to devote their whole energies to carrying to a successful issue the enterprise with which they were entrusted, classifying and utilizing to the best advantage all the men and money at their disposal. Is it the opinion of this House and the opinion of the country that such a combination of men as I have described is in charge of the affairs of this country? The affairs of this country should be managed just as is the business of any large corporation. Let us see whether the men in charge of the affairs of this country are competent, whether they are men of large views and long experience and absolute honest intentions, with no graft or protection for friends, but open-handed justice to all. Where a large number of men are engaged in some enterprise no partiality or favouritism should be shown. If there is, the men who are favoured are all right, but the men who think they are not favoured do not feel so well about it. This proposition to conscript the manpower of the country without conscripting its resources and wealth is not in the right direction. It is not fair to ask a young man of twenty years of age to go to the front and offer his life as a sacrifice for the protection and good of the country while the other man, who is older and therefore has had more benefit from the country, if benefits there be, makes no sacrifice at all. It is said that the married man with a family should not go to the war, and I think that is right. Yet, there is another side to that question. The man who has a wife and family of young children is more interested in the good government of the country than the young man who has no dependents to think of. Old men like myself and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) cannot go; but we must be just to those who go, and just to those who stay at home.

The Minister of Finance and the Government, in my humble judgment, have failed in their duty, not through lack of judgment, but, I am inclined to think, through lack of courage. When the war broke out in 1914 the Government should have made provision, not only of men to send overseas, but of money to pay them. They should have adopted a fiscal system to raise at least fifty per cent of the necessary funds to maintain the army at the front, especially as this country is at present, and has been for a couple of years past, immensely prosperous. The time is coming at the end of this war—and, I think, has arrived now—when more money will be needed. The minister should have imposed more taxes—I do not mean piling it all on the manufacturers as he has

done, but so levying the taxes that all should pay their equal proportion. Is there any reason why every man should not pay according to his means? That principle will have to be conformed to before this war is finished and the bills met. I was talking with a financial man here in Ottawa last week, one of the first financiers of this land. He estimates that when this war is over, though he does not pretend to know when that will be, our national debt may amount to four billions of dollars, taking both our borrowings and also our liabilities in providing for invalided soldiers after they return home. When the war broke out the minister should have adopted several systems of taxation. One is the form which he has adopted, the tax on business profits. He should also have an income tax. I think that, in addition, he should have gone to the municipalities and said to them: You shall levy taxes upon the taxable property of your municipalities at such-and-such a rate; collect it with your ordinary taxes and pay it over to the Government. The minister expects to raise through new taxes about $50,000,000 a year. If he had imposed the taxes he should have imposed, he would have raised $150,000,000. I want to tell the minister that the next time he goes to the country to raise a loan of $150,000,000 or so, it is not going to be so easy as it would have been had the war expenditure been met more by taxes and less by borrowings. I think the Government lacked courage; they have simply followed the line of least resistance, realizing that taxation is always unpopular. The fact remains that taxation must be resorted to, and that it cannot all be piled up on one section of the people. The system the Government have adopted is unjust and unbusinesslike. If you doubt it, read the financial papers of this country and see what they think about it. I am not complaining of the tax on business profits, provided that all are equally affected. And when I say that there should be an income tax, without boasting at all, I think I should be affected somewhat myself. I want to be, because we owe it to our country.

Then there is the cry that recruiting has failed, especially in Quebec. Let us see if there is not a reason why the young men do not enlist in as large numbers as we think they ought to. I maintain that the Government is to a large extent responsible for it. Early in the war, when the British Government wanted munitions and the people of this country were not equipped to supply them, and did not understand the methods of production, it was necessary to pay high prices, in order to get manufacturers started in this line. But the manufacturers did undertake this line of production, and soon they were flocking here to Ottawa, spending months of time, and begging for orders,—and could not get them unless they had political influence. The Government then, instead of fixing their price as they did at nearly twice what they ought to have paid, should have called upon the several manufacturers to say how many shells of certain sizes they could provide, and at what prices and what delivery, thus putting the whole matter up to competition. Had they done this, they would have got their shells for far less money than they have paid. I know one concern that declared a dividend of 400 per cent last year. When the Government imposed their business tax of 25 per cent on profits over a certain amount the manufacturer said: I am not going to worry myself or rustle around looking for help; I will simply pay my help more instead of giving it to the Government and I will get all the men I want. The result has been that men, not mechanics or tradesmen, but common labourers, have made as high as $12 and $15 a day. The farmer cannot get help to work his farm and the ordinary manufacturer cannot get help in his shop because he cannot pay these prices. The prices of all kinds of provisions have gone up as a result of the scarcity of labour. These men that are working in munition factories and earning $10, $12 and $15 a day are not very apt to enlist at $1.10 a day to go to the front. The man who gets $10 or $12 a day eats his meals in his own home and sleeps in his own bed. Can you expect him to drop that job, to enlist voluntarily at $1.10 a day and sleep amidst the rats and mud of the trenches? That is what the Government ask him to do. The Government are responsible for the lack of enlistment in having disturbed the whole system and price of labour. The farmer, and the ordinary manufacturer, are hampered by the want of help. But the Government say that a young man should be patriotic enough to leave his job at $10 or $12 a day and go to the front for $1.10 a day. If he does not do that he is not a patriot; he is a slacker. Let us see whether there are not other slackers. When the Minister of Finance floated his last loan, did he do what they did in the United States—go to the bankers and say: We want you to handle this loan free of charge and you

will not get anything out of it? No, my information is that one of the biggest banking institutions in Canada was employed to float the last Government loan and that it received a very handsome commission for doing it. The Minister of Finance did not ask this big bank to work for nothing but he thinks this young man, working in a munition factory and earning $10 or $12 a day, is a slacker, that he is not a patriot, if he does not drop his job, go to the front at $1.10 a day and sleep in the trenches and sometime not sleep at all.

When this war broke out the Minister of Militia called to the service a gentleman from Toronto—I think one of the Ellis Brothers—to assist him in buying binoculars. Giving evidence before the Public Accounts Committee, this gentleman said he had done the work entirely for patriotic purposes, that nothing would have induced him to leave his shop and come down here to superintend the buying of binoculars but pure patriotism. But, when we got the evidence we found that he had received 10 per cent on everything he bought or that was bought. Not only that, but he allowed his friends to buy binoculars here, there and everywhere, some were bought for as low as $9.75, some for $24 and $25, but by the time these binoculars reached the Government they cost $57. That is patriotism. That is the kind of patriotism that this Government and their friends appear to think is all right. For my part I do not.

I was going to enumerate a lot of the sins of commission and omission of this Government, but I do not think it is necessary. My hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) described all these matters last night; they are fresh in the memory of every one in this House, and if they read Hansard they will find an array of offences committed that I think would to some extent establish the fact that this Government has not handled the business of this country economically, wisely, honestly, free from all kinds of graft and crookedness, or in such a manner that the people would have confidence in it.

I said at the outset that this war is the nation's war, and that it must be won at whatever cost if possible. I also said that one of the essentials was men, another was money, but that the third and most important essential was judgment and good management. I do not think that any business men in this country would put the amount of money or the number of men that are called for in the carrying on of this war or in carrying on the affairs of this country into the hands of men who are scrapping amongst themselves, who have no respect for one another, and who have been accusing one another of being crooks and grafters. The situation reminds me of what Robert Burns said when two ministers fell out, were quarrelling over their congregations, and were blackguarding each other, the congregation clapped their hands and said: "Neither is lying." That also brings to my mind the words of one of those old Presbyterian ministers who were always supposed to be very solemn and very earnest. He was preaching to his congregation one day when a matter of great political importance was engaging the attention of his congregation and the public generally. He said, "An honest man is the noblest work of God, but, politically speaking, I do not think He has made one for the last fifty years." I think that applies to the situation to-day.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That takes in the last Administration.

Mr. McCREA: What is that?

Mr. NICKLE: That takes in the last Administration.

Mr. McCREA: The question of recruiting, in Quebec especially, has been pretty fully dealt with by other speakers, and, therefore, I do not propose to take up the time of the House by a reference to it. It has been stated here—and I think with reason—that no honest effort has been made in that province to recruit. It would look to me rather that it was the intention of the Government, or at least the idea of the men engaged in that part of the Government's business, that they would rather have a chance to say to the people of Quebec that they were slackers and were not doing their duty. I think it has been said in this House that Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not take the part in recruiting that he should have taken. I think the hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said that Sir Wilfrid Laurier could go down to Quebec and come back with fifty or sixty members supporting him in this House. That may be so in politics. Sir Wilfrid is getting old. He is a statesman, and not a military man. When he goes down to Quebec and appeals to the people for their support, he appeals to them as their leader. He says, "Vote for me, follow me, and I will bring you to success." As a politician he says, "Come, vote for me; follow me, I will be your leader in the election, and in the House when the election is over." But

he cannot go down to Quebec, appeal to the citizens, invite them to enlist and tell them that he will lead them, not only to the seaboard, but to the other side of the Atlantic, and lead them in battle. If the Government were anxious to have recruits from Quebec, they should have sent men of military training and knowledge to that province. They should select men who would be understood by the French Canadians, and in whom they would have confidence, who would have said to them, "Enlist, and come with me. I will lead you to the battlefront and will stay with you in the battle." Such an effort has not been made. Nobody knows better than I do that the French Canadians are a law-abiding, courageous people. I have lived among them, and most of my employees have been French Canadians. If the French Canadians have confidence in a man they will follow him a good deal more closely and place more reliance on him than most Englishmen would follow their leader. But the Government did not send men of military training to Quebec to recruit. They did not give Quebec a fair and honest trial. They commenced by calling them slackers. The war had hardly commenced before Ontario was hurling insult at them about being slackers, and not enlisting. Ontario appears to be very much interested in Quebec, and it spends a lot of time and energy abusing the people of Quebec for not recruiting. I think if they had spent part of the time in trying to do justice to the minority in Ontario, by granting them the right to teach their children in their own language, instead of calling them slackers, they would have accomplished more in the direction of recruiting. It appears to me that the first duty of the Government in times of peace—and very much more so in times of war—is to endeavour, first, to create good feeling and harmony amongst all classes. Has the Government of this country endeavoured to do that? Last year a simple resolution was proposed by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, not to coerce Ontario, not to dictate to the people what they should do, but to ask them, in all fairness and kindness, under all the circumstances, if they would not be willing to enter into a conference and have a heart to heart talk on this question, and see if they could not come together and agree? Did the Government vote for that? What would you have expected of a Government that was trying, heart and soul, to create peace and harmony among the different elements of the Dominion, especially during war time, when we have one common enemy to fight? Would it not have been wisdom on the part of the Government, if they were bent on doing justice to everybody, to have said: Well, we will invite Ontario in; we have no right to dictate to them, but we have the privilege to ask them to consider the question. They might have done that, but they didn't do it. And why did they not do it? There was nothing in the resolution; it was simply asking them if they would condescend to do so and so, and they said: No. The leader of the Government, with everybody behind him following his lead—

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Why does the hon. gentleman single out Ontario and say nothing with reference to Manitoba, where more drastic legislation was passed in reference to the schools?

Mr. McCREA: The other provinces are not refusing the French Canadian minority the right to teach their language in the schools. Ontario is the only province which refuses.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Oh no.

Mr. McCREA: Ontario refuses to have the minority taught in their own language in the public schools, and that is the reason I am talking about Ontario. Another reason is that Ontario seems to be the only province that is specially interested in Quebec. You have only to take up the Ontario papers, the Sentinel for instance, to see what they have to say. I understand the Sentinel is a paper edited in the interests of the Orangemen of Ontario. That is the paper's business. I have no objection to that, and I have all respect for any particular branch or order of people that wishes to have a paper of its own, but I think any paper of the pretensions of the Orange Sentinel would do very much better to devote its attention to talking about the order's greatness, its members' ability and their qualities, if they have any, than to spend it talking about another race and creed, as the Sentinel is generally doing.

Mr. Speaker, we have had in this House, since the House met in January, continual complaints, and continual pleadings with this Government, to do something to arrange or control the cost of living, but the Government have turned a deaf ear until lately, when they could stand it no longer, they appointed a controller. I hope he will do good work. I think that matter should have been taken in hand a long time ago. Although times are prosperous and money is plentiful, and although with a great many men, times are better than

they were five years ago, still I do not think there has been a harder time for men of moderate income, with large families to provide for, than during the last year. Still, the Government could not see any way of dealing with the matter. I should like to give the Minister of Finance a little advice, though I do not wish to criticise him unduly. He will make a great mistake if he allows this session to close without bringing down a proper and full measure of taxation which will make the burden of taxation bear equally upon all classes, rich and poor, great and small, according to their means. The time has come when we have to resort to greater taxation than we ever dreamed of, and it is better to resort to this taxation now, when times are good and when men's sympathies are in favour of patriotic movements and organizations. If it would be hard to enforce a fuller measure of taxation now, it will be doubly hard to do so later, after the close of the war, for instance, when times will be harder. The only thing that the minister could find it in his heart to deal with was the price of news print paper; that unfortunately for the manufacturer, he saw fit to place at about one cent a pound less than the cost of production. His reason for taking that action was that the public press was of such immense value in the way of the enlightenment, edification and instruction of the people that it should be specially favoured. Nobody has more respect than I have for a good, honest, truthful, upright paper that states the facts as they are. But the more one reads the public press—I refer more particularly to the Government organs—during the last six weeks or more, since the agitation for conscription was started, the less informed he was as to the real facts. That seems a rather strong assertion, but if any hon. gentleman doubts its truth, all he has to do is to compare what the papers have said about what was taking place in this House with what actually did take place. I have no desire to criticise the public press unfavourably. But I do say that the people look to the public press for information, for guidance, and for plain statements of facts. During the last six weeks the Government papers have come out with brave headlines to the effect that coalition was assured; that certain members on this side of the House had consented to join a coalition government; that the leader of the Opposition had resigned, and a whole mess of other stuff. It was to enable the newspapers to engage in this kind of education and to give out this kind of information the manufacturers were compelled to furnish paper at less than cost.

I think it would have been wise if leaders of thought in Ontario had been more friendly towards the French minority in that province and had granted to them what was their just right. As an English-speaking Protestant, I should be ashamed to have it said that my own countrymen deprived their fellow men, who have just as good a right to their language as I have, of anything which was their right. They were the pioneers in this country; they were the people who saved this country to the British flag at a time when there were few Englishmen, if any, here to defend the country. I agree that enlistment has not been as great in the province of Quebec as it has been in other provinces. But we must remember that the French Canadians in the province of Quebec have had absolutely no military training. In time of peace, they had no drill halls, no military organizations. War is entirely new to them. The fact that they have not enlisted in greater numbers is not due to their being cowards or to failure to appreciate their responsibilities. The thing is new to them, and it takes time to educate people in respect to anything that is new. They have not had that education; they have not had proper persuasion; they have not had a proper appeal from their own leaders in the matter of enlistment. We had men who were capable of leading them, but these men were not sent to Quebec to carry on recruiting campaigns. Even if such men had not been available, we could have got Frenchmen from France, military men, well-trained, having a wide knowledge of warfare, whom the French Canadian would at least have been able to understand. Imagine French Canadians being placed under English officers whom they did not understand! I am not a military man, but we have had regiments in Sherbrooke. I have watched them—not in time of war—when they were out for their annual drill. Some young Frenchmen enlisted in those English regiments, and when they went astray in their drill because they could not understand certain commands given them by their English-speaking officers, instead of speaking to them kindly, the officers would talk to them in a manner that I myself would not like to express. Is that the way to appeal to French Canadians? Is that the way to make military men of them? The hon. mem-

ber for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) the other day referred to the French Canadians. I think you, Mr. Speaker, were in the Chair and heard what that hon. gentleman said. Would you, if you were the father of one of those boys—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McCREA:—be willing to have him go to the front?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McCREA: I ask you, do you think the mother of any French Canadian boy would like to have her son go to the front under an officer who speaks of the French race so disrespectfully as the hon. member did the other night in this House?

In order to carry on our part in this war, we require men and money. But good management is just as necessary. Having regard to the turmoil and quarrelling amongst the members of the Cabinet, I ask whether we have had the good management that is essential to the proper carrying on of the war? I say: No. What this Government should do and what it will have to do before it obtains the confidence of the people is to go to the country and find out what the people desire. If the people approve this Government as it is now constituted, I for one will be only too pleased to support it in every possible way. But at the present time, this Government cannot be expected to have the confidence of the Liberals, and I do not believe it has the confidence of the Conservatives. Many leading men have told me that they have no confidence in this Government, and I believe that is the general feeling throughout the country. In any case, what is required is men, money and a powerful combination not of politicians, but of men of strong views, with courage to enforce their views and to go about the winning of this war as they should do, instead of squandering and wasting money like water as this Government has done so far in this war. There has been waste and extravagant expenditure of money in every direction. At this time you have to appeal to the people of this country for more money and to impose further taxes, and if you show them you are going to spend that money honestly, uprightly and fairly, you will have the confidence of the people, but you cannot obtain it in any other way. When the business affairs of the country are going along in a normal way people do not take very much notice, but when you touch their pockets and you call upon them to pay out their money by direct taxation, you cannot squander their money; you cannot fool the people; you must spend the money rightly and properly. That in my judgment, is what should be done. I am sorry to have to criticise, but I think the case demands criticism. This is a time when we need men and money, but we also need business-like management, and that it what we do not have at the present time.

Mr. DUNCAN C. ROSS (West Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, the measure now before this House has, as it should, aroused the intense interest of the people of this country, and I feel I would be failing in my duty to the Riding I have the honour to represent if I gave a silent vote on such an important question. I shall endeavour, as was suggested by the Prime Minister, to make my remarks as short as I can in conformity with my duty, and I shall also, I hope, maintain the high tone which has characterized this debate since its beginning.

In the first place I am in favour of the principle embodied in this Bill and of giving this Government or its successor, —preferably the latter—the power asked for in this Bill. My reasons amongst others for doing so are these: As I understand this measure, it is not conferring upon this Government, nor would it confer upon any other Government greater power to compel military service than it has under the existing Militia Act. As a matter of fact, this measure limits those powers in some respects, while in others it extends them in a more reasonable and more profitable way than is provided for in the Militia Act, in that this measure gives the Government power to mobilize the man-power of the country, not entirely for military purposes, but for military, commercial, industrial and agricultural purposes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the hon. member be good enough to point out where in the Bill that appears? I can find no such provision.

Mr. ROSS: If my hon. friend from St. John will permit me to proceed with my remarks, if he requires any enlightenment —and I do not think he does—I shall endeavour to give it to him. In order to make my position clear to the hon. member for St. John and to the other members, it will be necessary for me to some extent to place before the House the provisions of the present Militia Act, as I understand them, and to contrast those provisions with

the provisions submitted in this measure. As I understand it, the Militia Act, chap. 41 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, gives the Government of the day—whatever Government, Liberal or Conservative, it may be—power under certain circumstances to enroll every man in Canada and power also in case of an emergency war to enroll every man between the ages of eighteen and sixty for the purpose of defending Canada in or beyond Canada. What does that mean? It means that this Government, to-day or to-morrow, if this Bill were defeated, could enroll every man from eighteen to sixty years of age and compel him to fight in this struggle for the liberty and civilization of the world. It means that if the Government of the day thought that 200,000 men were required for that struggle, it could enroll them and compel them to fight. There are other provisions in the Militia Act which, to my mind, are quite insufficient to meet the situation to-day. The Militia Act is an anachronism in the situation that confronts this country and the whole world in this great world-war. There are practically no exceptions of any material kind specified in the Militia Act. There are a few exemptions such as ministers of the Crown, deputy ministers, telegraphers, men engaged in transportation, preachers, and, I think, priests, pilots, the only son of a widowed mother who is dependent on him for her support, judges and those who from conscientious religious belief do not believe in war. But throughout the whole Act there is nothing to say that the man who may be as useful in Canada as he would be at the front, and perhaps more so, may be exempted, so that the Militia Act is not suitable for enforcement in this country under present conditions. How does the measure under discussion limit the power of the Government? Under it the Government cannot send to the front men of eighteen years of age; they can send only men twenty years old and upwards; they can not send to the front men between forty-five and sixty years of age; they can send only men up to forty-five years of age. The Government are limited under this measure to enroll 100,000 men for service abroad. In all these respects the measure is placing strong and, I think, proper limitations upon the power of this Government or of any other Government.

There are other features of the Militia Act which do not appeal to me, to which, in my judgment, the present Bill is preferable.

How would the Militia Act be enforced? What would happen is this, and I leave it to the judgment of the House whether I am correct or not. The men are divided into four classes: Unmarried men and widowers without children from 18 to 30 years of age, and the same from 30 to 40 years of age; married men from 18 to 45, and men from 45 to 60. If this Government intended to enforce the Act, and it has power to do so to-morrow, what would happen? These men would be enrolled by proclamation. Taking a township in my own county as an illustration, this is what would happen in Caradoc, a good Scotch township, loyal to the core, if the first two classes were called. The names of the men would be put in some bag or box—that has been done in the past, at any rate—and a recruiting officer or soldier appointed by the Government would pick out names from the box until the required number of men from that township was drafted. We can easily see what might happen. The man who would be most useful on the farm might be sent to fight, and the man who would be most useful at the front might be left on the farm. Other things might creep in, as they have been known to creep in in the past. When the last draft took place, I was told by the son of a man who had been drafted himself that in one township in my county, by some skilful manipulation—I do not know how it was done—every man who was drafted to fight the battles of Canada at that time was a Grit. He told me how he thought it happened. He thought there were two sections in the box, one for Liberals and one for Conservatives, and in drawing out the names the officer in charge went to the section in which all the Liberal names were put, and consequently only Liberals were chosen to fight the battles of their country. I say it is unsafe to put that power in the hands of any Government. Governments are not more honest to-day probably than they were then, and the same thing might happen to-day. I am opposed to entrusting any Government with such power as that.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: You are doing worse in this Bill.

Mr. ROSS: I am not going to do worse if I can help it. I shall try and see that this Act is amended or clarified so that no injustice will be done to any man, whatever his creed, race or colour or political faith may be. I understand from what the Prime Minister said in the House that he is quite willing to listen to any suggestions along these lines.

I will tell you what might happen under the Militia Act. A man might have six sons and 100 acres of land. When the ballot was taken those six sons might all be chosen. This man's neighbour, with a farm of 300 acres might have only one son, and he might be chosen to fight the battles of his country. What would become of that man's farm, and what would become of production at this time when the need for production is so great? But if this Military Service Act is honestly administered, if there are thrown around it the proper safeguards which we upon this side of the House, at any rate, will insist upon, there is no reason why it should not work out infinitely better than the Act at present on our statute book. Although the Military Service Act is a separate statute I regard it entirely as an amendment to the Militia Act, because it states in one of its clauses that it shall be read in conjunction with the Militia Act. Consequently, everything in the Militia Act that is inconsistent with the terms of the present Act, is by that clause in effect repealed.

There are several things in this proposed Act which do not appeal to me, and they are basic principles to some extent; at any rate, they are basic principles at this time. In the first place the Bill applies to men of 20 years of age. I do not think that is fair; I do not think it is a right principle to follow. If a man of 18 or 20 years wishes to enlist, that is all very well; he is the keeper of his own liberty, if I might put it that way, and has the right to volunteer in the service of his country. But it is another matter when you compel a man of that age to go and fight the battles of his country. A man of 20 has not got the franchise, he has not the responsibilities or benefits of citizenship in that respect; he cannot say anything in regard to this Act. In view of that, I do not think it is fair that a man over 21 should by his vote cast upon him the responsibility of serving his country in a foreign land. I say in all earnestness to the Prime Minister that the Bill should be amended so as not to include men under 21 years of age. That seems to me a fair thing to do. It is the principle that has been adopted in the United States, and I think it should appeal to every hon. member of this House.

Mr. PROULX: Would the hon. member give the privilege of voting upon this measure to the man of 21?

Mr. ROSS: If the measure is submitted to the people, the hon. member's question is meaningless.

Mr. PROULX: Would the hon. member submit it to the people?

Mr. ROSS: That is for the House to determine. There is another thing in this Bill which does not suit me, and it goes to the very root of the principles we are considering on this second reading. We have been told by the Solicitor General that this Act is going to fall more lightly on the province of Quebec than on any other province. He said as a matter of fact that the Bill was designed and planned to do no injustice to Quebec. That is perfectly right; no injustice should be done to any province. As a reason why this Act would fall more lightly on the province of Quebec he intimated that the people of that province were largely engaged in farming and their men married very young. He commended the latter practice, and I think his commendation was quite right. I think if the other provinces would follow the example of Quebec in that regard we should have a better country. That is just an intimation of what should be in this Act. The Solicitor General may say that we may take his intimation in that respect. I do not want to go into ancient history, but members of this Government have in times past made intimations which never materialized in regard to other things.

The Solicitor General may say that the regulations made under the Act will provide that the farmers shall be exempt from combatant military service. I think that the less we have of regulations in this Act the less of directions under its terms, and the more of concrete principles embodied in the sections of the Act itself, the better the people will be satisfied. Administrative officials are very human, whether appointed by this Government or by any other. They are influenced by local considerations, they are influenced by their own ideas, and I contend that the Government and the Solicitor General, who is sponsor for the Bill, if sincere, should put a clause into the Act to provide that every man bona fide engaged, on the eleventh of June, 1917, in the production of food on the farms of Canada shall be exempt from combatant military service.

I make that suggestion after careful consideration. I am not trying to exempt the farmers from their duty in the battle line—they would not thank me if I did. The farmers of Middlesex county would not, at any rate, for they have given as many of their sons to this struggle as any other community, rural or urban. Only within the last few days two farm boys and one town

boy from my county gave up their lives at Vimy Ridge that liberty might prevail in the world. I am not trying to shield my farmers from their duty—and, as I have said, they would not thank me if I did—but there are other considerations which impel me to make this suggestion. We are fighting two wars in this great struggle. One is on the battle line in Europe, a war of men. Our sons there are bleeding and dying for this country, and we need to give them all the support they require, and we intend to do it. The other battle is a battle of production. We are fighting that battle in Canada and throughout America, and unless we are just as sincere and as forceful in that fight as are the boys at the front in the fight they carry on we are going to fail in the struggle. I shall not go into the details of my reason for saying this, but I do not say it on my own initiative. We have the words of Mr. Balfour on this subject. He told us, when he came to Washington, that the supplying of foodstuffs is as important as the supplying of men, and that he was looking to this continent for the means to feed the Allies.

We have the word of Lloyd George to the same effect. We have the word of the President of the Board of Agriculutre of Great Britain, Mr. Prothero, who said a day or two ago that "the outcome of this war may ultimately hang on food production." These men are all witnesses to the fact that food production is one of the most important factors in the successful carrying on of the war. How do we find the situation in this country? How is it in my province of Ontario, or, to be more precise, how is it in the county of Middlesex? I am informed by a representative of one of the railway corporations, a concern which keeps track of the labour situation throughout the land, that to-day in the province of Ontario there is a greater shortage of labour by thirty per cent than in the western part of Canada. Why? The men who worked on the farms in Ontario before the war commenced were largely British born, and, all honour to them, when the call of duty came they went to the trenches to fight England's battles. Many of our own Canadian farm boys did the same. Others, persuaded by the larger remuneration of munition factories, went to those factories. The result is that to-day in my county the men of the farm are struggling as they never struggled in their lives before to put in their crops and get them off. There never was a time in the history of Ontario when there was such a shortage of farm labour. That is one reason why I say that, if we are to win this struggle, we must put an express exemption in this Bill that no man bona fide engaged in agricultural industry shall be sent to combatant military duty.

Mr. LALOR: Would the hon. gentleman apply that only to farmers' sons, or would he apply it to any man working on a farm?

Mr. ROSS: My idea would be to confine it to the men necessary to work the farm. For instance, I would not think it right, if there were six men working a hundred acres, to leave them all there. But that is a little aside from the point, because under the working out of this Bill as I think it should be worked out, the farm labour of the country would be mobilized by the Government; and if there were six men working a hundred acres the Government would have the power, not to take these men for combatant service, but rather to send those who could be spared to other parts of the country where farmers are needed to sow and reap the crop. I do not think that any farmer could object to that, and that it is fair. I think my suggestion most important, and I trust it will receive the sympathetic attention of the Prime Minister.

But this Bill, in my opinion, is to be found fault with, not so much for what it contains as for what it does not contain. I shall not repeat arguments so ably made by my hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) and my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), but I do say that this Government, when they are conscripting the young men of this country, should be honest with the people and provide for equality of sacrifice in this great struggle and, as these hon. members have urged, should take immediate steps to conscript the wealth of this land. It has been said that this is a very nebulous proposition, that it is hard to define what "the conscription of wealth" means. It did not seem hard to define it in Great Britain where men are paying thirty and forty per cent on their incomes. The United States did not find any insuperable difficulty in this matter, for though they have been in the war only three months, they have taken steps to carry the conscription of wealth into effect. It has been said also that such a provision could not be put into this Bill because it is not a cognate subject with the conscription of men, and also because you would have to get the consent of the Governor General, as it involves the imposition of taxes upon

the people. It seems to me that that is a simple evasion of the point at issue. If the Government has the courage it should have, and is really desirous of providing for equality of service; if the Minister of Finance is as anxious to win the war as he says he is—and I am sure he is—and is anxious to distribute the burden of war in a way that shall be equitable to all the people he and the Government will take immediate steps to introduce a measure for the conscription of wealth.

It is not I alone who am asking this. All the people of this country cannot be wrong. The labour organizations who represent a great body of thinking people in this land, and who have a right to be heard, demand that this thing be done. The assemblies of all the churches in this country that have met recently say that as a condition precedent to the conscription of men, it is only fair that wealthy men should be obliged to pay their share of the winning of this war. It is a simple proposition and it is easy to define.

I think my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) well defined what could be done in this regard. I think the people of Canada should sacrifice as much as the people of Great Britain for they have just as much at stake. I think they should sacrifice as much as the people of the United States for they have just as much at stake. The wealthy should be made to pay their share just as the poor man is made to give his son. We all know the situation in this country. The wealthy are not the people who have large families. The wealthy people who have sons in Toronto and other cities have done well in this matter, they have sent their sons voluntarily and gladly to fight our battles but that does not alter the fact that it is the artisan, the mechanics and the plain people who have large families and it is they who will have to fight this battle and it is through their suffering and agony that it will be won. I could take the Minister of Finance, if he would come with me, to Toronto and Montreal and I think I could find for him 500 or 1,000 men in each of these cities who have more money than they know what to do with and who have no boys at the front. It is only fair that they should be made to pay for the support of the wives, mothers and dependents of those boys who are protecting their property at the risk of their lives.

How could this be done? I would suggest a very heavy income tax. We all know that in the cities and towns of Ontario they have had a municipal income tax which has practically been a dead letter. For the purpose of winning this war every man in every town who has an income up to $3,000 should be exempt, but above that amount and up to $10,000, he should pay ten per cent to the Government of the country. From $10,000 to $20,000, he should pay twenty per cent and you could go up on a sliding scale. In every city a man might be exempt up to $5,000, between $5,000 and $10,000 he might pay ten per cent, between $10,000 and $20,000 twenty per cent and as the amount of the income increases the percentage should increase. I also contend that it is high time this Government took action in regard to the way the people of this land, particularly the poor, are being oppressed by profiteers who flourish almost under the protection of this Government. We are lagging; we are behind the times. We are behind what they have done in Great Britain and we are not doing our duty. Why in the world should the wife of a soldier fighting at the front pay more for her bacon, flour, potatoes, bread and everything else she uses in her household than a woman in Great Britain? In this great, rich producing country why should that be and why should this Government allow it? I would say that as a measure of the conscription of wealth in this country the Government should immediately take over and control all the meat-packing and pork-packing institutions, all the cold storage plants, all the munition factories and all the flour mills. They should be fair to these men. They should find out what their investment is, they should pay them a fair rate of interest in their investment and whatever is made out of these ventures should be used in the interest of Canada and of the Empire in this war. I have been told by a gentleman who came from Toronto that he saw in that city 200 cords of green bacon stored in cellars. The same gentleman saw in Toronto 100,000 hides that were being held in order that the shoe manufacturers could sell shoes at the exorbitant prices at which they are selling to the people of this land to-day. Fifty-five cents per pound of bacon! A man cannot buy a decent pair of shoes for himself for less than $8 or $9 or for his wife for less than $10 or $12. These are important matters that should be taken in hand by this Government. It has been done in England and surely this Government has as much ingenuity and force as the British Government. I have a clipping here containing some remarks made by Lloyd George only a few days ago. This is what he said:

The second condition which the country was entitled to ask from the Government, the Premier continued, was that it should not permit the burdens of the country to be increased by what was called profiteering, as distinguished from profit. Profiteering was unfair in peace; in war it was an outrage. This was why the Government had taken action to restrict profits and proposed to deal very drastically with unfair profiteering in food.

I contend that that is the ideal that the Government here should aspire to achieve. The plain people are not going to be content any longer with the mere promise of an income tax a year hence. They are not going to be content with the mere appointment of a food controller; they demand action, they are entitled to it and I hope they will get it. In so far as the Bill is concerned and the principles thereof, that is about all I have to say.

In regard to the referendum proposed by my honoured leader, I am of the opinion that wartime is not the best time to submit a question of this kind to the people. I am also of the opinion that it would be practically impossible to secure the votes of the soldiers on such a measure, and I am unable to support it on the second reading of this Bill. In my humble judgment, the soldiers are more entitled to express their views in regard to it than many who are at home. Some may say that the member for West Middlesex is deserting his leader and his party. But in the Liberal party a difference of opinion on a temporary policy is not a desertion. The question of voluntary or compulsory service has never been an issue in Canada dividing the leaders or the two great parties from each other. The matter has never before arisen and I pray God it may never have to arise again.

My honoured leader recognizes the principles of the party he has so nobly led in the interests of Canada and instead of trying to pursuade his followers to his view on this matter, he has said privately, and publicly in this House, that each of them should make up his own mind as he sees the right. I honour him the more for that and therefore more closely adhere to him as leader and as the exponent of the great permanent principles of Liberalism. His leadership along these lines has proven an enduring benefit and inspiration to this country, on account of the courage, sincerity and lofty patriotism it has always breathed. Recent references have been made to him and his countrymen by hon. members of this House. My leader has been designated as the "Lamb of Quebec" and it has been hinted that his policy in this case is to win elections and not to win the war.

[Mr. Ross.]

Mr. Speaker, I resent the designation and I repudiate the motives assigned to my honoured leader by the hon. member who made them. "The Lamb of Quebec"—The only application this designation has to my honoured leader is in the fact that, while for forty-five years he has been in the public service of this country, and the white light of publicity that beats upon greatness has been upon him, no one dared charge that his public and private life have not been as white as wool. "The Lamb of Quebec," rather Mr. Speaker, "The Lion of Quebec"—of Canada—and one of the great lions of the Empire. Was my honoured leader a lamb in 1896, when he fought his own people, in order that provincial rights might be established in Manitoba? Was he the lamb of Quebec when, at the Imperial Conference in England, he stood up and fought for Canadian autonomy in the face of the most strenuous opposition from Imperial and Colonial statesmen, whose judgments were dazzled by sentimental visions of false Imperialism which would not have stood the shock of this world war in the splendid manner the present union of affection has done? Was he the lamb of Quebec in 1911, when he had opposed to him all that conglomeration of wealthy, selfish, self-seeking interests and prejudices and in addition many of his compatriots on account of his loyalty to Britain, and stood up for a Canadian navy and for a fair deal for the people of Canada? No, Mr. Speaker, his attitude as a Canadian has ever been leonine and his conduct lion-hearted. Epigrams are not always arguments. Sarcasm is not always logic. If the hon. members I have mentioned truly desire to know the place my honoured leader holds in the history of this country, I would commend them to his life written by Sir John Willison, a man who has probably done more in the last ten years, except Bourassa and Lavergne, to rend this country asunder than any man in Canada, and for which dis-service he must have been knighted by the present Government, because he has rendered no service to Canada that I have been able to discover. Let them read that life. They should believe what its author says; the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has been preaching its author's doctrine ever since I entered this House. And, if in times of peace there ever was in any country a greater romance—no, not a romance, but an epic than that of the struggle of my honoured leader and his Liberal friends

for civil liberty in Quebec, and for unity and harmony in this great country, I have yet to read it.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time for politics and personalities. I might say, as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) said of my leader, that the leader of the Government intended to use this Bill to win an election. There are clauses in this Bill which I regard as absolutely unnecessary and redundant, and which might lead one to that conclusion. I have heard that suggested, but I do not think it will assist in the discussion of the Bill to make such suggestions. I might find fault with the Prime Minister of this country because he promised in January, 1916, 500,000 Canadian boys to fight the battles of Britain, I may say, Mr. Speaker, that that rather flavoured of Czarism, that it might be all right in Russia, but in a free country, when Parliament was about to be assembled, it was not the proper thing to do, but that would not assist in the solution of the situation. I might go further along that line and say that the mal-administration of this Government has led to this situation, but I do not intend to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman came mighty close to saying it.

Mr. ROSS: I might say many other things. Members on the other side of the Chamber have said many bitter things, which I think were entirely uncalled for and unnecessary, and will not help the situation in the least degree. All the wrong in this matter does not come from the province of Quebec. Ontario is somewhat at fault also, but I do not know that it assists in any way to stir up these old bitternesses. For my part, I am quite ready to let the dead past bury its dead. This is no time for personalities or for politics. The nations are having the greatest struggle for liberty which has ever occurred in the world. In the past there have been struggles which inspired the poet, the bards, and the historians of almost every nation. They inspire us to-day. No man can read of the immortal heroism of the Greek people, when they were fighting against the domination and cruelty of Turkey, without having their heart's chords touched. No man can read of the heroic struggle of Poland against her inhuman adversary, or of the downfall of Warsaw and the death of Kosciusko, and the death of Polish freedom, without having his blood run more quickly through his veins. No Scotchman in Canada can read of Wallace or Bruce of Bannockburn, and the struggle of the Scotchmen for their liberties, without being proud of his country and countrymen. But the Canadian people are engaged in a much greater struggle. The struggle of the small countries for their liberties might be said to be the mere glimmer of a firefly as compared with the dazzling light of the noon day sun, in comparison with the great struggle the Canadian people are engaged in to-day. Scotland was a poor country. Her soil was poor. It was not timber nor agricultural land, but the people were fighting for what was dearer to them than their country or their lives. They were fighting for their liberty, and I say that their descendants in this country, and the descendants of all the British races, are not, at this stage of the war, going back on the heroic inclinations and the heroic traditions of their ancestors, and are not going to refuse to assist the Canadian boys who are at the front to-day, fighting the battles of civilization.

When I say I am in favour of the principles of this Bill, I mean it, but I do not think at this time it would be wise for this Government, nor would it be wise for any other Government, to immediately put this measure in force. I do not know what the Government is going to do. It will not tell us. I do not know why we have not been informed of their intention. The Parliamentary Secretary of the Militia Department told us the other night he thought it should be put in force immediately. I do not think the Prime Minister intended to put it in force immediately, because he made an offer of coalition to my honoured leader, and an election was to be held in regard to this measure, so that he could not have intended to put it into force immediately. I do not think the Government really know what they intend to do. The reading of the Bill would lead one to think they did not know themselves, because, if they intended to put it in force immediately, they would not provide that it should only go into effect by Order in Council. However, my opinion is that voluntary recruiting in this country has done wonderful things. I do not think it has fallen down. I do not think any country in the world, situated as we are, could have done better than the Canadian people have done. I think more good can be done yet under the voluntary system, and the men we require to reinforce our boys can yet be procured by that system.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROSS: I agree with the member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) in that re-

gard, and for my own part, although I approve of the principles of this Bill, I cannot too strongly impress on the Government the advisability of not putting it in force at the present time. I would suggest that all the members of this House get together, as true Canadians desirous of winning this war, and commence one of the grandest and most enthusiastic propagandas in favour of recruiting that could be undertaken, and I hope and believe that by that means we will be able to fill up the ranks.

I do that for two reasons. We have the honour of having volunteers, freemen, in France. I would like to see Canada retain that proud honour. I would like to have it said that while France, England, Germany, Italy, Serbia have conscripted men for military service, Canada has had the proud distinction of sending an army of voluntary freemen to fight in this great struggle. That is the first reason. The second is this: I think that that is the best way of maintaining in this great crisis harmony and peace among our people. Nothing is more desirable than that at the present time.

I have stated some of the reasons that impel me to vote for the second reading of this measure. There are others. The Prime Minister has returned from England, from the heart of this great war, having had conferences with the statesmen of the whole Empire. He has informed the House and the people of Canada that there is a pressing need for reinforcement of the Canadian forces at the front, that the need is, indeed, very pressing and that without reinforcements our Canadian soldiers will not receive from their fellow countrymen the support that they have the right to expect and obtain. Mr. Speaker, I am not bold enough to say that the Prime Minister is wrong; that is one reason why I support this measure.

Again, a message from a son of my own county, Sir Arthur Currie, an intimate friend of my own, has recently been conveyed to the Canadian people. Sir Arthur Currie is a man who sprang from the plain people of this land, from whom have come so many of our great men. He was born almost within sight of the birthplace of his great fellow countryman, Edward Blake. He is not one of those Canadians who have had knighthood thrust upon them on account of fictitious political services; he is one of those who have achieved greatness and who have deserved it. I know the Irish-Scotch stock from which he springs. I know his people. I know his integrity. I have faith in his judgment and his patriotism. I believe that no man in Canada is better able to tell us what the needs of the Canadian force at the front are to-day. He has made an appeal to the men of Canada and to the men of Middlesex, and I, as his neighbour and friend, and as one born in the same county, do say that the people of that county would condemn me, and properly so, if I did not listen to that appeal. He knows that Canada and Canada's sons are fighting, and have fought most nobly, the battles of liberty and of civilization. He knows the strength of the enemy; he knows their determination; he knows the needs of the hour, I base my decision largely upon the faith that I have in him and upon the faith that I believe every man in this country places in him. I would not, Mr. Speaker, be following the advice which his aged mother gave him when he left his home in Middlesex if I did not do as I am doing. Her advice to all her children, as I saw it reported in one of the daily papers, was "Be honest to yourself." In simple language, this proud mother quoted Shakespeare, who said:

> To thine own self be true;
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.

For this and other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would not be true to myself, to my country, or to the cause for which the world is struggling, did I not by voting for this measure endeavour to send to the Canadians at the front such support as will enable them to gain victory for Canadian arms and liberty for the world.

For Canada these are fateful and critical times. On the momentous decisions of the hour hangs the fate, not of the Canadian battlefront only, but of our country in the days to come. It is a time for calm, reflective judgment, not for noisy agitation. Canada's leaders and Canada's people hold the future in their keeping. They have inherited proud traditions and priceless liberties. Sad, indeed, will be Canada's fate if, in this day of testing, her people fail. But Canada will not fail. Democracy has unsheathed the sword and will not turn back until its enemies are completely destroyed.

Mr. R. E. TRUAX (South Bruce): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important matters that has been considered by this House since Confederation. It affects the whole of the Canadian people, and for that reason will have to be very carefully considered.

When I was home about ten days ago, I was asked what had become of about 75,000

of the men who had enlisted in Canada. There are many rural mail delivery routes in Ontario; practically all the farmers take the daily papers and read them carefully. On January 22 the Prime Minister stated that we had enlisted up to that time 413,279 volunteers. He said that, in addition, 5,000 French reservists, 7,500 Russians and 5,000 Italians had gone overseas from Canada, making a total of 434,500. The Minister of Militia stated a couple of weeks ago in answer to a question that 312,503 men of all ranks had crossed the ocean and that 25,475 were drilling in Canada. According to those figures, 75,000 men who enlisted are missing, not accounted for. I think that the Government ought to give a fuller explanation of this matter than has already been given, because the people cannot understand the cause of the discrepancy.

A good deal has been said about voluntary enlistment. Since August 4, 1914, nearly 2,400 volunteers have left the county of Bruce for the front. About 800 of these went with the first and second contingents and the remainder trained with the 71st Battalion of Galt. On October 15, 1915, permission was given for the raising of a battalion in the county of Bruce. A commanding officer was selected and sent out by the Minister of Militia. He took charge of the work and carried it on actively; the citizens co-operated with him; public meetings were held in every town, village and hamlet throughout the county. In many township halls meetings were held in which the county judge took a very prominent part. The result was that after three months' work a battalion of 1,350 men was organized. In fact, the enlistment of the battalion was completed by the 1st of February. The Government gave no assistance to that work. The Minister of Militia did not visit the county. If a by-election had been taking place in the county, we would have had a visit from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and the Solicitor-General (Hon. Arthur Meighen); they usually pay the county a visit on such occasions. Not a dollar was given by the Government to assist the work of recruiting there, nor did any of the cabinet ministers come into the county to lend their aid.

The sources from which we may be enabled to get men for military service do not appear to me to be extraordinarily large. The following is a statement of the number of men, single, married, and widowed, of the various classes mentioned in the Military Service Bill, who were in Canada in 1911:

Class.	Age.	Number of men.
1 and 4	20-23	306,674
2 and 5	24-28	386,147
3 and 6	29-34	373,867
7 and 8	35-41	355,010
9 and 10	42-45	161,751
Total		1,584,449

In classes 1, 2, 4 and 5, ages 20 to 29, the proportion of single men to married men is: single men, 521,932; married men, 224,771. In classes 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, ages 30 to 45, the estimated number is 837,746, in the proportion of 5 married men to 2 single men. The male population of Canada of all ages over twenty-one years is 2,197,746, viz., British-born, 1,851,223; foreign-born, 346,523. Of the British-born population, 78 per cent is native Canadian and 22 per cent from Great Britain. Of the foreign-born population, only 39 per cent is naturalized.

In estimating the population now available for conscription, the following facts and figures must be borne in mind:—

1. Number already enlisted, 411,000.

2. Essential occupations cannot be drawn upon except to a limited extent.

(a) Agriculture—The rural population, which is mostly engaged in agriculture, is more than one-half of the total, 3,924,394 rural to 3,280,444 urban.

(b) Transportation—including railways, lakes, canals, teaming, cartage.

(c) Mining, lumbering and fisheries.

Nearly all those engaged in the above occupations are adult males. The Canada Year Book, 1915, gives the following figures: Total industrial workers, 2,723,634. In agriculture, 933,735; in transportation, 217,544; in mining, 62,767; in forestry, 42,914; in fishing, etc., 34,812. Total, 1,291,772, or nearly one-half of the total workers. To this must be added the male adult population necessarily working on munitions.

3. The daily rejections by the medical authorities prove that a very large percentage is physically unfit; too small in height, narrow chested, afflicted with bad eye-sight, or suffering from infirmities.

4. The French Canadian population is two-sevenths of the Canadian total, that is, 2,054,890. It is largely occupied in agriculture and lumbering, much more so than the population of Ontario, and the total number of French Canadians enlisted is only 14,000.

5. One-fourteenth part of Canada's population is of enemy origin: Germany, Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria, to the number of 528,298. Therefore, it will be seen that

when conscription comes into force we shall not have a very large number of men to draw from.

As to recruiting in the county of Bruce, in one township of 2,800 people, 150 have voluntarily enlisted. I take this from the number of enlistments given weekly in a weekly paper published in the township. Six of these men have been killed at the front and one has died of wounds. If the same energy in recruiting had been displayed in other counties in Ontario, that province alone would have brought forth every volunteer the Premier has asked for, not to speak of the western provinces and the eastern provinces. I have nothing to say in reference to recruiting in Quebec. The people in that province are perfectly competent to take care of that matter.

We must be careful not to draw away all the help from the farmers. I notice this article in to-day's Citizen in regard to this matter:

> The Organization of Resources Committee is putting forth special effort to secure competent help to assist farmers in the Ottawa Valley district, who cannot get help locally, for haying and harvesting operations. The plan is to secure able-bodied men chiefly from the manufacturing centres, who by special arrangements with their employers, are permitted to go to the farmers' assistance for a period of three weeks. Two three-week periods are being arranged for, one to begin on July 16 and the other on August 6.
>
> Farmers desiring this special help should write at once to the office of the honourary secretary, Mr. L. H. Newman, Canadian Building, Ottawa. The suggested minimum wage for these men is the military wage of $1.10 per day, but the farmer is expected to pay for services rendered.

I believe that before the Bill is put into force, every effort should be made to secure voluntary enlistments, and the greatest effort that was ever put forth by the people of Canada should be in the interests of voluntary enlistment. I think the whole energies of the loyal British people of Canada should be put into force to encourage enlisting. In my opinion selected conscription should not be put in force until the volunteer enlisting has completely failed.

We are asking the farmer to produce. Great care must be taken not to rob the farmers of the help they will require to take off their hay and harvest. It looks at the present time as if Ontario would have a very large crop, and as a great number from the rural sections have already enlisted, it has left the farmers very short of help. We have been asking and urging them to increase food production and at the same time their help has been leaving them. The farmers have made a special effort this year to put in as large a crop as possible. This has been caused largely by the increased prices, and the great call for food production has stimulated them to a greater degree than anything else could. The three Prairie Provinces to the west of us are apparently going to have a fairly large crop. In former years they have drawn from Ontario ten to fifteen thousand of our young men to help in the harvest field. A certain number of these young men have gone West, and have stayed in those provinces until November to help with the threshing and fall ploughing. Some of them take up land and remain there. It must be kept in mind that the West has received in the last thirty years from the province of Ontario a very large immigration, which has steadily, year after year, drained the young men from the older part of Canada. Many of them have taken up land in the West and have become well-to-do farmers.

Many of the wood-working establishments in Ontario are very short of help, and if conscription is put into force, it no doubt will take many young men and farm labourers away from the farmers, and it will also take a large number of young men from the factories, which they can ill afford to spare.

The cost of living during the last two years has increased in many cases nearly fifty per cent. It is true that wages have advanced in a great many cases, but not in proportion to the increased cost of living. In many cases some lines of manufacturers could employ a third more men than they are doing now. The very best of our young men have enlisted and gone to the front. In many cases the best mechanics that we have in the province have gone, and this has left the manufacturers short of skilled help. It is true that the munition factories are paying very high wages, more than factories manufacturing other lines of goods can afford to pay, and so well they might, as I notice that twenty-two of these Canadian firms paid last year $5,297,279 in excess profit taxes. This great sum was only 25 per cent of their profits in excess of 7 per cent. This would show that each of these twenty-two firms, after paying the Government this large amount, had each of them nearly three-quarters of a million dollars of profit over and above their 7 per cent.

I have no objection to those firms making good fair profits, but I think the amount

that they are making is exorbitant, and unfair to our soldier boys who are standing up in the firing line for $1.10 a day. I think it is unfair to pay munition workers $5 and $7 a day when we are asking the flower of Canada, the finest young men we have, to stand up in the firing line for $1.10 a day. The Government should increase the pay of our soldiers materially, say from $2.50 to $3 per day, and for this purpose they should conscript the wealth of this country as well as our man power.

I am in favour of the principle of conscription. I am not in favour of the present Bill. I shall vote for the referendum.

Mr. JAMES S. DOUGLAS (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put before the House the reasons for the vote which I shall cast to-night on this Bill. The whole object of the present Bill is to enlist fighting men for the front, and the question arises—and it is a legitimate question—which is the better method of getting these men, whether by voluntary enlistment, or by the principle of conscription as embodied in this Bill? I have seen something of the methods employed in enlisting men in this country, particularly in western Canada, and I have had something to do with it. So far as the province from which I come is concerned, I am forced to the conclusion that we can raise no more men by voluntary enlistment. I do not know that the Government has conducted the voluntary system as it might have done. In fact, I am inclined to think a great many errors have been made. The system of enlisting men when the war first broke out was, in my judgment, absolutely unbusinesslike, and not carried out according to the plan which had been laid down by the Militia Department prior to the outbreak of war. It was the enthusiasm of the people that was entirely responsible for the splendid response which was made to the call to arms on the 4th of August, 1914.

One of the chief reasons why voluntary recruiting has fallen into disrepute in western Canada at least, has been the extreme partisanship which has been shown in the conduct of every phase of voluntary enlistment in that part of the country. I question very much if there is a province in the whole Dominion with the possible exception of British Columbia, which has responded so nobly and given so freely of her men as the province of Alberta. The city of Edmonton, from which I come, has sent over ten or eleven battalions to the front, and I know from my own experience that partisanship has entered into the appointment not only of senior officers but junior officers as well. In spite of this, however, enlistment has been keen. Men have given up their employment, no matter what it was, and have answered their country's call. I am not prepared to say that the Militia Department is entirely responsible for this partisanship. Unfortunately, under our system of government, party patronage is governed by the recommendations of local committees, and the minister who can resist appeals made to him on behalf of political friends must be a very strong minded man indeed. I do not think, in our province at least, that the Militia Department has shown the proper strength of mind in resisting political influence in appointments in connection with the tremendous war in which we are now engaged. If ever there was a time and occasion when partisanship should have been cast to the winds it was by the Militia Department during this war. I believe that if this Bill is properly administered we may escape from a certain amount of political partisanship.

Another reason why I think voluntary enlistment has failed in western Canada is because of the campaign in connection with National Service. I had the pleasure of hearing both the Prime Minister and the Director General in the city of Edmonton and the city of Calgary. I listened very attentively to what they said and I think I am within the mark when I say that neither of these gentlemen made one appeal for recruits. The whole appeal made in connection with this propaganda was the need for men registering so that the Government would know who were available if at some future date it should decide to call upon men for service other than going to the trenches. Maybe I did not interpret the speeches correctly, but I must say that was the impression received by almost every one with whom I conversed, as to the real reason for the National Service propaganda.

It may possibly be that voluntary enlistment can be revived, but in my judgment it would do a wrong to western Canada at least. We are a producing country and under voluntary enlistment our people have left the farms and productive labour and gone to the front. One of the reasons why I favour this Bill is that it will prevent men of patriotic spirit from enlisting who are now engaged in productive walks of life. If it will do that, it will do a good work. I have every hope that safeguards will be thrown around the administration

of the Bill so as to prevent men engaged in the production of foodstuffs from going to the front at the present time. Authorities whom we cannot ignore claim that one of the great needs of the present war is the production of foodstuffs. They say that foodstuffs are almost as essential as men. In that country from the Manitoba boundary to the boundary of British Columbia, we have the greatest food-producing section of Canada, but owing to the splendid response to the call to arms made by the settlers in that country I am sorry to say that our productive area this year is going to be less than it has been for the preceding two years.

This is a regrettable circumstance, as I believe that the present year is the one in which production in this country should be greatest, and the one especially in which the Allies will depend upon us to feed the men at the front. An interview was recently published with Mr. Prothero, president of the Board of Agriculture of Great Britain, from which I shall quote briefly:

> The outcome of the war may ultimately hang on the quesiton of food supplies, and the American farmer is allotted the essential part to play in the great struggle for freedom. . . . From the grim spectacle of human carnage and from the feverish race of piling up munitions the farmer stands aloof. His task is to make hills, plains and valleys stand so thick with corn that they shall sing. Yet the man who drives a plough is helping as is the man who shoulders a rifle. . . . For this reason it is a welcome relief to us to know that the farmers of the United States are co-operating with the Allies, that they fully realize the essential part they play in this struggle for freedom, that they are bringing into their work the spirit of self-sacrifice and endurance, and that they are determined to put out the last ounce of their strength to win the war on the ploughlands of the United States. Here and there, God speed the plough.

Sir Thomas Lipton is an authority on the production of food. He sees the importance of this question, and he has recently stated:

> I know for a fact that there is no bluff in all this talk about the scarcity of food. We are up against it. America has come in just at the right moment for us, and no one can ever make me believe America will not be able to rise to the emergency.
>
> The situation here is much worse than English people realize. The storehouses throughout the country are being emptied of food, and we who are in the trade know they are not being supported by the stocks we used to keep.
>
> The public doesn't see this. Everything is being run bare. There is some idea here that we are not taking strong enough action to meet the crisis. That is not so. I know for a fact that the most drastic kind of machinery is being prepared to put the whole United Kingdom on rations, and you can take it from me that when the necessity arises the machinery will be ready.

There is a lesson for us in Canada in statements such as these made by reputable men who know the conditions in the Motherland intimately, and I think it is the duty of this Government to take strong measures in regard to this question of food supply. I join with my friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) in saying that in my judgment very few farmers should be permitted to enlist. The production of food is so important, the number of men who have gone from the farms is so great, that it is an absolute necessity for the successful prosecution of the war on the part of Canada that the food-producing industries of this country should be very carefully safeguarded. We have seen an unprecedented rise in flour within the past year. I think the Government should face this situation for the coming year and, if necessary, commandeer every flour mill in the country, and should commandeer also packing houses, cold storage warehouses, canning factories, and all other concerns that supply food to the people and derive undue profit from the sale of the same. I know for a fact that men in western Canada—and all men are human when money enters into the question—men of small caiptal, are going about the country buying all the eggs and butter they can find, and storing them, in expectation of high prices. They look for a price of at least a dollar a dozen for eggs during the coming winter. In ordinary times I should have no fault to find with men doing this sort of thing, but under the circumstances of to-day I think it is the duty of the Government to see to it that profiteering of this kind is not permitted for the people suffer by it, and suffer very severely, and our effectiveness in the war is hindered by this means.

Let me briefly sum up my views on this question. I consider compulsory service the only fair means of the State receiving from its citizens that full measure of service to which it is entitled. By this I do not only refer to those of its young manhood who are called upon to risk their lives on the battle front. I believe that in a crisis such as now confronts us there is a service every man and woman is called upon to perform, and it is the duty of any Government to so organize its forces that this duty will be performed in an equitable manner. This should be the true meaning of compulsory service. I heartily approve of any plan of taxation which will reach the people who are deriving a certain measure of prosperity brought about by this war.

Every man who remains at home should be called upon to contribute something to aid his country in its hour of trial. I consider the farmers of this country are doing just as patriotic work in winning the war as the munition workers and in my judgment the Bill should specifically state that no man engaged in the production of foodstuffs shall be liable for military service. In my province too many of our producers have felt it their duty to go overseas, and to-day we are facing the very serious situation that our production this year is likely to be less than last year. This is a most alarming condition and every effort must be put forth on the part of every one to have this remedied, and I am firmly of the opinion that the great industry of agriculture should be exempt from the operations of this Bill.

Mr. J. E. MARCILE (Bagot) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the night, I will not undertake to discuss the legal aspect of Bill No. 75, now before us; I am no lawyer, and as that phase of the Bill has been sufficiently debated, I shall not touch upon it; no more than on this Parliament's power to enact such legislation, as in my opinion, it has been sufficiently demonstrated that we have not the right, under the present conditions, to enact compulsory military service.

Mr. Speaker, although I have given my opinion, on the 10th of May last, upon recruiting and upon Canada's participation in the war, I believe it my duty not to let this conscription Bill, now before us, go by without making a few remarks, so that there may be no equivocation as to where I stand in the matter of compulsory service.

On August 4, 1914, England declared war against Germany, because the latter trampled under foot a solemn pledge, signed by herself, to respect the neutrality of Belgium. No honourable man there was but approved of the stand taken by the British Government.

Canada's Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) thought he should offer this country's support to the motherland, in the conflict then beginning. Parliament was convened and, on August 19, it was proposed that we should send over a contingent of 22,000 men. Every one thought this was generous and even more than generous. We approved, without a word of dissent, because we did believe that, under such circumstances, our duty was to help, within our means, to destroy Prussian militarism and to show England, and especially our friends here—those of Ontario, in particular—that we were always ready to fight for the pledged troth and, above all, for national honour. Unhesitatingly, we voted the money asked for, although it was quite a large amount. Instead of twenty-two thousand, thirty-three thousand men enlisted and went to the front. Since that date, Sir, nearly three hundred thousand more have left. Any one who, at the outbreak of hostilities, would have dared to mention such figures would not have been taken seriously. Moreover, we have in this country over one hundred thousand volunteers awaiting orders to leave and join those who are gone. Notwithstanding that incredible contribution in men, the Government is not satisfied; they are endeavouring to impose compulsory military service, although publicly and officially they have asserted that compulsion would never be resorted to in Canada.

Can there be any surprise, Sir, if the people protest loudly, and want the Government to live up to that pledge, since it is exactly what our sons are fighting for overseas, as has been so eloquently said by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea).

My two sons—the only two I have—were so incensed at the Kaiser's treachery that they took up arms. Must one suppose that this disposition on the part of the Kaiser is a contagious disease? If so, complete isolation should have been resorted to; no Canadians should have been allowed to cross the Atlantic, and thus be exposed to contamination.

As one of the reasons for this Bill, we are told that the Prime Minister received a message from the boys at the front and in the hospitals asking for assistance. When the right hon. gentleman made that statement in the House, I could hardly refrain from rising and giving vent to my outraged feelings. They calling for assistance at the front when there are in England three millions and a half young men who have not yet deemed it proper to enlist! They are calling for assistance at the front, and over one million and a half men in restaurants, bar rooms and such places have not the mettle to answer the call of those who are fighting for them! They are calling for assistance at the front, and we have in England 126,000 of our boys awaiting the word to start for the firing line! Have they not been told that their brothers were crying for help? These men, at least, would have

summoned enough courage to answer the call and jump into the trenches.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to tell you that I have my doubts as to the genuineness of this message and I cannot satisfy myself that the situation is as desparate as it has been represented. Can we suppose for one single moment, that the imperial authorities would be willing that such a great number of their own people should continue to live in peace and content while the soldiers from their colonies are dying for them? Is it possible that our parade officers who are in England since the beginning of the war, whom we are paying and maintaining to strutt about in the streets of London have not been apprised of the situation and prefer to came back here, rather than go to the assistance of their brothers in arms that are calling for help? Lastly, Mr. Speaker, is it possible that our own officers in Canada, who look so proud wearing the King's uniform, who never went further than London and some of them no further than Ottawa, and who are receiving fat salaries, will not feel themselves in honour bound to go and help the boys whom part of them accompanied as far as England, and whom all of them have encouraged to enlist?

Again, Mr. Speaker, I say that I do not admit that the situation is so desperate as it has been represented, because were it so I could not find words bitter enough to characterize the conduct of those who, having the opportunity refuse to go to the front.

We have contributed over 300,000 men, we have spent our money so lavishly that we will have to impose a tax on real estate to meet the interest on our loans; yet our imperialists are not satisfied.

Because our Prime Minister, without taking advice from any one, without taking into consideration the needs of the country, has been pleased to offer 500,000 men, are we bound to make good the offer? I, for one, say no.

If I had other sons wishing to enlist I should fasten them to their post as securely as the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sevigny) who intended organizing a regiment but did nothing of the kind.

For more than a year we heard a great deal about the immense strength and number of the British army. If it is as formidable as it is represented, it is high time that the fact be demonstrated. It is up to it to show its mettle and relieve the colonial forces which since the inception of the war have constantly been under fire and very often have been left alone to fight and win the battle.

Are we to think that our soldiers and those of the other colonies are the only ones brave enough to face the danger of a battle in close formation? For, since war began, whether in Flanders, France or elsewhere, all the victories reported have been won by the colonial troops. It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that those valiant boys take a rest, and that the five million men, enlisted in England, do their share.

I have listened most calmly to the lecture given, last week, by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue and I sat wondering whether, really, he was speaking his own mind or if he was not expressing what he had been told to say. He complained of certain newspapers which criticised our participation in the war, and of certain orators of the province of Quebec who claim we owe nothing to England. Where did that idea originate? Who preached it from the hustings in the province of Quebec? Who did, if not the hon. minister himself and all his friends during the electoral campaign of Drummond-Arthabaska, in 1910, and throughout the electoral campaign in 1911? Is it at all surprising that those who fought side by side with the hon. minister, still remember those statements and keep on repeating them? The hon. member for North York (Mr. Armstrong) complained the other day that Tancrede Marsil, of Montreal, was advocating rebellion and stating that we owed nothing to England. Mr. Tancrede Marsil was once a political friend of the hon. member for North York; he had the administration of the patronage under the present Government, from 1911 until the election in Hochelaga, where he intended to run against the ex-Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude). Up to that date, Mr. Marsil had been a devoted friend of the present Government and it was only because he opposed the hon. Secretary of State that they took away from him the patronage of Bagot county, where he had been a candidate in 1911.

The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, the ex-Postmaster General, now Hon. Judge L. P. Pelletier, the ex-Minister of Inland Revenue, now Railway Commissioner, and others, have sown the wind throughout the province of Quebec in 1910-11; there is nothing surprising if, to-day, we reap the tempest. Indeed, all the elements bode an approaching storm, especially if the Government persist in spreading among the people discontent and scorn, by forcing upon

the country compulsory service as is meant by the Bill now before us.

We are told that the object is to get from 10,000 to 12,000 men a month as long as the war lasts. Will the Government be able to get them? I do not think so, especially if Lord Northcliffe is to be believed when he says that the war is just beginning. The very thought drives one to despair and to fancy that the hour has probably come when the breakdown of conscription, foreseen by those who opposed it in 1867, must take place. What did our public men say at the time in reply to the advocates of Confederation? Let me quote some of their objections:

1. Confederation is the realization of the schemes generated, hatched, during a whole century, to subject Lower Canada to the domination and influence of an English majority.

* * *

5. Ambition, the quest of honours and of high positions will induce talented men to make sacrifices and concessions to pander to the English majority, in order to enjoy the advantages and the boon of power.

6. The French language, swamped in a parliament, composed of members three-fourths of whom will not understand it, must finally disappear.

7. The members from the English provinces, divided upon questions of interest, will unite every time a national or religious issue will arise.

8. Lower Canada, after having made Upper Canada's fortune, under the Union, will now largely contribute to the prosperity of three or four other provinces, whose influence will later become fatal to it, while it will lack the necessary resources to maintain its population and clear its lands.

* * *

10. In time of war, Lower Canada will be at the mercy of the Federal Government, who may force it to take up arms against its own will and affections.

Have not the events of the past fifty years given more than one reason to the opponents of Confederation?

Let us ponder over, one by one, those objections and who will say that the present period is not one of the darkest of our history; the very one foreseen by those who opposed the new regime?

I now quote from a newspaper which, commenting upon the present situation, entitles its editorial as follows:

What Will Follow From All That?

Where is the Canadian who, at present, does not ask himself what future has in store for our country? The sky is becoming darker and darker; the storm is on the point of bursting; from all parts are to be heard the roarings of a terrible thunder; but nothing seems to move our public men.

The Orange press wants to banish us from confederation; it would even drive us out of this land which is so much our own, since our fathers and our missionaries have carried upon all its borders, with their genius, the stamp of our race.

What will befall, do we ask? It is well to examine it; thus, perhaps, those whom the care of our national future still concerns may become interested in that survey, and, if they have the power, may do their best to save the grand work of our nationality.

Let the Government, if they have at heart the maintenance of order and harmony, in a united confederation, accept the amendment of my honourable leader, asking for a referendum to the people and, whatever the majority decide, the minority must submit to it in silence and will submit to it, I have no doubt. But, if the Government persist in their scheme, without considering the numerous and urgent appeals of the people that this question be submitted to them before its final adoption; they shall have, Mr. Speaker, to bear alone the responsibility of their act and of its consequences. Do they mean to save confederation? If we are Canadians, loyal subject of His Majesty having at heart the interests of our country first, and of the Empire next, the thought of the country will of itself be sufficient to save confederation. Thus recently spoke a newspaper, of which I want to quote the following extract:

If we really mean to save confederation, there is only one way to do it: keep intact Canadian autonomy.

And to safeguard autonomy, the Government must do its duty.

The measure now before Parliament is one of those which most endanger our nationality, because it amounts to a bold denial of national autonomy. Why then should not the Government and Parliament, who only exist in consequence of an Imperial mandate, appeal to the people who are, after all, the dispensers of power?

And when the people shall have decided this question, when it will have chosen new men, then should be taught what is really meant by the word "country"; thus only can confederation be saved.

The idea of country is defined by Bossuet in one of his finest works:

"Human society demands we should love the land wherein we live together; we consider it as a common mother and nurse; we cling to her, and that unites. It is what the Latins called charitas patri soli, the love of the native country; and they consider it as a bond among men. Men, indeed, feel bound by something strong, when they know that the same land that has produced and fed them, while living, will take them in its bosom, after death."

That is what high-minded men have thought. Why should not the Canadians, while remaining loyal subjects to His Majesty the King, George V, have also, their own national ideal; the love of their country, of Canada, above all others? For this country, celebrated in song as the richest, the greatest and the most beautiful of all the countries, for the preservation of its greatness, of its wealth and of its

beauty, I am ready to lay down my life. Fearing for its future, I shall vote for the amendment of my hon. leader, that the military act now proposed be submitted to the people, for its approval or its disapproval, trusting in the wisdom of the popular verdict and ready to submit to it. It is as a Canadian loving his country, desirous of seeing peace and happiness reign over it, as these are indispensable conditions of a happy future for the nation, that I conclude these remarks by asking the hon. Prime Minister to take them into serious consideration and by declaring that I am against the principle of forcing others to do a thing which I would not want to do myself, that is to say, I am against any kind of compulsory service, and I shall vote accordingly.

Mr. EDMOND PROULX (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, I shall take the advice of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and promise to be brief, but I cannot promise that I will take his advice any further in reference to this matter. Had the question not been so important I would have been satisfied to have given a silent voe, but the matter being of so much importance, and establishing a new principle in our traditions and policies, I consider that it is incumbent upon me to give the reasons for the vote that I am about to cast in a few minutes. When this war was declared in 1914 the Prime Minister made an offer to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the people of this country agreed to that offer. The response was very generous. Parliament was called, and did not object to the offer which had been made. It unanimously voted the money that was asked by the Government to enable the Government to send across one contingent and more if it was thought necessary. When the Prime Minister made the offer he did not intend to apply the Militia Act, which he said the other day could have been applied, but as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) proved to this House the other day he made the offer to the British Government on the understanding that our soldiers would serve as British troops under the British Crown. The Prime Minister had grave doubts that the Militia Act would apply, or that the defence of Canada was at stake. If the defence of Canada was not at stake in 1914, how can it be said that it was at stake in 1917? Canada is not now more menaced than it was in 1914, and although Parliament may have power to pass this Bill, I am of the opinion, with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that Parliament has no right, has no mandate, to pass this measure. It has never been before the people. At the last general election in 1911 this Government came into power on the policy which was preached in the province of Quebec of no participation in the wars of Great Britain. You may say that this is not a war of Great Britain. I admit it is not. I am not one of those who say that we must not fight for Great Britain. This war was not declared by Great Britain. Great Britain was not prepared for war, and it is to the credit of Great Britain that she went into this war to protect Belgium and to honour her signature to the treaty which was made in 1839.

But that does not change the situation, and it does not prove that it is Canada's war. I maintain that Parliament has not the right to pass this law for sending Canadians to go across seas to take part in this war. There was no question in the session of 1914 that it was a free offer which the Government was making to the Government of Great Britain. It was an offer which similar to the one which was made in 1899 by the Government of that day at the time of the South African war. The only difference was that the number of troops and the expenditure were much larger. But Parliament was not asked to send these troops under the Militia Act. I am not going to read the despatches which were sent. Members of this House must remember them. They were read the other day by the leader of the Opposition. The first one was sent on the 1st August, 1914, and the second on the 5th August. The Government had five days to consider the matter and though they had five days to consider it they did not change their mind. They still had grave doubts as to whether our soldiers could be sent across as Canadian troops and they preferred to send them as Imperial troops. Parliament assented to the request of the Government and at subsequent sessions Parliament voted freely and unanimously the moneys which were asked by the Government to permit equipping and sending the troops overseas. The Prime Minister made a promise on the 1st January, 1916, without consulting Parliament. It is said that in Germany the Chancellor is the mouthpiece of the Kaiser and that he presents to the Reichstag the policies which the Kaiser wants him to present.

It seemed that at that time the ex-Minister of Militia was the Kaiser of Canada, and that the Prime Minister was the mouth-

piece of the ex-Minister of Militia. It was also said at that time that the ex-Minister of Militia was anxious, and had the ambition, to send a large number of soldiers from this country to the front, and, in fact, wanted to send the last man, if it was necessary. In a country governed by a Parliament elected by the people I think that Parliament should have been consulted before the Prime Minister promised to send 500,000 men. Great Britain never asked us to send that number. In fact, I think Great Britain was surprised that we should send over 200,000 men. At that time Great Britain did not expect that we would send over 150,000 men, and if the Prime Minister made this offer without consulting Parliament he should not be surprised if some members in this House refused to give him power to procure the 500,000 men by a compulsory measure. The mandate of this Parliament expired in October, 1916.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. gentleman intend to take his sessional indemnity this session?

Mr. PROULX: I cannot appreciate my hon. friend's question. I say that our mandate has expired, as far as the vote of the people is concerned. We are only here by our own consent, and before we make a new departure such as this Bill proposes I submit we should go back to the people, if not by referendum, at least by general election. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Descarries) went even further than my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and said that this Parliament had not the power to pass this Act, that if this Bill became law it would be ultra vires of this Parliament. He may be right. I am not a constitutional lawyer, but I would prefer that the Bill be not made law before consulting the people, because, if this Parliament passed this measure, I believe the law would not be declared constitutional. I do not think the Governor General would refuse to sanction it, and even if the Bill were reserved for the consideration of the Imperial Parliament, I do not believe that body would veto it. If my hon. friend does not want to see this Bill become law, I think it would be safer for him to vote for the referendum, and if the referendum does not carry, to vote against the second reading, and not to adopt the principle of the measure. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, said that it was never suggested to him while he was in England that we should adopt conscription, and he was, in fact, a little exercised because some people in this country suggested that he had been requested, while in England, to enact such a law. In introducing the Bill he said:

> Some people afflicted with a diseased imagination have asserted that I took my present course at the request or direction of the British Government. No more absolute falsehood was ever uttered by human lips. The subject was never discussed between myself and any member of the British Government; if there had been any such suggestion from them, I for one would not have tolerated it. The Government, Parliament and people of Canada are the only authorities that can deal with or determine questions such as those which are embodied in the Bill now presented to this House.

And this is confirmed by the dispatch which we saw in newspapers on the 21st June, coming from England, that the hon. Mr. Walter Long, Secretary for the Colonies, said that the Prime Minister had not spoken of the question at all when he was in England, and, in fact, the Secretary for the Colonies was surprised to see that the Prime Minister had asked the Canadian Parliament to adopt the law so soon.

What are the reasons of the Prime Minister in asking Parliament to pass this Bill? If I remember well, when my right hon. friend the Prime Minister landed in this country with his colleagues, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Minister of Public Works, in an interview with the reporters, the Minister of Public Works said that he did not think it would be necessary to have conscription in Canada, as it had been found necessary to adopt it in other countries. I presume my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works must have been in the confidence of my right hon. friend. He left this country in February to make the trip with him, stayed with him all the time he was in England, and returned to Canada with him. So that it would appear that my hon. friend the Prime Minister was not thinking of conscription when he landed in Canada. When did he think of conscription? Was it when he reached Ottawa, and ascertained that the ex-Minister of Militia intended to bring the matter before the House? If he had permitted the ex-Minister of Militia to bring the question before Parliament, he could not have avoided expressing his opinion, and taking a stand on the matter, and when he found that there was probably a large contingent behind him favouring conscription, he thought he might be obliged to adopt conscription, and all the credit would have gone to the ex-Minister of Militia. So that the ex-Minister of Militia

would again have loomed very high in the public eye, and if my hon. friend had not listened to him, and adopted conscription, the ex-Minister of Militia might have divided the Conservative party and endangered the chances of the Government at the next general election. It was the intention of the Government to use this measure as the slogan to win the war. Some people in this country think that the slogan should be changed, and that it should be said that probably the Government is more anxious to win elections by adopting conscription than to win the war. We are told that conscription is adopted to fill the wastage. The Minister of Militia states that there are over 126,000 men in England, waiting to go across to France. That is probably more than would be required this year. Over 400,000 men were recruited in Canada. There are to-day over 300,000 men overseas, in France or in England, only 138,000 of them being in France—four divisions, and the auxiliary services. The period of offensive for this year is more than half over, and if we judge by the wastage that took place last year, perhaps not half the 126,000 men now in England will be wanted in France this year. I do not see, therefore, why there should be so much hurry in adopting this measure.

The member for South Bruce (Mr. Truax) asked a few moments ago for an explanation in regard to the 75,000 men who could not be accounted for. Are they in England? Will they go to the front, or will most of them come back to Canada without having gone to the front? It is said that about 7,000 officers left Canada for England, but never went to the front and will not go unless they go as privates. They cannot be forced to go as privates, as they left this country with commissions. The country, therefore, is spending money uselessly in sending overseas officers who stay in England for several years and come back without having gone to the front. Besides enjoying their pay, they take up precious space in the transports. When the people learn that so many men have commissions and do not fight, they do not like to enlist as privates and receive only a private's pay while bearing the brunt of the fight. The result is that recruiting is discouraged.

I do not want to vote for the principle of this Bill before it is submitted to the people by means of a referendum, as is suggested by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. The member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) said that men of twenty should not be conscripted because they have not a vote; he suggested that the minimum age should be twenty-one years. But the Government would deny to those of twenty-one or over the right to express their view in regard to this Bill before it becomes law. Why should not those who are liable to be conscripted have a say in the matter? Should they not have the privilege of saying whether this Bill should become law? There are people in the country to-day who are clamouring for conscription, but when you speak of the conscription of wealth, they object. We have the example of the Montreal Board of Trade. That body some time ago adopted a resolution calling upon the Government to adopt a measure of compulsory military service, but when the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) proposed that wealth be conscripted, they sent a deputation to the Finance Minister objecting to the conscription of wealth. The conscription of men is much more important than the conscription of wealth; therefore, if some men object to the conscription of wealth it is not surprising that the labour men object to the conscription of men. They are the people who will bear the brunt of the fight if this Bill becomes law—and they ask for a referendum. The member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) who is supposed to know the opinion of the labour men of Canada, said the other night that at least 85 per cent of the men who belonged to labour unions were in favour of a referendum.

I shall not delay the House any further; I intend to vote for the amendment of the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. P. J. A. CARDIN (Richelieu): Mr. Speaker, the terrible war which is presently convulsing the countries of Europe seems to have caused quite a commotion in people's minds; and especially so in Canada. I cannot account in any other way for the origin of the extraordinary theories which we have heard enunciated by those who would impose on our country compulsory military service. The most ancient of these theories has been unearthed by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) the present Government's recognized sophist. His doctrine is that Canada's sacrifice in the present war, must extend to her last dollar and her last man. Another theory no less extraordinary, is that advanced by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) who has proclaimed that, as times go, we must sup-

press or ignore all the rules of logic and throw aside all the teachings of experience and the dictates of reason. Another of these hon. members who demand the imposition of a conscription law, would be ready, in order to attain that end, to rend every article of the constitution. Among these extraordinary theories also, we find the boastful and childish pretension that we have allies, and that we are playing in the present conflict a part equal in importance to that of the autonomous nations, such as France, England and Russia. Lastly, another claim which is devoid of common sense, would make of the present war our war, Canada's war.

And add to that, Mr. Speaker, all the other absurdities which we have heard, which we have read and which are all included in the exaggerated and irrational vocable: Win the war.

People talk of the crushing of Germany, of the Kaiser's downfall, with the unconstrained language of schoolboys enjoying their holidays. In all those theories we find the precepts of the most appalling anarchy combined with the teachings of the most complete and most absolute autocracy.

But, meanwhile, what becomes of the true Canadian sentiment? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is forgotten. This perturbation in the Canadian mind would leave us quite unconcerned, if from the chaos of these incoherences had not sprung up the Military Service Bill. Offspring of excitation, prematurely ripened by the scorching breath of prejudices, this measure is apparently justified by the Government by two arguments, both absolutely worthless: First, our promise to those who have left, and secondly, the absolute necessity of filling the gaps and keeping up our effective forces.

Our promise? I have listened with great attention to the speeches which have been made since the opening of this debate, but I yet fail to find in any one of these speeches a satisfactory proof of such a promise. When the country decided to take part in the present war, it was understood that such participation would be absolutely voluntary, and that those who would enlist under Canada's colours, would do it freely and of their own volition, absolutely so.

The public men of the country, the right hon. Prime Minister himself, and after him the right hon. leader of the Opposition, have stated everywhere, not only in this House, but at all the public meetings that were held, that the enlistment was absolutely voluntary, and that never should we resort to compulsion.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, the volunteers who have gone to fight overseas, have left, knowing that it was the Government's determination, supported by the Opposition, to always maintain volunteering and never to impose conscription. They were not put under any false impression; they went away fully aware of the Government's intentions, and no one can surely find in their voluntary enlisting, nor in the solicitations made to them, a promise to impose conscription.

But, is it said, we must keep up our effective forces. Where is the evidence that the Allies, and that England, in particular, need fifty or a hundred thousand men, who would have to be levied under such difficult circumstances as may arise from the enforcement of this compulsory military service? It has been established, beyond all doubt, by the Prime Minister himself, and by others who have folowed his lead, that England had never asked Canada to impose compulsory military service and, Mr. Speaker, we understand the wisdom of England in not requesting from our Premier the imposition of such a law, because it is evident to-day that England herself has not thrown into the struggle all her manhood nor has she seen fit to employ all the resources she can dispose of. In support of my statement, Mr. Speaker, allow me to quote from the speech of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) who has seconded the amendment moved by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. This quotation, Mr. Speaker, bears out my assertion that Great Britian has not put into this war all the forces she can dispose of; probably, because she has not yet found it necessary. The extract is from an English paper, and forms part of a communication from a resident in England:

> "Tribunals all through the country continue to hand out exemptions to huntsmen, variety artists, store managers, clerks, luxury manufacturers, frankly declaring that their mission is "to protect local industry." One district alone granted 30,000 exemptions during the past fourteen weeks.
>
> "Even the Government joined the Freedom League. Only a few departments are not still to a large extent manned by eligibles with influence. In this 34th month of the war it is still the custom to hand a list of names to a branch of a department with orders to find places for them. A regiment is permitted to retain at home its football players and runners and boxers.
>
> "The great markets of London—Smithfield, Covent Garden, Billingsgate and the rest—have scarcely been touched, because their combing

out was left to committees of themselves and they have been unable to agree."

When we have such an admission as that, made by a person living in England, it seems to me that we are perfectly right in denying any urgency for compulsion in Canada; and far less should we be charged with disloyalty because of our opposition to such a measure.

To further justify our position, we would only have to refer to the situation in Ireland where, according to reports there are 150,000 soliders employed in maintaining order and where it appears, there would be from 200,000 to 300,000 Irishmen who would be ready to enlist if they were granted Home Rule.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another reason for Canadians not rushing headlong into compulsory military service. It is the entrance of the United States in the conflict. When the United States shall have done as much as Canada has done, it may then be time, perhaps, to impose conscription or to ask more of Canada than she has done up to date.

Our effective forces must be maintained, is it said. What are our effective forces, Mr. Speaker? The soldiers we have sent across have been incorporated at the Government's own request, into the British army; they belong to the British army; they are no longer Canadian soldiers, they are soldiers belonging to British regiments and forming part of the British army. And I assert it boldly, because I believe every member of this House should be allowed to plainly express his views and state the bare facts. If Canada is not presently able to fill the gaps which are being made in the regiments she has sent across, if for this purpose voluntary service proves inadequate, I say that England must take upon herself to fill those gaps before the Prime Minister can come and ask us to foist compulsory service on Canada.

But we are told, Mr. Speaker, that the soldiers are looking to us; that we must win the war, and that Germany must be crushed! Let us leave mere words aside, and stop making big drum politics and considering the people as an agglomeration of ninnies who will jump at theories of any sort.

Let us not, therefore, allow the fever of excitement and the heat of prejudices to take the place of collected reasoning. Let us give up this speculating upon the glory of those who have gone and also not lessen their sacrifices by intimating to-day that they enlisted because they feared that conscription would come or that their action was prompted by the belief that sooner or later they might be compelled to take up arms. They did go away freely, Mr Speaker; and that is why we do admire them and why our souls are so moved by the remembrance of their exploits. All those soldiers, who so generously went over, had it in their heart that they were going to fight for liberty and justice, and in my humble opinion, they must frown on those who to-day want to ostracize their own compatriots.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I nowise understand the position taken by certain members of this side of the House who support the Military Service Bill. I was just listening a few moments ago to one of these hon. members who was trying to justify his support of the Bill on the ground that it contained more exemptions than does the present Militia Act. In that case as well entitle this Bill, as did an hon. member who spoke before me, the Exemption Act, rather than calling it the Military Service Act. Moreover, the Government has been taken to task by Liberal supporters of the Bill for not having conducted voluntary enlistment as they should; for having given undue preference to their supporters in awarding positions, and one of them added, not long ago, that he thought he had found in this Bill, now before the House, certain signs that led him to believe its object was purely political.

If these gntlemen do entertain such opinions, I wonder how they can afterwards speak in favour of this Bill and pledge themselves to vote for its second reading; the more so, when they take the pains to add that it is dangerous to entrust the administration of such an important measure to a Government who have not the people's confidence. Is it at all surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the people are growing uneasy since the Bill has been introduced? The country is not accustomed to such coercive laws and our people are not prepared for a measure of compulsion. I think the general disquiet is well justified; the masses may well feel anxious, for, after all, they alone will have to bear the burden which this Bill seeks to impose on the country. Just to realize the instinctive force of self-preservation among all the elements that compose our population, one has only to consider, not the statements, but especially the actions of certain organized groups of financiers. How easily, how very disinterestedly did the Montreal Board of Trade, at one of its meetings, pass a resolution demanding compulsory military service and decide that it would be in the country's interest and that it had become

necessary for the Government to enact such patriotic legislation. That is all very well. But let us now come to these gentlemen's actions. When it became known that the Government intended increasing the burden imposed upon wealth, and tax business and industrial profits on a larger scale than was the case last year, immediately these same gentlemen organized a delegation to come to Ottawa and beg the Government's favour. When these gentlemen, who are all of them exempt from military service, discuss the expediency of imposing conscription upon the people and of compelling the poor and the labourer to enlist and defend to a certain extent, the very wealth of these privileged classes, their patriotism runs high. But, when it comes to put out money to pay the expenses and the small wages of those who by this legislation will be coerced into active service, it is readily seen that their patriotism is only measured by the closeness of their fobs.

A great number of reasons, Mr. Speaker, have already been given against the passing of this Bill. I will not repeat them. But it might be added, I believe, that this Act shall be absolutely nugatory and ineffective and that, besides, it is antinational.

I say that this Act will be nugatory. Canada has, until now, made a splendid effort which has commanded from every nation of the world a deep admiration and has brought to her most deserved and cordial congratulations.

Canada's intervention in this war was surely proper. Why? When the declaration of war came as a clap of thunder in the serene sky of Europe, England was taken by surprise. Her fleet was ready to meet any foe on the seas; but her army was not in a fit condition to fight against a serious foe on land. She had not enough soldiers to effectually fill the part she had to play in this war. She needed the aid of her colonies; and every one of them rose up, ready to give the required co-operation. What has been the result of that intervention? It was secured for her an expeditionary army that contributed to the first victories over the Germans in the foreign land of France. Thanks to the intervention of the Canadians, the Australians and the inhabitants of all other colonies, England had the time to organize her forces; she had the time to prepare for the fray; she had the time to impose compulsory military service.

Now, when she is able to line up for battle several million men, it seems to me that our effort should abate; that we must think of the preservation of equilibrium in our economical conditions, and that we should not, without due consideration, spread misery and ruin throughout our territory.

Moreover, this compulsory military service law is useless, because England, who has adopted a similar one, has not applied it in all its strictness; it is applied with all possible discretion inspired by the most motherly feelings. A large number of people have been exempted from military service. Every one admits the fact, for it has been stated by an eminent personage in British politics that there are almost three million men in England, affected by this law, who have not yet been sent into active service. More than that, the compulsory military service law does not apply to Ireland. We are called disloyal because we object to compulsory military service in Canada. Are we not right, Mr. Speaker, after the splendid effort our country has made? If we are disloyal, I would ask what word we could use to qualify the action of Ireland who has quite a number of representatives in the British Parliament.

They now propose to enlist some 50,000 or 100,000 men. Is not that an insignificant number when the intended effort of the United States is taken into consideration? It seems to me that before a mere colony like Canada is compelled to destroy all her industrial, agricultural and commercial organization, before she is reduced to the point of sowing misery in her own territory, the autonomous countries, who will reap all the immediate benefits at the end of the war, should at least make as large sacrifices as this colony has already made. It is averred that when the United States shall have raised an army as large as that of Canada, in proportion to their respective populations, German militarism will have been annihilated, and Germany and her allies utterly defeated.

All our efforts should tend toward a more absolute necessity than enlisting men: agricultural production. In so doing, we would give a better and a more practical aid to the Allies' cause than by sending over a contingent of some fifty to a hundred thousand men, a mere drop of water in the ocean—if we consider the innumerable quantity of soliders now fighting on European soil and the still greater number of those who are preparing to join in the conflict.

Conscription is, moreover, an antinational measure, because it detracts from the merit and nobleness of Canada's effort. After enlisting more than 400,000 men in

this country, with a population no more than seven million souls, they would make the world believe—and what is worse— impress upon the minds of the Canadians themselves the conviction that Canada has not done her duty. I say that no one has the right, excepting if he be an anti-patriot, to charge Canada with remissness in duty. By so doing, I repeat the value and nobleness of our sacrifices are set at naught. For my part, and I believe it is the same for all who truly love their country, and love it first and above all, I would prefer reading upon the tombstone of the Canadian soldier the word "volunteer" than the epitaph "conscript." Voluntary sacrifice compels emotion and enthusiasm, whilst the sentiment at the sacrifice of the conscript is only that of grief.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, conscription would unjustly put us on an equal footing with the autonomous countries who are presently at war; it would put us on a level with England, with France, with Russia, with Italy, with the United States. Equality as to obligations, but not equality as to rights, since war has been declared without our consent and will be settled without our co-operation. I will go further, Mr. Speaker, they are making much noise with these three words, "Win the War", which are nothing but wind.

What would become of all the theories built upon those words if the autonomous countries decided to settle the war by a compromise? What could we say? What could we answer; what explanation, what excuse could we give to those we would have enlisted after a campaign all of excitement and exaggeration?

This measure, Mr. Speaker, would moreover destroy the harmony now existing or which has existed among the races who inhabit this country. It would give a chance to the demagogues of both races to wave all over the country the incendiary torch of prejudices. And that has already begun, Mr. Speaker. By comparisons and figures, some are trying to prove the loyalty or the disloyalty of one or the other of the provinces of the Confederation. Since when have patriotism, love of one's country and self-sacrifice been a matter of figures? Since when can these questions be settled by ciphering and statistics?

Patriotism is a sentiment and sentiments have nothing in common with arithmetic.

They say: Quebec has not done enough. If we take into account the circumstances, if we consider the odious campaign which has been waged against the province of Quebec for several years past and the unfair treatment our compatriots have been submitted to in certain provinces, I say that the province of Quebec has done not only her duty, but even more than her duty. Had she listened to prejudices, had she allowed herself to be guided by sentiments, she would not have enlisted a single man. We have done our duty; and I consider, by reason of the position occupied by the province of Quebec, by reason of the mean consideration given to her citizens in the other sections of the country, that this province has done more than Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the French Canadian's first thought is for Canada. The English Canadian's first thought, however, is for England. I do not want to reproach him with it; but it seems to me he has no right either, resting upon a false theory, to accuse us of being too strongly attached to our land and institutions and of preferring above all Canada, the land where our ancestors were born and died and on whose soil we intend to die ourselves.

We have no personal sympathies, might I say, across the ocean; we have no relatives, no friends in England; nor do we cherish the hope of going back there to end our days, as probably do some members of the Government.

We have no longer, either, nor have we had for many years past, any attachment to France. Those ties have been broken, and to-day the French Canadians of the province of Quebec are, before all else, Canadians. Mr. Speaker, the province of Quebec says aloud what she has in her mind, and in doing so, she even says and proclaims what the other provinces of the Confederation also have in their minds. Do you want a proof of it? It comes from the lips of one of those who have seen fit to abandon their party. What does he tell us? "If conscription were submitted to a referendum, for my part, I would ask that the vote be not taken by ballot, but openly." It is for the province of Ontario, that these hon. gentlemen demand the open vote. It is not for the province of Quebec, for they know what her opinion is; they know what she thinks; they know her convictions and these have been expressed by her mandatories; no one is uncertain as to her decision and can be mistaken as to the verdict she would deliver. It is for the province of Ontario they would have the old absolute system of the open vote, so they might intimidate the people and prevent them from freely expressing their

opinion. These gentlemen who would impose conscription in order to send our soldiers to fight for liberty, so they say, on the soil of France, would prevent liberty from flourishing even in that very province of Ontario.

It was painful to hear from the lips of the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) such base and despicable accusations as those we have had to endure. It seems to me that this gentleman who is a military man, who has been oversea and was a witness of the valour of the French Canadian soldiers, should be the last one to fling abuse in the face of the compatriots of those French Canadians who have covered themselves with glory. Having seen them in action, I do not understand how he can have the audacity, in this Parliament, to make such vile accusations against the citizens of my race. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people of my province prefer, as I do myself, Colonel Arthurs, who voluntarily enlisted for service on the other side, to the hon. member for Parry Sound who would impose conscription by abusing the province of Quebec. And this hon. member, or rather Colonel Arthurs, deserves much more credit and consideration for the part he has taken in the victory of Vimy than he deserves for the mean work he is doing for the benefit of his party just to help it to win an electoral victory.

We are not the only ones to denounce conscription. It is true that in the province of Ontario a good number of the people's representatives have seen fit to break off with their party and have allied themselves with the Conservative party upon this question, but there are other provinces in the Dominion where the English language is that of the majority, and we have heard several members from those provinces strongly oppose conscription. There cannot be two ways about it. If the hon. members of the provinces of New Brunswick and of Nova Scotia, and some from the western provinces have the right to oppose this Conscription Bill without being disloyal, I now ask you why we should be charged with disloyalty when we preach the very same doctrine? Certain parties wonder at hearing us say that the enlistment of 500,000 men is an excessive number. I will not repeat the words which have been already quoted, those of an important personage in the British Empire, Lord Shaughnessy. When Lord Shaughnessy tells us that the promise of enlisting 500,000 men is of doubtful wisdom, I wonder how they can then turn around to the province of Quebec, to its representatives, and charge them with disloyalty when they make the very same statement. If Lord Shaughnessy remains loyal to England although indirectly opposing conscription, if he remains loyal when he says that the enlisting of 500,000 men is excessive, I do ask myself how we can be charged with disloyalty when we do nothing else but repeat what he has said. No, we are not disloyal. But such are those who intend to deprive the people of its liberties in order to maintain here the plague of autocracy which England wants to stem on the soil of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, laws are useful and efficient when they are consistent with the needs of the people, and the way to know the people's needs, is to consult them. You cannot do it by posing as an autocrat as did, this afternoon, the hon. Minister of Justice. It is not by assuming the power, the right of life and death over the citizens, but only by consulting the people, either by means of a referendum or through elections.

Those who oppose the referendum say : But the people must be guided. Some of the hon. members who have left the Liberal party have made such a statement. If there was a referendum, Mr. Speaker, what would prevent those hon. gentlemen from going down into their counties, attend public meetings and speak in favour of conscription.

Mr. Speaker, volunteering is an individual sacrifice. Every one is free to dispose of his life as he thinks proper and offer it for a cause he believes to be a good and a just one. But conscription is an obligation imposed by the State; then, it is the State that disposes of the life and blood of its citizens. I say that before adopting such a measure we must be well convinced that we have the right to do it, that we are acting according to the will of the people and in their best interest. It is a serious, a most serious question, replete with grave consequences which may be disastrous for the future of a country like ours. I say that this question must be decided in the light of reason and not in the fumy torches of fanaticism.

The Government does not seem to suspect the gravity of this question of compulsory service. One would think, in listening to these hon. gentlemen, that the lives of the citizens are of no account, of such mean value that they can be disposed of without any consideration and with the sole object of preparing an electoral programme.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that those who are to be drafted have the right to be consulted. It has been said and repeated in every tone, during this debate, that the most interested ones, those who should, above all, have their say in this matter, were the soldiers who have already crossed the sea. Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to take exception to this doctrine. The men who have already gone to the front have done so of their own free-will; they were not led there through coercive means; nobody forced them to enlist.

But when it comes to forcibly send over those who have already used their own judgment and have decided to stay at home, I believe that we cannot deny them the opportunity to express their opinion.

Some may find too severe what I am about to say; but it is my duty to speak and of my statement I take beforehand the full responsibility. I do not fear to express my opinion here. They refuse the referendum in apprehension of the result, because they dread the verdict of the majority of the people of this country, which might confirm the opinion already expressed by the province of Quebec. They want to be able to say throughout the country that the province of Quebec is the only one to oppose conscription; that the French Canadians only refuse their co-operation to the Empire. They wish to speculate upon this campaign of prejudices inaugurated a few years ago and which is being waged throughout the country against the province of Quebec.

It would be useless to insist. To point out such an object, means to submit it to the most severe judgment of the honest conscience of every true Canadian.

I deny the Prime Minister the right to wrap himself up in the mourning flag of our country in order to preach us the destructive creed of Imperialism and to attempt the Germanizing of our political morals.

Let us have no discussion, Mr. Speaker, upon the tomb which covers, united in the same glory, the ashes of our fellow-citizens, English and French, mowed down together by the war.

Their common tomb is a symbol of peace and harmony among the races. From this union of the races in death, let us draw a lesson of good understanding for those who survive. And upon this glorious tomb let us respectfully incline our thoughts to find therein teachings of tolerance and of liberty.

Mr. M. S. DELISLE (Portneuf) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, this House should not expect a very lengthy speech from me. I am a business man and I have less than others the practice and art of public speaking. However, I believe that I must protest, as a citizen of the province of Quebec, against an assertion made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Sévigny).

He has stated that he was keeping his place as a minister so that our province may continue to be represented in the cabinet, since it is entirely against conscription and that he is in favour of it; since it demands that the law be submitted to the electorate and that he refuses.

No, Mr. Speaker, in this cabinet, the hon. minister represents only himself, and his portfolio which he keeps in defiance of all his former pledges.

The hon. minister realizes it is so well, Mr. Speaker, that, in his speech upon the present Act, he has tried to make us believe that the electors of Dorchester had approved conscription since they had elected him on January 27, 1917. But he was called to order and to common sense by one of his friends who went through this Dorchester campaign, in his interest; I am referring to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Achim).

I quote herewith the strong language used by the hon. member for Labelle in contradicting the minister's assertion. I find them at page 2972 of Hansard, French edition:

> Mr. Achim: My hon. friend puts an exceedingly delicate question to which I could with difficulty reply without hurting his present feelings and without taking explicit exception to the course he has chosen to adopt. Much would have I preferred it had my hon. friend not raised the issue, but since he has, I have no option but to tell him that in my opinion it would be better. Should ever a disruption occur in this country, Mr. Speaker, I say it will not take place between the province of Quebec and the remainder of Canada, but between the province of Ontario and the rest of the Dominion. Yes, Ontario, where the capitalists are attempting to crush the freedom of labour, Ontario whose manufacturers are attempting to restrain the freedom of trade, Ontario whose jingoes are trying to strangle freedom of conscience. I do say that if ever there is a disruption, that will be it, and the sooner the better perhaps.
>
> Mr. Speaker, I am grieved beyond expression to have to utter such words and I pray you to believe that before bringing myself to utter them, many doleful hours have I gone through; I feel that old bonds are being severed which I had hoped would be permanent. In brief, Mr. Speaker, I must declare that in this House I shall vote on this question with the Liberal party; that at the next elections I shall vote for the anti-conscriptionist candidate, that I resign as Conservative candidate in the county of Labelle and that in the province of Quebec I shall speak in favour of the Liberal party.

The minister of Inland Revenue labours under another delusion which I should like to dispel. He gives the result of the Dorchester

election as a verdict in favour of compulsory service. And such is my hon. friend's appreciation of his constituents that he argues—I epitomize—"What is the good of a referendum? We held one in Dorchester and Dorchester has spoken the verdict of all the electors of Canada. When Augustus had imbibed, Poland was full. Quand August avait bu, la Pologne était ivre." The argument is more creditable to the electors of Dorchester than to the minister's powers of interpretation.

The part of his speech to which I refer is to be found at page 2747, unrevised Hansard, and reads as follows:

What does the vote given at this election mean from a constitutional point of view? Does it not mean that the war policy of the Government was approved, as it has been approved by the members for the past three years, and has not this policy of the Government been to make every sacrifice to carry the war to a successful end, as far as conscription if necessary?

I agree with the whole paragraph save the following words: "As far as conscription if necessary." To that statement I take the most strenuous objection, because those who did cast their votes for my hon. friend had in their minds not the statement made by the Prime Minister in his letter to workmen dated December 27, 1916, but the one he made long ago on the floor of this House, which was quoted by the right hon. leader of the Opposition and which may be found at page 2747 of revised Hansard:

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.

If my hon. friend insinuates that the electors of Dorchester, by their vote, wished to approve of conscription, I must tell him that he would not be sitting on the Treasury benches if at the election he had so declared himself.

Thus does the hon. member for Labelle reduce to naught the hon. minister's pretentions, that his election was an approval of conscription. The hon. minister must be in quite a quandary to resort to such a shift, for during this election he more than once readily declared himself opposed to conscription.

Here is now what I find in La Patrie of January 22, 1917. If he ever did tell the truth, it was on that occasion, for he was speaking in the Sacred Temple, close to the parish priest, who actually presided, if you please. This was at Ste. Rose. That parish was destined to become famous during this election; indeed, it was there also that another minister displayed his leaning toward the Borden government's conscription when he advised the people to run away to the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us return to the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. I read in La Patrie, an organ of the Government:

The Rev. Father Tremblay's patriotic appeal to his parishioners.
A priest presides.

As there is no convenient hall in the village, Saturday's meeting was held in the vestry and the parish priest, Rev. Father Tremblay, not only had the kindness of permitting this invasion of his domain, but he even presided over the meeting, with a perfect ease, indeed, and no one would have thought that he was filling such a part for the first time.

The good parish priest also made a short speech: Gentlemen and voters, I will introduce to you the speakers who are your two representatives. It is not for me to commend them, it will be yours to do it for one or the other by the vote you will honestly and conscientiously give. Do seriously reflect upon the duty you are called upon to perform as citizens. Please carefully listen to your candidates with a view to gathering information and ideas for guidance on polling day. I need not ask you to observe due decorum, just remember that you are in the house of God. Mr. Sévigny admits that, in 1911, he was opposed to the Naval policy and against any participation of Canada in the wars of the Empire. He was then only thirty years old, he had no experience, but he believed in the principles he advocated, he was sincere and candid, not knowing the future more than any one else.

And, further on, Mr. Sévigny charges Mr. Cannon with taking undue advantage of the issuing of the National Service cards; he solemnly asserts that the census taken by the Commission has no relation whatever to the military service. That among the 400,000 soldiers whom Canada has to-day under arms, not one has been forced to enlist, neither shall any be conscripted in the future; there shall be no conscription, declared the new Minister.

Let us now take Evénement, the hon. minister's recognized mouthpiece, the newspaper which has made the most strenuous fight for the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue and we will see the various attitudes it shows him to have taken. I am reading Evénement of January 22, page 4, column No. 4, referring to that same Ste. Rose meeting:

The hon. Mr. Sévigny repeated the statements he had made on the opening of the campaign about the political errors he might have committed in the past. He also sincerely admitted he had trespassed in 1911 when he had declared himself against Canada's participating in the wars of the Empire, but he added that the terrifying events which are at the present time creating a general upheaval among the nations of the world fully justify him for having modified his views as to the war policy. He recalled the fact that the Liberal party has approved and still approves the war expenditure and that such expenditure would be continued if, one day or another, the Liberals should be returned into power in Ottawa.

Mr. Sévigny also spoke of the National Service question and repeated, once more, that we would not have any conscription.

The same paper reports another meeting held at Ste. Justine, and there, the hon.

minister outrivals his rival, Mr. Cannon, in his zeal to denounce conscription.

I read on column 3, page 4:

Mr. Sévigny stated that it was easy to find out who was responsible for the scandals unearthed by the Liberals. They are great in making charges, but they can prove nothing. As far as conscription was concerned, he stated he was as much opposed to that measure as Mr. Cannon and he added that the latter had consequently no right to raise any political agitation against him on that ground.

Mr. Sévigny was loudly acclaimed; as for Mr. Cannon, plaudits were rather weak in his favour and he was interrupted several times.

Again, at another meeting, at St. Odilon, the hon. minister protests against the very thought of such an iniquitous thing as conscription.

I will read once more from column 3, page 4—all about charges made—and you might find many more ad libitum:

As to the charges made by Mr. Cannon about broken pledges, Mr. Sévigny told Mr. Cannon he should be the last man to utter such reproaches. The man who would be entitled to do this, said Mr. Sévigny, is Mr. Ernest Roy, whom I defeated in 1911. As for you, you were not in the county of Dorchester, but you were busy fighting, in Charlevoix, Sir Rodolphe Forget, who crushed you. I do not mean by this that I deny my statements of 1911, for I do frankly admit that I did then make a mistake, but I deny you the right to come here and claim anything on behalf of a man who has not yet seen fit to fight by you. Mr. Sévigny then repeated his statements about the National Service, asserting that we would not have conscription and that this measure does not in any way imply conscription.

Now again, the Evénement of January 29—page 6, column 3—publishes another statement:

At the meeting held in the afternoon, at Sainte Aurélie, Hon. Mr. Sévigny did again reiterate his statement to the effect that there would be no conscription in the country. In most eloquent terms, the Minister of Inland Revenue pointed out the hateful results of a German victory. He made a generous appeal to all to unite in the struggle now kept on by the Allies for the triumph of right and justice.

But the climax of that campaign, Mr. Speaker, I find it in the Evénement of January 26, 1917, on the very eve of polling day. The paper speaks in the hon. minister's own name. It expresses itself as one that knows. It declares that the conscriptionist party is the Liberal party. That editorial is entitled:

A Bird in Hand is Worth Two in the Bush.

The voters of Dorchester are now perfectly informed: they know that they never shall have conscription under a Conservative Government; they do not know what they might have under a Liberal government.

[Mr. Delisle.]

The Conscription Party.

Lucien Cannon asks the electors of Dorchester to vote in his favour as against the new French Canadian Minister of Inland Revenue. And the arguments of Lucien Cannon, stripped of all the personal abuse which ornament his speeches worthy of a shameless politician, may be thus summarized:

Hon. Mr. Sévigny has changed his mind since 1911. He was then against the Laurier navy; he was even against any participation in the war; and he is now in favour of the National Service which, according to Lucien Cannon, must bring conscription with it. And Lucien Cannon states that he has the support of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to come and ask the electors of Dorchester to vote for him, as against the minister of a Government which is imposing too much upon the country and especially upon the French Canadians. On the other hand, Mr. Sévigny admits he has changed his mind since 1911 and of having followed the course of events which have also changed since that date. In 1911 it was the country's good interest to be pacifist; since 1914, it would be criminal to remain pacifist. Anyone who has heard that a horrible war has been declared in Europe must conscientiously realize that it would be criminal to remain a pacifist nowadays. Every great statesman, in France, in England, and everywhere else, has been forced, by the turn of events, to change policy since the outbreak of the war. The Hon. Mr. Sévigny represents the Borden Government's policy. This policy, that Government has drafted it and has even applied it. The whole country, Dorchester county, as well as the rest, is perfectly familiar with the Borden Government's policy, since the whole country has seen it applied for more than two years. If the Borden Government had meant conscription, it would already have been imposed. But they have declared they did not want it, that there is no use for it, and that they can sufficiently take a hand in the national defence without resorting to conscription.

Is Dorchester county just as sure of what would be the Liberal party's policy? Would it feel safer if the Liberal party were returned into power?

Lucien Cannon himself states in Ontario papers that he is in favour of our participation in the war. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's best lieutenants, as the Hon. Frank Oliver did state in the House of Commons, assert that the Borden Government has not done enough towards the war, that the Borden Government should impose conscription. All the Liberal newspapers cry for conscription; they promise to all the provinces of Canada that, should the Liberal party be returned to power, it would mean conscription. And Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the leader of the Liberal party, gives no denial to his lieutenants or to his organs who preach conscription—because Sir Wilfrid perfectly knows that his papers express the opinion of the majority of the Liberal party, and that is only with that conscription cry that the Liberal party has any chance of returning to power and to overthrow the Borden Government who have not done enough for England. Should the electors of Dorchester elect a Liberal representative and conscription come later on, they would have bad grace to complain that they have not been duly notified. They know what they have from the Conservative Government, they do not know what they could expect from a Liberal government. "A

bird in hand is worth two in the bush." Thus speaketh the wisdom of nations.

After all this, the hon. Minister dares to pretend that he represents the province of Quebec, when he now votes for conscription. No, he does not represent it and, before long, he will have the opportunity to go and ask his friends, the Tories of Ontario, for a county, if he intends to sit again in this House, for if we are to believe that same paper, it seems that his good Tory friends have already offered him a dozen or so. I read from the same edition of the Evénement, January 22, 1917, another editorial entitled:

What Would Happen if Hon. Mr. Sévigny Were Defeated in Dorchester?

The hon. Mr. Sévigny would then be elected by acclamation in Ontario. What would happen if the hon. Mr. Sévigny were defeated in Dorchester?

The small Liberals go around claiming it would be irretrievable condemnation of the Borden Government; that this Government would be defeated and that the Governor would order general elections.

The real truth is not quite so dreadful.

In view of the bare possibility of defeat in Dorchester, three or four Ontario members have already tendered their resignation to Sir Robert Borden, in order to give the new French Canadian minister a county wherein he would be sure of being elected by acclamation.

The Ontarians have committed particular wrongs against the French Canadians; but we must, however, admit that they understand their civic duties otherwise than many of us.

If, then, hon. Mr. Sévigny were defeated in Dorchester, he would be elected by acclamation in some county of the province of Ontario. As Cartier, he would have to loyally put his talents and his influence at the service of his constituents, and instead of having a minister to represent and help them in the Dominion Parliament the electors of Dorchester would have a Cannon—on the Opposition benches. The Dominion Government would be less embarassed than the county of Dorchester.

And that is all.

Such was the case of Sir George Etienne Cartier who, on being appointed a minister, asked the electors of Montreal to ratify his ministerial mandate, and was defeated in Montreal. A Manitoba member gave him his seat and Cartier was elected in St. Boniface. Instead of exerting his talents and his ministerial influence in favour of the Montreal electors, Cartier loyally put them at the service of his constituents of St. Boniface. The Ottawa Government was not otherwise affected by the defection of the Montreal electors.

Well! let him get ready, Mr. Speaker, and fall in with his generous supporters. The province of Quebec cannot recognize in him the true representative of her views and feelings. She will prove it to him when he will run the gauntlet of an election even in Dorchester.

I cannot support this measure, because it is neither fair nor constitutional, and above all because my fellow-citizens are unanimously against it. When I consider the stand taken by the representative of the province of Quebec in the cabinet, who disregards the opinion and the feelings of his fellow-citizens, I cannot but protest both orally and by my vote.

Mr. EDMOND FORTIER (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, as I do not intend taking up uselessly the time of the House, I shall dispense with repeating what many members have with good reason done and said against the Bill No. 75 introduced by the hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). Therefore, without any dilly-dallying, I shall deal with the subject and consider a few of the outstanding features of this debate, which has been going on for two weeks already.

Representing a rural division, I cannot let this opportunity go by without letting this House and the country know the stand I believe it my duty to take upon this selective conscription Bill, as well as on the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As for the amendment to the amendment, I consider it perfectly useless and I can immediately declare I shall vote against it.

When the extension of the parliamentary term was voted last year, not a single member of this House would have surmised that such a measure as conscription would be imposed upon the country. Since that extension has been granted, the leaders of both parties, as well as their friends, have declared that conscription would not be imposed. Volunteering alone was to be established for enlisting in His Majesty's imperial army, in order to assist the Allies and more especially the mother country and France, who are the principal powers having joined other countries to avenge outraged Belgium, to protect minorities and democracies, whilst safeguarding the rights of justice and liberty against Prussian barbarity, the vandalism of the Central powers of Europe and of their Balkan allies.

This war, Mr. Speaker, is not waged against any country in particular. It is rather against this Prussian militarism, this vandalism organized by Germany and her allies, in order to conquer and to subdue the world by means of this revolting prussianism of the Huns and assume world-wide supremacy. In order to reach their ends, the foe had to first strike at the most formidable powers, such as France, England and Russia, by overrunning smaller countries who are the martyrs of patriotism and whose heroism even exceeds all that

man would have supposed in those little nations; I refer particularly to Belgium and to Serbia, to whom defence and protection had been promised. France and England, who had undertaken to protect those countries, in respecting their treaties, found themselves in honour bound to fulfil their engagements, whilst defending themselves against the foe of the democratic nations.

Mr. Speaker, our mother countries being at war, their colonies are equally at war, and every one of them should, in proportion to its financial circumstances and the total amount of its population, aid by all possible means the Entente Allies to win a final victory and to establish a permanent peace. Patriotically, Canada rose up to the expectations of the mother country and of our allies by contributing over 420,000 volunteers, armed and equipped by the country and placed in the imperial armies' service. Of course, voluntary enlistment was bound to subside after a while, and such falling off was accentuated by the quarrels which arose among the members of the cabinet who in so doing have stopped recruiting; and also by the unspeakable manner in which the French Canadians of the province of Quebec were treated by certain fanatics who are ever making it their study to insult the French people of this province.

It has been said and repeated, in this House, that we should sacrifice everything, even to our last man and our last dollar for the Allies' defence. I do not hesitate to state, Mr. Speaker, that, under the present circumstances, it would be rashness. All the democratic countries are as much interested as we are in aiding the Entente Allies in this great conflict which threatens liberty and justice and in securing a final and universal peace.

How many of those countries, Mr. Speaker, have done as much as Canada, both in men and in financial aid, since this war began and up to date? How many of those democratic countries have been as generous as we, when their interests were at stake just as much as our own? Who, among all those people, would be ready to shed their blood, give their last man and drain their finances—as some Canadian Imperialists would want Canada to do—to secure a victory which can be hoped for without doing so much, when those other countries shall have contributed their proportianl share? Why, Mr. Speaker, should Canada give her men and drain her finances for the benefit of the neutrals and of the patronage sappers, profiteering out of our generosity, in favour of our political mountebanks whose patriotism is limited by the manger and the fat jobs. I have no hesitation in stating, Mr. Speaker, that until now, Canada has done her full share, and more than her share. I do not hesitate to say that it is not necessary to establish this conscription which has been imposed upon the Prime Minister by certain financial vultures. In my opinion, the system of volunteering, if well organized, would suffice to contribute our quota of the necessary reserves. And were that system inadequate, we would only have to reduce the number of divisions which the Prime Minister has had the temerity to promise, on his own responsibility, without first submitting this rash pledge to the approval of the leading men of the country. To promise without previous consultation, for and on behalf of Canada, 500,000 men, or four full divisions with their reserve forces, without a mandate from the people. I say, Mr. Speaker, that only a wilfully blind man could have done such a thing. The conscription Bill, now before this House, would never have been needed, if the means taken to further voluntary recruiting had been rational and if certain classes of our fellow-citizens had not been wounded in their feelings by the aspersions lavished on their nationality, their patriotism and their loyalty to the British Crown, as well as on their mentality.

Under such circumstances, it was only natural that the province of Quebec should have contributed a smaller number of volunteers, and more than that, we see here in this very House, while discussing this measure, an individual arrogating to himself the title of the western lion,—attempting to compare the population of Quebec to a lamb, that faithful friend of John the Baptist, the patron saint of the French Canadians. Mr. Speaker, were I asked to give my preference to one of these quadrupeds, I would certainly grant it to the Quebec lamb rather than to the Imperialist bull from Red Deer, the representative of the region of the wild buffaloes of yore. When discussing this measure, our friends on the other side of the House rejoiced at the defection of certain Liberal members. To such, may I be allowed to say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is, in this House, the personification of loyalty and of democracy, respecting in others the liberty of thought, of judgment and of speech. And that loyalty may advantageously compare with that of the Prime Minister who, one day, boasting of British fair play, was the first to apply the gag to the leader of the Opposi-

tion, just to prevent the discussion of one of the most important measures submitted to this House. On this side, Mr. Speaker,—I mean on the Liberal side—the leaders do not gag any one. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, true to that principle of freedom of action, has given all possible latitude to those of his partisans who think they should follow their mind and their conscience's dictates, as free men, and part from those who, conscientiously also, while relying upon the rights of the people whom we no longer represent here, believe they should differ from those who are opposed to submitting this most important question to the sovereign people of this country whom apparently it is the intention to gag.

When he submitted this conscription Bill for its first reading, the Prime Minister stated that we needed a greater number of men, because enlistment was ebbing; hence, the need for immediate conscription. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Allies need more men, is it a necessity that Canada should contribute them, and that, in order to do so, selective conscription should be established in this country? I say: no. If the democratic countries, just as interested as the United States and Canada may be, do their duty as well as the latter has done heretofore, there is no need for conscription. When the United States, who are just entering this conflict, will have given the Allies their aid in the same proportion as Canada has done, they will necessarily have some six or eight million men up against the Huns; a sufficient number to settle them for good.

Under such circumstances, why should Canada have conscription when, with a good voluntary recruiting system, we might continue what we have been doing ever since war started, and thereby creating a feeling of admiration for Canada's generosity towards the Allies as well as towards the mother country.

For all the reasons I have just given, Mr. Speaker, I shall support by my vote the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition, and I shall oppose, also by my vote, the second reading of the Military Service Act of 1917, inasmuch as we do not any longer hold any mandate from the people who, alone, have the required authority during these most critical times for us, and who must be consulted. This consultation would restore peace in the country, put an end to the uneasiness now existing among the people of the Dominion and put a stop to that feeling of animosity which unfortunately, is growing from day to day between the English and French speaking Canadians. Before taking my seat, I appeal to the Prime Minister to withdraw this measure which would certainly be a source of trouble in the country, should it be enforced.

Mr. J. B. BOURASSA (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, it is past two o'clock and the cock will soon be crowing, consequently, I will be very short. A few days ago, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), when speaking about conscription and as to the referendum, stated that this world was full of paradoxes. In our present circumstances, this is particularly true, but I think it might also be true to say that everywhere, among nations as well as among individuals, there are many points of similarity. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in 1914, we have seen a man rise up before the nations of Europe. He had not consulted his people. He had not consulted his allies, but alone, standing by himself, he said to Europe: Liberty is no more, independence does not exist, the treaties mere scraps of paper, I shall set up a throne to autocracy, which I will build upon agonizing democracy and upon it I shall dominate the world. Again indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have also seen in our country another man rise who had not consulted the people, and we heard him say to Canada: I alone represent liberty; I alone represent independence, I alone represent right in the country—the constitution scraps of paper; thus imitating the overseas Kaiser. We can therefore say that we also have our own Kaiser here, in Canada.

I have asked myself, Mr. Speaker, what right the Prime Minister had, in the name of Canada, and without consulting the electors of Canada to promise to give 500,000 men. I have studied, Mr. Speaker, I have considered the question on all its sides, and I have not been able to understand the why and the wherefore, except, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been a dream. I wondered if we had not been struck by the magic wand of a mischievous fairy in the service of the Government, if we had not been thrown back for ages and centuries to that distant era when there were no subjects, when there were only serfs and a master who could dispose of their wealth, of their blood and of their flesh, to suit his fancy.

Now, must we accept this situation such as offered us? Who is asking for 500,000 men? Is it England? If I did correctly understand what has been said of late, never did England ask the Prime Minister to contribute 500,000 men; if I well understood

what has been said in Franre and what has been printed in France, Canada will not need to contribute 500,000 men. And, besides, that balance of a total amount of 500,000 men which they ask us, what does that represent in the present conflict where we are fighting together, or against one another, some twenty millions of men; and if that total of 100,000 should have no influence upon the result, we would be forced to admit that this balance of the 500,000 men which, before two months, six months or a year are over, may perhaps be raised to two or three hundred thousand men, will be useless; that we are needlessly depriving Canada of these men.

There are, at present, so we are told, more than 100,000 of our men in England. For more than a year, these men have been over there; that is to say that, for over a year, the country has been deprived of their help, agriculture has been deprived of the aid of a great part of these 100,000 men, trade has likewise been deprived of the help of these 100,000 men, and, yet what can they have done for the Allies' cause? What good have they been to the Allies, since they have not yet been at the front? And those other 100,000 men they are asking us, when will they reach Europe? Before 100,000 men can be landed in Europe, it will take at least one year, and that also means that for one year our country will be deprived of the labour of these 100,000 men, and that means moreover that the Allies will not have the aid of these 100,000 men before another year. That would be, you must admit it, unfortunate, both for the farmers and for the manufacturers of our country. In short, we should not deprive farming of its necessary hands, nor our mills and factories of the labour essential to their activities. I might say the same thing as to our commercial firms and here, perhaps, it might not be out of order to inquire as to what would become of our important firms such as, for instance, the Ames, Holden & McCready Company, of Montreal; it is safe to say, as for the latter, in particular, they would no longer be able to realize, within a year, about 120 per cent, net profits.

This compulsory Military Service Act is put before the country and then they give, as a reason, that the province of Quebec has not done her duty. We should then infer that this conscription Act would have the province of Quebec as its object, and that, to quite an extent. Can these gentlemen yet wonder why the province of Quebec has not contributed just as many men as they would like to see on the fields of battle? Ever since the war began, or rather, as I should have said, ever since 1911, there has been lacking in the province of Quebec an essential element, I might even say an indispensable element for the success of recruiting; that element was the trust that this province should have had in her rulers. Deceived in 1911, deceived ever since, deceived by all and more especially by the Government leaders, Quebec has come down to the point of asking herself in whom she may trust. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) has declared before this House and before the country that there would be no question of conscription in Canada; during the session of 1916 he again asserted it explicitly. He may probably answer us that events have changed, that since 1916 circumstances have become so serious and the future so gloomy that he has been compelled to modify his opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, in the course of January last, could not the Government then realize the situation. Through the seconder of the Address in reply to the Governor General's speech (Mr. Descarries) did not the Government inform us that there would never be any conscription in this country, and after this declaration has any member of the Cabinet stated that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had unwisely spoken or that he had not expressed the whole truth?

I would ask those hon. members who, ever since the war started have never ceased to abuse us, if they would have acted any other way than the province of Quebec has seen fit to do. No, Mr. Speaker, for some time there has passed over the province of Quebec a storm of abuse of every description; a storm of hysterical abuse and I do beg you to believe, Mr. Speaker, that I use the term "hysterical" to be decent and in order to not apply the true name to the sickness now affecting the men who attack us. That sickness, if I can judge of it by the way some of the members of the right are behaving, has become a chronic one. When some of those gentlemen speak of the province of Quebec and of the French Canadians, you can see hatred depicted upon their faces, and their eyes sparkle with joy at every abusive word uttered against us; and when I hear them vomit this abuse, I always imagine I hear the sounds uttered by a Hun pirate who, after having sunk the ship, cries and yells out to his gunners the order to sink the life boats also. They pretend that the province of Quebec, in particular, and Canada, generally, have not

done enough for the war. Let us sum up the situation: Canada has contributed more that 400,000 men, she therefore had to deprive herself of that many. She has paid these soldiers' expenses, both at home and abroad, and considering our total enlistments in proportion to our numbers, as compared with the corresponding figures for the United States, France or England, we cannot come to any other conclusion than this one: That Canada has done her duty, not only as regards the number of enlisted men, but also as regards money contributions. Right here, Mr. Speaker, it may perhaps be appropriate to mention the fact that our Canadian soldiers draw $1.10 per day, whilst in France they only get 25 centimes; that means, therefore, that our army of 400,000 men represents, as far as expenses are concerned for pay only, 9,000,000 men.

Mr. Speaker, among other insults they were pleased to hurl against Quebec is this one: They call us "slackers". If I can understand well enough the meaning of this term, I believe it would be what we call in French "tirer de l'arrière." I have endeavoured to find in Quebec and, particularly, in the Quebec district, what they do call slackers. After lots of trouble, I must admit that I actually found only one of them. I remembered that, last year, the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Sévigny) had it widely advertised by papers in his pay that he was going to raise a regiment and lead it himself across the deep to slay as many Germans as possible. Did he even go midway? That is a thing I could not vouch for, but what I do positively know is that the regiment was never raised and that the hon. member for Dorchester, instead of being in the trenches, is now occuprying a seat in the cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, we find everywhere some points of resemblance, as I have already stated. The hon. member's conduct reminds me of the story of a certain King of France. History reports that this king was most terrible when he spoke of combats; he was ever ready to declare war against his neighbours but, as soon as he heard the clash of swords and the clearing of the decks, he became such a poltroon that he would literally swoon as soon as the word "battle" would be mentioned to him. If my memory serves me right, that king was Charles the Bald.

Was it fear that thus inspired the member for Dorchester? I don't believe it. He cannot have studied the theory of Safety First, but he must have rather believed that he would be giving a better proof of intense patriotism in immolating himself upon the altar of sacrifice for the salvation of the French Canadian nation.

Quebec has not made enough sacrifices, has not contributed her share in men, do they say? I might perhaps be allowed to read to this House the following extract of a letter from Captain William Chandor Innes, of Toronto; here is how he speaks of the province of Quebec's contribution.

This letter had been addressed to the Toronto Telegram where its publication was refused, but it came through anyway.

After the first contingent, twelve French Canadian battalions were authorized: the 22nd, the 41st, the 57th, the 150th, the 163rd, the 165th, the 167th, the 178th, the 189th, the 206th, the 230th and the 233rd. The larger part of those units were levied and sent for overseas service, and they have covered themselves with glory. You have only to glance over last year's list of dead and wounded, and you will see that the French Canadians are largely represented.

Besides these figures which amount to a total of 17,000, the province of Quebec has contributed three stationary hospitals and a field battery. With the number of French Canadians disseminated among the various English battalions, particularly in the Engineering and Forestry battalion (in which the French Canadians represent 90 per cent), I believe we may reach a total amount of 20,000 men from the province of Quebec.

The Laval University has, moreover, furnished an ambulance corps (one of the best in the Allies' service, according to despatches) and a dental corps; more than that, a large number of these students and graduates make themselves useful in various ways at the front. The Maritime Provinces have contributed a French Canadian battalion and the English battalions from that section of the country count over 3,000 French Canadians in their ranks the western provinces have in their local battalions more than 4,000 French Canadians.

You might allow me to say a few words about the recruiting in the province of Quebec, where I have resided several years. I know the French Canadian as a loyal subject in the full sense of the word, and it would be most unfair and erroneous to size him up after the Bourassa standard. Those unfortunate comparisons between Quebec and the other provinces as to recruiting, should never have been made.

He states that, since the first contingent was recruited, twelve Canadian battalions were authorized: the 22nd, the 41st, the 57th, the 150th, etc. Most of these units have been levied and sent away on overseas service where they have covered themselves with glory. You only have to glance over the list of last year's dead and wounded and you will see that the Canadians are largely represented.

Besides these figures which form a total of 17,000 men, the province of Quebec has contributed three stationary hospitals, one

field battery, and many French Canadians disseminated among the various English battalions, especially in the Engineering and Forestry battalion. And, moreover, Laval University has furnished an Ambulance corps, one of the finest in the Allies' service—so say the despatches—and a corps of dental-surgeons.

I refrain, Mr. Speaker, from going through this list which makes us really understand what this impartial Englishman says of the province of Quebec.

On the other side, on your right, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be two parties who differ in their ways, but whose efforts have the same object. They want to weaken the country in order to reign. One of them tries to weaken the country by splitting it; it has set the English race against the French race. A gale of abuse coming from there has blown over the province of Quebec, a storm of hatred has fallen upon us. Those who compose it believe they are the greatest men of their race, greater than the British Empire, truer than history, mightier than right, more patriotic than the French and English struggling together shoulder to shoulder in the most terrible war the world has ever seen. They are blending their blood for the defence of a grand idea, for the triumph of a holy cause: Liberty. That should certainly be enough to force strong roots and wide branches to sprout from the tree of concord in the fertile soil watered by French blood and by English blood, and in its shade the Canadian nation could find a safe shelter.

The other party wants to weaken the people by impoverishing them. It shouts for poverty; it will soon shout for misery. It has given a free hand to speculation, to monopoly, to stock-jobbing, to such an extent that the old den of the Forty Thieves would be too small to shelter all the public embezzlers and squanderers. They have hoarded up fortunes. Gold is powerful, I know it, powerful for an individual, for a family, for a caste. However, open the history of nations, and you will have to admit that there still is a greater power, which has overthrown institutions which had braved storms for centuries. Beware! the people are patient, because they are strong. Beware! you have sown the wind; very soon, harvest time will be with you, and you will gather the storm. For my part, I deny myself the right to coercion. Following my leader's example, I recognize only one master in the country, it is the one who pays, it is the one who suffers, who prays, who supplies the blood and the flesh for cannon. It is him I want to consult and I will bend before his supreme will.

We are now threatened with civil war and I cannot see wherein the Allies could get any benefit from it. For my part, I ask the Government to well consider the scope of their Act; it is an extreme and destructive measure, which may give results far contrary to those expected. I recall what stand was taken in 1911 to impose an appeal on the people. It was then alleged that the Liberal government had not the right to modify our commercial relations with the United States without consulting the Canadian people. How much more important is the legislation now before us, since it actually amends our own constitution to quite an extent?

Mr. OVIDE BROUILLARD (Drummond-Arthabaska): Mr. Speaker, no doubt the Prime Minister of Canada does to-day realize to what extent the autocratic character of his measure is unseasonable. We are under the threat of a calamity which, from the Canadian point of view, shall be irreparable. Civil war is at our very doors. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I should have to declare that the reasons put forward by the Premier do not have, as I can see them, the merit of sincerity. I have come to the point of asking myself what kind of sickness attacks the Government leader, every time he comes back to us from England. When he first returned, in 1913, he raised quite a storm in this country by telling us that England did not know what to do. The Empire was on the point of foundering if Canada did not immediately vote thirty-five million dollars in order to ensure the building of three dreadnoughts to increase the British naval forces. The people as well as the Parliament of this country were put under the impression that the voting of such a sum would meet the British government's objects and wishes. Well, since then the very facts have demonstrated that England had never asked us a single dollar. The Prime Minister's reputation must necessarily suffer from this, even to-day, a severe counter-blow, and he can have no fault to find if his hysterical imperlialism leaves us quite unconcerned.

This is not, however, the only time that the Premier has allowed his word to falter. Every one in this House remembers that when he introduced the Bill demanding the grant of thirty-five millions to England, the Prime Minister stated that if such legislation were not passed, he would immediately make an appeal to the people.

Well, that legislation did not pass and there has been no appeal to the people. That was four years ago—yes, four years have already passed and never since has the Prime Minister even dreamed of thinking that the first care of a man of honour is to redeem his pledged word—it would surely not be an act of temerity on my part, should I to-day assert that this appeal to the people is what the leader of the Cabinet apprehends the most. And, judging the present by the past, I have no hesitation in saying that the Prime Minister seems more anxious to remain in power than to redeem his pledged troth. The measure now before the House, a measure of exceptional importance, is submitted to us as being of imperious necessity. The only guarantee we have of that necessity, is the word of the Prime Minister. For my part, that is not sufficient, past experience justifies me in demanding something more substantial. I regret that I should be obliged to so express myself, but, in fine, it is no fault of mine if the leader of the Government has put himself in such a position that a reputable backer is now demanded in support of his word.

Admitting I am quite unable to discuss the Bill now before the House from the legal point of view, I will simply limit myself to state in a few words what I think of it from the national and economic standpoint, I have most heartily agreed to our full participation in the present conflict. And I am one of those who declare, without any hesitation, that our duty is to continue the effort so generously put forth up to date. It is most unfortunate, however, that the Government should have tolerated speculations which, in these critical times, have a criminal character.

The attitude taken by the American government since the United States have entered into the war, shows plainly to what extent our rulers have been careless, not to use a harsher expression. The blood imposition was already painful enough, without adding to it the scandals which have kept on increasing since the beginning of the war. Whatever be the case, our duty would have remained the same, and those who have tolerated the abominations we did witness, must bear their full share of responsibility before history.

I admit I am unable to see the opportunity of the measure now before this House. A few months ago, the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) enthroned as head of the National Service, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to draw American labour towards our western prairies. That step was a straight admission of the lack of hands to perform the required labour in this country. To-day it is perfectly admitted that this effort of the hon. member for Calgary was a lamentable failure. Since then, the American people have joined hands with the Allies, and no one ignores that we can expect nothing from the support our neighbours might have given us. The lack of farm labour is being daily more visible and it is to my personal knowledge that, in the province of Quebec, our farmers are seriously anxious to know how they may be able to gather in their wheat and their hay. The same anxiety exists in other provinces. Recruiting, although less active, is just the same taking away every month thousands of helpers from the farm fields. Every day we are being informed that the Allies are crying for munitions and still more munitions. How will we be able to feed our soldiers and supply them the means of defence if, through an improvident policy, we put ourselves in the impossibility of producing and of gathering in. It has been stated that Russia's attitude was one of the main reasons demanding a more strenuous effort on our part. That reason no longer exists, and the Russian victories are now becoming a subject of admiration for the civilized world.

The United States have now thrown themselves, body and soul, into the furnace. The millions of soldiers they will add to the Allied forces will soon give an overwhelming numerical superiority to the cause of the Allies. On the one hand, the Allies have a superabundance of soldiers; on the other, they need what we are in a position to furnish them: ammunition and bread.

Why should the Government be so obstinately bent upon placing us in the actual impossibility of doing that which would be the most useful to the common cause? Is it only to redeem that imprudent boast of contributing five hundred thousand men? It would be simply dispensing with the fulfilment of a national duty, just to justify an arrogant personal boast. It would be a crime of high treason against our own country. Is it, as some have stated, in order to better reach the province of Quebec? That would be most hateful and infamous; Quebec knows her duty, and she needs no one to dictate it to her.

I do repeat what I said in opening my remarks; we are threatened by Civil war—I do not see what the Allies could gain by it. I realize what their cause might lose through it. For my part, I beg the Govern-

ment to duly reconsider the scope of their Act. It is an extreme measure and one evolved by extremists. Statesmen should know how to maintain fair equipoise, more so in a country like ours. Moderation only and a fair appeal to the best sentiments of the whole nation, will give the most desirable results.

I still remember that in 1911, the then Opposition forced an appeal to the people, alleging that the Liberal government had no right to modify our commercial intercourse with the United States, without first consulting the people. How much more important is the proposed legislation now submitted to us. The exchange of commercial commodities is like child's play compared to the blood sacrifice you wish to impose upon us.

These are, Mr. Speaker, some of the reasons which may expose the grounds upon which I have decided to vote against the Government's measure, and which will induce me to support the amendment offered by the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: With respect to the amendment to the amendment, moved by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Barrette), a point of order was raised by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin) as to whether it could properly be received. To my mind, there is no question that the amendment to the amendment is in order, and can properly be entertained by the House.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Barrette) for the six months' hoist, which was declared lost on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Achim,
Barrette,
Bellemare,
Boulay,
Descarries,
Girard,
Guilbault,
Paquet,
Patenaude.—9.

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Alguire,
Ames (Sir Herbert),
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Ball,
Barnard,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Best,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Blondin,
Boivin,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Brouillard,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Cardin,
Carvell,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Chisholm,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Copp,
Cromwell,
Crothers,
Cruise,
Currie,
Davidson,
Deslisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Donaldson,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Ethier,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fortier,
Foster (Sir George),
Fripp,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
German,
Glass,
Graham,
Green,
Guthrie,
Hanna,
Hartt,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Jameson,
Kay,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lafortune,
Lalor,
Lanctot,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Loggie,
Macdonnell,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York, O.),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
McMillan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marshall,
Martin,
Meighen,
Merner,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Mondou,
Morphy,
Morris,
Morrison,
Munson,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Paul,
Power,
Proulx,
Rainville,
Pugsley,
Reid,
Robb,
Robidoux,
Roche,
Rogers,
Ross,
Schaffner,
Scott,
Seguin,
Sevigny,
Sexsmith,
Shepherd,
Sinclair,
Smith,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thoburn,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walker,
Wallace,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Sir Thomas),
Wilson (Laval),
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wright.—165.

The House divided on the amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for referendum, which was declared lost on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Achim,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Barrette,	Lapointe
Bellemare,	(Montreal, St. James),
Bickerdike,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Boivin,	Lemieux,
Boulay,	McCoig,
Bourassa,	McCrea,
Boyer,	McMillan,
Brouillard,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Bureau,	Marcile (Bagot),
Cardin,	Martin,
Chisholm,	Michaud,
Copp,	Molloy,
Delisle,	Mondou,
Demers,	Murphy,
Descarries,	Oliver,
Devlin,	Pacaud,
Ethier,	Papineau,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),	Paquet,
Fortier,	Patenaude,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe)	Power,
Gauvreau,	Proulx,
German,	Robb,
Girard,	Seguin,
Guilbault,	Sinclair,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Kay,	Tobin,
Knowles,	Truax,
Kyte,	Turgeon,
Lachance,	Verville,
Lafortune,	Wilson (Laval).—62.
Lanctot,	

NAYS.

Messieurs.

Alguire,	Lewis,
Ames (Sir Herbert),	Loggie,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Macdonell,
Armstrong (York, O.),	Maclean (Halifax),
Arthurs,	Maclean (York, O.)
Ball,	MacNutt,
Barnard,	McCraney,
Bennett (Calgary),	McCurdy,
Bennett (Simcoe),	McLean (Queen's, PEI),
Best,	McLean (Sunbury),
Blain,	McLeod,
Blondin,	Marshall,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Meighen,
Bowman,	Merner,
Boyce,	Middlebro,
Boys,	Morphy,
Brabazon,	Morris,
Bradbury,	Morrison,
Buchanan,	Munson,
Burnham,	Nesbitt,
Burrell,	Neely,
Carvell,	Nicholson,
Champagne,	Nickle,
Charlton,	Northrup,
Clark (Bruce),	Osler (Sir Edmund),
Clark (Red Deer),	Pardee,
Clarke (Wellington),	Paul,
Clements,	Rainville,
Cochrane,	Reid,
Cockshutt,	Robidoux,
Cromwell,	Roche,
Crothers,	Rogers,
Cruise,	Ross,
Currie,	Schaffner,
Davidson,	Scott,
Doherty,	Sevigny,
Donaldson,	Sexsmith,
Douglas,	Shepherd,
Edwards,	Smith,
Elliot,	Steele,
Fisher,	Stevens,
Foster (Sir George),	Stewart (Hamilton),
Fripp,	Sutherland,
Glass,	Taylor,
Graham,	Thoburn,
Green,	Thompson (Yukon),
Guthrie,	Thornton,
Hanna,	Turriff,
Hartt,	Walker,
Hazen,	Wallace,
Henderson,	Webster,
Hepburn,	Weichel,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	White (Sir Thomas),
Jameson,	Wilson (Wentworth),
Kemp,	Wright.—111.
Lalor,	

Pairs on Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Amendment for Referendum:

D. D. McKenzie,	Dugald Stewart,
W. Carroll,	H. B. Tremaine,
E. M. Macdonald,	J. Stanfield,
Wm. Pugsley,	J. J. Carrick.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was paired with the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Carrick). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DUGALD STEWART: I was paired with the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion.

Mr. ARTHUR B. COPP (Westmorland): I am sure that during the debate on this Bill, hon. members must have been impressed with the fact that all were of one mind with regard to the main question—the duty and the intention of Canada to assist in every way within her power to assist our allies in the great struggle in which we are engaged.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member is speaking on the main motion?

Mr. COPP: Yes. It seems to me that the only line of cleavage between those who differ in this debate is on the question whether this Bill affords the best means of bringing our greatest force to the assistance of the Allies. This measure has given me a great deal of thought. I have approached it with an entirely open mind—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. COPP: —and have carefully followed the debate, that I might decide my course fairly, and as wisely as I could, in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask hon. members to maintain order.

Mr. COPP: During the past two weeks, I have given to hon. gentlemen discussing this measure, a respectful hearing; I ask of them the same. The discussion in this House has not followed political party lines, but each member has sought to understand the question and has voted as his conscience dictated. The main argument of those who support the Bill, as well as I have been able to understand it, is that the Prime Minister, having attended the Imperial Conference overseas during the recess, has come back imbued with the idea that our boys at the front must have reinforcements, and to get them we must introduce a conscription measure because voluntary enlistment, which had been taken up by the Government and endorsed by the leader of the Opposition, has fallen down. Some hon. members who usually do not support the Government have come to the same conclusion, but their reasoning is altogether different.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COPP: I put myself on record here, I care not what hon. members may say, "hear, hear," or with what derision they may treat my statements—I put myself on record that I am firmly at one with other hon. members as to what Canada's duty is in this crisis; I believe that we should give every possible assistance to the Allies in this war both in men and money . But the question that arises in my mind is, whether, in order to send the necessary reinforcements to the front at this time, it is better to have coercion and compulsion in the form of this Military Service Bill, or whether it is better to follow the course declared for by the Prime Minister time and time again since the war broke out, and carry on voluntary enlistment. Hon. members who support this Bill tell us that voluntary enlistment has fallen down, and that we cannot raise the necessary reinforcements except by enacting this Military Service Bill and forcing men to go to the front. Yet when you follow the arguments you find that even those who declare that we must have this Military Service Bill because we need these reinforcements and need them now, invariably tell us that the Bill is not to be brought into effect except by Order in Council, as provided in the Bill itself. If this measure is left on the statute book and not brought into effect voluntary enlistment is killed. That means that we cannot get the men in any way. I say it would be far better to continue voluntary enlistment than place a coercive measure on the statute book which will not be effective, which will not even be enforced. I have just returned from a few days in my own constituency, and while there I received information of the most reliable kind that a member of the other Chamber, a strong supporter and appointee of this Government, was going through the length and breadth of the different counties of that province, absolutely assuring the people of those counties that this measure would not be brought into force. Now, if that statement is being made —and that it is being made I am assured by most reliable authority—and if the Government are not going to bring into effect the Military Service Bill, and bring it in at once, then, I say, the effect of passing it would be absolutely to put Canada out of this war. For voluntary enlistment is at a standstill, and if this Military Service Bill is to be made the law and yet not be brought into force, while you get no voluntary enlistment from any part of the country, you certainly cannot raise reinforcements under a law that is not in operation.

The Prime Minister on January 1, 1916, told the world that Canada would offer 500,000 men to assist the Allied Powers. No one found particular fault with that except that the statement was made by the right hon. gentleman on his own responsibility. In January of that year, when the House met, the right hon. gentleman made the statement that recruiting and voluntary enlistment were satisfactory, and that there would be no conscription and no compulsion. He reiterated that statement on different occasions, and last January he made the same statement at the opening of this House. The argument made by hon. gentlemen in supporting this measure is that the present pressing need at the present time of men influenced the Government in bringing down this Bill. It does seem rather singular that the number of men that the Prime Minister asks for in connection with this Bill coincides exactly with the number of men he said was required eighteen months ago. When the Prime Minister brought home the demand for more men two months ago, he had the same number of reinforcements in mind that he had eighteen months ago when he made the statement that Canada would supply 500,000 men.

I am in favour of voluntary enlistment. That has been followed up in the past. I have spent a good deal of time myself assisting in getting recruits in my own portion of New Brunswick, and I am glad to

say that the effort in my province has been very successful, indeed. Much has been said in regard to other sections of Canada, but I want to pay a tribute to my Acadian friends in Westmorland, New Brunswick, particularly for the manner in which they have enlisted. Westmorland, according to population, I believe, has given its full proportion of troops of both races. I went on public platforms and on tours holding open air meetings and inducing as far as I could, the young men of my own county to rally to the flag and do their part. I did not say to them: You should go. I left it to their consciences to decide as to how the matter appealed to them. I appealed to the upright, honest, intelligent young men of my county to determine for themselves whether they were going to wait for this coercive measure or whether they were going to volunteer. If recruiting were carried on in a proper manner, and if the matter were taken hold of in an intelligent way, and free from any political bias, I believe the young men of Canada would respond to the call and would put themselves on record in such a way that Canada would not be in danger of being told in future years that coercion had to be adopted to get the 500,000 men that were promised to the Allied Powers. It is my opinion, based on the information I have, that a splendid class of men would respond if the call were properly made by a united country and united parties.

I did not rise for the purpose of detaining the House at any length. I am convinced that a better, an easier and a more reasonable way to get men to go to the front and fill the gaps in the ranks would be to continue thoroughly and systematically the volunteer recruiting campaign. Many arguments have been used during this debate. There is nothing new left to bring to the attention of the House. Many things have been said in regard to the conscription of man power, the conscription of wealth, the conscription of resources and the levying of a tax on those who are best able to stand it for the purpose of carrying on this war. I am with those who have put themselves on record as being in favour of the wealth of this country bearing a large part of the financial burden of this war instead of handing it down to posterity by long term loans. Some hon. gentlemen have spoken of the United States coming into this war and have expressed the belief that probably the United States would furnish more men and that the demand upon Canada would not be so great. I am not in sympathy with that view of the situation. I think Canada should send every man she can irrespective of what our neighbours to the south of us do. The more they send and the more Canada sends the nearer will be the ending of this great struggle. But, I do not see very much difference between the Americans going over to fill up the gaps in the Canadian lines than the Government going to the United States and getting money to pay our boys for fighting at the front. We get that assistance from them and we work hand in hand for the betterment of our soldiers and the betterment of the country generally. I have always had a very strong feeling that the financial arrangements in connection with the support given to the dependents of soldiers have not been upon a proper basis. I have always frowned upon the idea that the dependents of soldiers who have gone to the front to protect our homes, our property and our lives, should be forced to look to charity for a part of their support. Times without number the wives and dependents of soldiers at the front have come to my office, making inquiries of me as to the money coming to them from the Patriotic Fund, and when I would explain to them where they had to go to obtain it they absolutely resented the idea of going around from pillar to post and asking for a sum of money from the Patriotic Fund. I never thought it was a proper way of giving assistance, and it looked like seeking for charity. Now that the referendum has been defeated, and the Bill now before the House must soon become the law of the country, if we are going to conscript the young men of Canada to go and fight our battles by compulsion, we should, at least, sweep away any thought or idea that their dependents must look to charity for support. It was all very well—I would not say it was very well, but it was different—under the voluntary enlistment. Every man knew what was expected of him, what pay, separation allowance and Patriotic Fund allowance would be coming to him and his family. After having all this information and knowledge, he placed himself before the country as a recruit, to go forward in defence of his flag and Empire. This situation did not apply to him so strongly, to my mind, as it applies to the Government to-day, when they are passing the Military Service Bill, and going to force men to go to the front. When a man leaves his employment, throws up a good job, perhaps, and goes to the front, his dependents should not be forced to throw

themselves upon charity for their support. The Government should provide funds for their support, before the man is forced to enlist. He should have definite assurance, not simply a statement from some one that the fund is doing wondrous things for the soldiers and dependents. If a man is sent to the front by force, the question of the support of his dependents should not be left to charity, or in the hands of any committee, or left topsy turvy, so that he would not know where the support of his wife, his widowed mother or family would come from. Therefore I move:

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If I had reference solely to section 54 of the British North America Act and rule 77 of this House, and, perhaps, to rule 40, as to the question of notice, I would feel disposed to rule the proposed amendment out of order. But in view of decisions which have heretofore been given in this House upon questions of a similar character, I have some doubt in my mind as to whether I would be justified in making strict application of the rules. I made reference to the doubt in my mind for the reason that I do not wish my decision in this instance to be regarded as a precedent, leaving it open to me to go into the subject more fully when I have better opportunity.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I hope my hon. friend will not regard me as wanting in respect for him if I do not dwell at any great length upon the observations with which he has favoured the House at four o'clock in the morning. Indeed, I think we would all have been very grateful to him if he had made an endeavour to express himself a little more concisely. I was not able to follow his argument in every respect. During one portion of his remarks, it seemed to be his conclusion that if this Bill should pass we shall not be able to get any more men, and I also understood his conclusion to be, that if this Bill does not pass we shall not be able to get any more men.

Mr. COPP: I said we would not get any more men under the voluntary enlistment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is the way my hon. friend's remarks impressed me.

[Mr. Copp.]

My hon. friend's amendment is obviously a purely dilatory motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Intended as such, and intended as nothing else; and I desire to say that the Government does not propose that any such dilatory amendment shall stand in the way of the second reading of this Bill. In order to relieve my hon. friend's mind, I may also assure him that the Bill will be put in force.

With respect to his observations as to the Patriotic Fund, let me make one or two very brief remarks. The gallant men who are fighting at the front for Canada to-day are as well provided for, in every respect, as any men who are now doing battle for the cause of civilization and humanity in the Allied armies. It is customary in all countries, not only in Canada but in Great Britain, in Australia, in every dominion in this Empire, and in the United States, to make provision for certain matters which are not usually dealt with by the Government of the country. A magnificent example was afforded to us only a few days ago when, in a single week's campaign the people of the United States, by voluntary contribution, laid aside $130,000,000 or thereabouts, for aid to their troops who were going to the front. We have done the same thing in this country, not only for our own men, but for the men of the Mother Country, the soldiers and the sailors who are fighting for the Empire. We raised, I do not know how many million dollars in Canada for the British Red Cross Fund. We raised pretty well up to a million dollars by voluntary contribution in this country for the sailors of the Empire who are maintaining their splendid vigil in the North Sea, and safeguarding the rights and the interests, not only of the Mother Country, but of the people of Canada, by their courage and sacrifice and by the toil and the hardship which they are enduring there. We have raised magnificent sums of money for the Canadian Red Cross Fund, for the War Contingent Association, for the Canadian Patriotic Fund.

There is no charity associated or connected with the Canadian Patriotic Fund. That Fund is an organization established for a national purpose by an Act of this Parliament to which my hon. friend himself gave his assent, which passed this House without question, and which has the endorsement and sanction of the people.

We have done many other things, Mr. Speaker. We have raised large sums of money for the relief of the people of devastated Belgium. We have aided the people of Serbia. In every possible way by voluntary contribution the people have done their full share, and I am thankful for it; it has been a blessing not only to those for whose benefit these sums were raised, but also to those who made the contributions.

When my hon. friend, therefore, at this hour attempts to delay indefinitely the passage of this Bill by a motion purely of a dilatory character, and intended as such, and seeks to bring the Canadian Patriotic Fund into discredit before the people of Canada and of the Empire, I say that I have no sympathy either with his motion or his motive, and without any hesitation whatever I declare to this House that the Government cannot accept it.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I am more than astonished to hear the Prime Minister——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. OLIVER: I am more than astonished to hear the Prime Minister declare that a motion which affects the welfare and the interests of those who are dependent upon our soldiers who are fighting at the front——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER: —is a dilatory motion——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER: —and one that should not be considered by this House. I should like to take this opportunity, even at this late hour in the morning——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: —of saying that if the Prime Minister cannot agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Copp) who has just spoken, neither can I agree with the Prime Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. OLIVER: We have had experience in matters affecting the war and the support of those who are carrying on the war which leads some of us to the conclusion that some of the things that have been done in the past have not been well done, or, if they have been well done, should have been done better. In this the third year of the war, it is high time that we should see that the things which particularly concern those whom we honour so highly, those of whom we speak as our boys in the trenches—

An hon. MEMBER: And that you do not want to help.

Mr. OLIVER: That we do not want to help?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER: That we do not want to help? The Prime Minister and the men behind him are using their authority and their majority in this House to prevent their being assisted.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, it is not only the men who are prevented from being helped; it is their wives and their children—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER—their mothers and their sisters, who are not to receive the attention of the House or of this Government, because it is four o'clock in the morning.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: The Prime Minister has told us that the dependents of our men are getting as good treatment as the dependents of the soldiers of any of the Allied nations—or did he say that their treatment was better? It does not concern me what treatment other countries give their men or the dependents of those men; I am not responsible for that. But

4 a.m. I am responsible as a member of this House for the treatment that this country gives our soldiers and their dependents, and that responsibility, with all due deference to my right hon. friend and those who sit behind him, I propose to discharge on this occasion.

Mr. EDWARDS: How about royalties on coal mines?

Mr. OLIVER: Did I hear my hon. friend make a remark with regard to riots in coal mines?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Royalties.

An hon. MEMBER: Or singing God Save the King.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask hon. members to bear in mind that this is a deliberate assembly.

Mr. OLIVER: In reply to the interjection made by my hon. friend, may I say that a Government which undertakes to settle disputes in coal mines by sending out a partisan supporter of the Government as representative of some of the men concerned is not taking proper means to settle those strikes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask the hon. member—

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not say "riots," I said "royalties."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask the hon. member to adhere more closely to the subject under discussion. His last remarks had no bearing upon the question before the House.

Mr. OLIVER: Certainly not; neither did the interruption.

Mr. SPEAKER: There was no possible opportunity of my preventing the interruption.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Warn the hon. gentleman against a repetition of it.

Mr. OLIVER: Let us understand what we are doing for our soldiers and for their dependents. We have been told how much we owe the soldiers. If we do owe the soldiers much, we do owe their dependents support at the cost of this country.

An hon. MEMBER: You owe the soldiers support, too.

Mr. SPEAKER: If an hon. gentleman wishes to address the House, he must do the House the courtesy of rising in his place.

An hon. MEMBER: They do not know what courtesy means.

Mr. OLIVER: What are we doing for the dependents of our soldiers? Are we providing for them a decent support at the cost of this country?

Mr. J. A. M. ARMSTRONG: How about God Save the King?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: Put him out.

Mr. OLIVER: I have here an announcement contained in the Bulletin of the Patriotic Fund of the date of February, 1916. It is headed, "A Message to the Canadian Soldier's Wife," and it says, in part:

> When the war broke out and our brave men came forward to enlist it was felt that there might be some, among those left behind, who would not be sufficiently provided for by the government grants. Men who could not enlist, but who desired to help, felt called upon to step into the breach, and are endeavouring to make good to the soldier's wife the difference between what the Government gives her, and the amount needed to enable her to live in decency and comfort.

That Sir is an indictment against the Government and the people of Canada by the Patriotic Fund in its official organ. For my part, I do not wish to be responsible for the condition that enables that indictment to be made, and at this time and on this occasion when, as my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) has said, we are going to put our hand upon the shoulders of our young men and compel them to serve us at the front, surely the same theory of conscription should apply to the money of the country sufficiently to provide for the dependents of those men so that they shall not have to rely upon the passing of the hat, the appeals to benevolence, to charity, to meet the needs of those whom they have left behind. Is that the stimulus to patriotism that we, the people of Canada, offer to our soldiers? Is it any wonder that voluntary enlistment in this country has decreased when we offer to our soldiers the proposal that we shall collect money as charity and dispense it as charity—

An hon. MEMBER: No such a thing.

Mr. OLIVER—to make up the difference between what the Government gives to the soldier's wife and the amount needed to enable her to live in decency and comfort. Do we or do we not owe to the soldier and to his wife the amount that will enable her to live in decency and comfort as a return in some measure for the service that the soldier renders to us? This document goes on to say:

> From time to time the management of the Patriotic Fund is urged to reduce the scale of payment. This we have hitherto been unwilling to do. Some revision has, it is true, been recently recommended whereby certain classes of families are dropped from the Fund.

What does that mean? It means that the families of the men who have enlisted in good faith to serve this country and who have left their families behind them, expecting that those families would receive certain support, have been dropped from the fund. The faith that was made with that soldier when he went to the front has been broken, and yet we wonder that other men do not come forward and enlist on the same terms. When life and honour are at stake, then there surely must be no breach of faith between the country and

the soldiers. It is discreditable enough that we should proclaim to the world that we are either unable or unwilling to provide for the dependents of our soldiers so that they may live in decency and comfort, but we go further than that, we insult them with instructions and advice. Here is a sample:

When, on the first of April, the Government decided that assigned pay, to the extent of at least $15 per month should be compulsory and that every woman receiving separation allowance should, in addition, receive at least $15 per month of her husband's or son's pay, there were many that thought that the Patriotic fund should reduce its assistance accordingly. This course may even yet be adopted. It really depends upon the soldier's wife, as to whether it shall be or not.

They say to the soldier's wife:

If you make good use of your money, you lessen the likelihood of such a revision being made. A woman's first duty when, after being a while on the Patriotic fund she finds herself less pressed financially than she was before, is to pay her husband's just debts by means of the money that comes from him as assigned pay. When this has been done, she is justified in using this same monthly allowance to adequately furnish the home and to properly clothe herself and the children.

That is how Canada is treating her soldiers at the front and their dependents. I hope the Government and their supporters are proud of the position they have taken to-night, as voiced by the Prime Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: I say, I hope they are proud.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: But I must say that if they are, I am very much ashamed of them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member, when he says he is ashamed of the position taken by the Government on this question, is surely exceeding the rules of debate.

Mr. OLIVER: I certainly wish to apologize to the House and to the Government and to withdraw the remark. I have no wish to infringe on the rules of debate, but sometimes it is difficult not to express one's feelings. I notice in the Canadian Patriotic Fund Bulletin for September, 1916, the following:

The fund pays only in case of need. There are about 105,000 families drawing separation allowance, but of these only 60,000 are on the Fund. The average of payments to these 60,000 families is $192 a year. If the Government administered the Fund and paid $192 to every family, the cost over present system would be $8,640,000 yearly. And every dollar of this would go to people who are really not in need of it.

A soldier's wife may receive half of her husband's monthly pay, say $15; she receives $20 of a separation allowance, or a total of $35. She may or she may not receive from the Patriotic Fund an allowance which may amount to anywhere from five to twenty-five dollars. What is the position of this country, of this Parliament, of this Government, towards the soldier when it tells his wife that out of this immense sum, after she has provided for everything else, she may properly clothe herself and her children. At the present time the Labour Gazette gives the cost of food per family in this country at something over $11 per week.

I ask you how much this woman is going to have to clothe herself and her family out of $45 or $50 a month, when she has to pay that amount for the food they eat. The Finance Minister has told us in the House how the cost of living has increased of recent years. We have been compelled to vote money to increase the salaries of civil servants, and there is a demand for increased wages all over the country. The coal strike in the West is because of the increased cost of living. But our soldiers are getting the same allowance to-day that they got in 1914; the Patriotic Fund allowance has been cut down instead of being increased, and yet we are enthusiastic about what we have done for our soldiers! We have done, the Premier says, as well, or better, than the people of any other country. Well, I am one of the citizens of this country who say that we have not done what we should have done. Whatever may have been the case in the past, when we are undertaking to compel men to serve us at the front, that is the time when we must take steps to see that those who are dependent upon the soldiers at the front shall not be stinted, and shall not be dependent upon charity. That is the time to place the maintenance of dependents of our soldiers upon the substantial footing of the Dominion treasury, and at a rate that shall give a decent living to those dependents without the intervention of charity.

Sir HERBERT AMES: My hon. friend has been quoting from documents that are from one to two years old. He is absolutely incorrect when he says the Patriotic Fund has been cutting down the allowance to the soldier's wife. If he had not had this speech

in pickle for a year or more he would have known that we have been increasing the rates steadily to correspond with the advance in the cost of living.

Mr. OLIVER: To correct the hon. member, I may say that part of what I read was from the Bulletin of September, 1916.

Mr. J. P. MOLLOY (Provencher): In rising to address the House, I want to assure the leader of the Government and every hon. member of this House that I am taking part in this discussion with no intention whatever of delaying the measure now before us. I am not here to oppose the Government because they think they are right, but I am here to oppose the Government and anybody else if I think that I am right, and if anything I may say in the few remarks I have to address to the House will help the Government to assist our soldiers, my time will be well spent. If we are to have compulsion in this country I take the ground that we are compelled to provide properly for the soldier wherever he may be.

The present Government is taking upon itself the most tremendous responsibility ever shouldered by any Administration of this Dominion. It is asking from Parliament permission to take the men of the country from their employment, their homes, and their families and to place them on the battle front. It is taking the responsibility of forcing men to make the greatest sacrifice men can make. From present indications the Government has no intention of attempting to equalize that sacrifice by forcing those who will not be affected, and whose wealth the men who go are protecting, to give of their means while other men give their lives. The question of the conscription of wealth, however, I do not intend to discuss here. But I say this, Mr. Speaker, and I say it with the greatest sincerity, that the Government which takes upon itself the tremendous responsibility of sending men to the front must see to it that the wives and children, and dependents of these men are left in such circumstances as not to add to the horrors of the trenches the anxiety which must come from the feeling that their dear ones are in want. That duty is plain, and cannot be evaded.

It is a notorious fact that separation allowances, and assigned pay, which at the beginning of this war may have been adequate to keep the dependents of soldiers from penury and want, are to-day absolutely inadequate, and must be supplemented by certain forms of what I choose to call charity. The pay of the soldier, and the amount of money he is able to leave his dependents is the same as it was when the war broke out. The separation allowance is the same. But the cost of living has more than doubled, thanks to the exploitation and manipulation of the prices of the necessities of life, permitted, and condoned by the present Administration since the war commenced. The soldier's wife has watched her meagre pittance dwindling day by day as the cost of the necessities of life has soared. She has been compelled to ration herself and her family as her husband at the front is rationed, but on a far less generous scale. She is often compelled to move from the neighbourhood in which she has resided beside her more fortunate neighbours whose husbands or sons have not gone, and to take up her residence in more humble quarters. Materially and socially she suffers.

Under the Government's present system of financing the war, by borrowing and letting wealth go free, the soldier who goes to the front will find when he returns, if he does return, that to the sacrifices and hardships which he has endured in the trenches will be added the hardship and burden of paying by taxation the interest on the debt incurred by the war. He has had to fight; he will have to pay. Probably he will not grumble. But for the present at least it is incumbent upon this Government and this country to see to it that while he is away his dependents are looked after.

I wish to bring before the House one particular case. In the town in which I live a platoon was raised last year. Every man, woman and child, even the little boys at school and on the street assisted in recruiting the men required. I myself materially assisted, and when I ask a man to enlist, and he does so, I feel that I have assumed a responsibility. These men left on the 2nd day of last November, and a short time afterwards they were in the trenches. Among the great many men who went from the county of Provencher with that platoon was the only son of a man who is now between 70 and 80 years of age. The boy's mother died many years ago. The boy's poor old father is a confirmed cripple and has no means whatever. He was officially notified on the 31st of March that his son had been seriously wounded. What do you think, Sir, that poor old man has been living on since his boy went away? He has been living on the assigned pay of his boy

who went to fight your battle and mine many, many miles away from home. Getting on the train about the middle of last month, a man came to me and said that So-and-So had lost his left arm and his right eye. And the poor old father of that boy, that boy who has made such a sacrifice for the country, is left to live on $15 a month.

It is late in the morning, but it is not too late for this country and this Parliament to be told that there is at least one case of this kind. When the session opened in January last, I took up that case. I wrote a letter, as strong as I could write it, to the Assigned Pay and Separation Branch. I got a courteous reply, stating that no provision had been made for such cases. When I came back I took it up again. I called up Major Ingalls, a perfect gentleman, who treated me with all kindness. I stated the case over the telephone. He asked me to write him a letter and send it by special messenger. I said: "I will write the letter and carry it down myself." And I did. He went into the case as well as he could, calling in the gentleman who had charge of that department and discussing it with him. They told me there was no provision for a case of that kind. In discussing the matter, I found that there were only two fathers in this country who were drawing separation allowance. I say, it is not too late in the morning to discuss a matter of that kind, and to call attention to the case of this poor old cripple, who would starve to death if it were not for the charity of his neighbours in the district in which he lives, while this country stands by and, so far as Parliament is concerned, does nothing for him. I was advised to take up this case with the Patriotic Fund in Winnipeg, and I wrote to the secretary. I said, just as I have said here, that I would write a letter and carry it myself. I wish to thank the representatives of the Patriotic Fund in Winnipeg from my place here in Parliament for the way in which they treated me. I found there two gentlemen of the highest character who made inquiry into the matter, and the result was that that Patriotic Fund granted that poor old man $10 a month. That is not the way for this Government, or for the men who form a government in this free country, to treat the father of a boy who has offered his life in defence of the country and who, though living, has lost one arm and one eye and has had his face torn in pieces by shell fire.

I do not want to criticise the Government in these matters, I want to help them. Such contributions as were made in these cases are regulated according to the judgment of a committee who claim the privilege of digging into affairs of the families and dependents of our soldiers. This gives such aids all the features of charity —which is most objectionable to a proud people such as we have in Canada. Many instances are on record where the dependents of soldiers are too proud to admit that they are deriving their substance from the charity of the public, and as a result refuse to be helped in this way. Why should the element of public charity enter at all into the method of looking after dependents of our brave men who are prepared to give up their lives for such a cause as our country is fighting for? The Patriotic Fund, in my judgment, should be paid into the treasury of the country and all aids given should issue therefrom, rather than have it placed in the hands of a committee, the members of which, in many cases, are most objectionable to our soldiers and their dependents. Is it fair that a member of a Patriotic Fund Committee should have the right to go into the homes of our soldiers and demand an accounting of how moneys are being expended and what are the sources of revenue of such families?—a privilege which no one would dare exercise with the humblest citizen in our country. Remove this entirely by providing for the soldier's dependents out of the treasury of our country in generous manner worthy of the great sacrifice made not only by the boys but by the wives, sons and daughters, the fathers and mothers, who are giving up so much for the cause. The separation allowance given by the country should be increased, and should bear a direct proportion to the number depending for support on the soldier. This amount should be paid every month to the proper person, and such amount should not depend in any way on the amount assigned by the soldier. If we are undertaking to care for those dependent on our soldiers we should do so in such a way as to entirely remove from our gallant boys' minds any anxiety about their families comfort. Voluntary recruiting would receive such a stimulus from such a policy, as, in my judgment, would entirely remove the necessity for any such legislation as is before the House to-night.

When we look around us and see the wages enjoyed by our labouring men in

munition factories and reflect on the fact that our soldiers who go forth to risk their lives to defend our country are only paid $1.10 a day and their families receive the munificient sum of $20 a month, is it any wonder that recruiting is not as lively as we would like? Is it not discouraging to the proud, warm-hearted young man to realize that if he goes forth to fight for his country, that his family may suffer from want or may be driven to the necessity of appealing to the generosity of a local Patriotic Fund Committee, the members of which, perhaps, are too small-souled to appreciate their wants, or perhaps instead of coming to their assistance will rather attempt to lecture them on domestic economy.

Dependents of soldiers should be properly provided for by the Government. First, because it puts the matter on the footing of a public duty. At present it is a system of private doles, which is humiliating to the recipients because it makes them objects of charity, where they should be pensioners of the Dominion treasury. The money paid to the dependents of soldiers fighting for the security of life and property in Canada must not be considered anything but a merited return for the services and the sacrifices the menfolk are making for the common weal. Second, the Patriotic Fund as at present administered is the subject of much complaint, on account of the inquisitorial nature of its proceedings.

I do not intend to go into the question of conscription. I have my opinion but I am going to set forth my opinion by my vote. But I might as well say that I believe that had there been a little more judgment and a little more care on the part of the Government in the many many instances that have come before them no doubt, and in which the claims made have been set aside, there would have been less of a feeling that the demands of justice had been left unfulfilled. There are many other reasons, I can tell the Government, why enlistments have dropped off in Manitoba, and there are other members of the House from that province who could back up what I say. And let me say to the Prime Minister, that he will find, when the men come back of whom he has spoken, that there is a strong belief that some of the public appointments he has made are not to the credit of the Government and were not made in the interests of the country.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. Copp which was declared lost on the following division:

[Mr. Molloy.]

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Achim,	Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),
Barrette,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bellemare,	Lemieux,
Bickerdike,	MacNutt,
Boivin,	McCoig,
Bourassa,	McCrea,
Boyer,	McMillan,
Brouillard,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Bureau,	Marcile (Bagot),
Cardin,	Martin,
Chisholm,	Michaud,
Copp,	Molloy,
Deslisle,	Mondou,
Demers,	Murphy,
Devlin,	Oliver,
Ethier,	Pacaud,
Fortier,	Papineau,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Power,
Gauvreau,	Proulx,
German,	Robb,
Guilbault,	Seguin,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Sinclair,
Kay,	Tobin,
Kyte,	Truax,
Lachance,	Turgeon,
Lafortune,	Turriff,
Lanctot,	Verville,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Wilson (Laval).—56.

NAYS.

Messieurs:

Alguire,	Knowles,
Ames (Sir Herbert),	Lalor,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Lewis,
Armstrong (York, O.),	Loggie,
Arthurs,	Macdonell,
Ball,	Maclean (Halifax),
Barnard,	Maclean (York, O.),
Bennett (Calgary),	McCraney,
Bennett (Simcoe),	McCurdy,
Best,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Blain,	McLean (Sunbury),
Blondin,	McLeod,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Marshall,
Boulay,	Meighen,
Bowman,	Merner,
Boyce,	Middlebro,
Boys,	Morphy,
Brabazon,	Morris,
Bradbury,	Morrison,
Buchanan,	Munson,
Burnham,	Nesbitt,
Burrell,	Neely,
Carvell,	Nicholson,
Champagne,	Nickle,
Charlton,	Northrup,
Clark (Bruce),	Osler (Sir Edmund),
Clark (Red Deer),	Paquet,
Clarke (Wellington),	Pardee,
Clements,	Patenaude,
Cochrane,	Paul,
Cockshutt,	Rainville,
Cromwell,	Reid,
Crothers,	Robidoux,
Cruise,	Roche,
Currie,	Rogers,
Davidson,	Schaffner,
Descarries,	Scott,
Doherty,	Sevigny,
Donaldson,	Sexsmith,
Douglas,	Shepherd,
Edwards,	

Elliot,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Foster (Sir George),
Fripp,
Girard,
Glass,
Green,
Guthrie,
Hanna,
Hartt,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Jameson,
Kemp,
Smith,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thoburn,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Walker,
Wallace,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Sir Thomas),
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wright.—115.

The House divided on the motion of Sir Robert Borden for the second reading of Bill No. 75, the Military Service Act, 1917, which was declared carried on the following division:

YEAS.

Messieurs

Alguire,
Ames (sir Herbert),
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Ball,
Barnard,
Bennett (Calgary),
Bennett (Simcoe),
Best,
Blain,
Blondin,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Carvell,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Cromwell,
Crothers,
Cruise,
Currie,
Davidson,
Doherty,
Donaldson,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Fisher,
Foster (Sir George),
Fripp,
German,
Glass,
Graham,
Green,
Guthrie,
Hanna,
Hartt,
Hazen,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Halifax),
Maclean (York,O.),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
McCurdy,
McLean (Queens ,P.E.I.),
McLean (Sunbury),
McLeod,
McMillan,
Marshall,
Meighen,
Merner,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Morris,
Morrison,
Munson,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Pardee,
Paul,
Rainville,
Reid,
Robidoux,
Roche,
Rogers,
Ross,
Schaffner,
Scott,
Sevigny,
Sexsmith,
Shepherd,
Sinclair,
Smith,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thoburn,
Thompson (Yukon),
Thomson, (Qu'appelle),
Thornton,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Jameson,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Lalor,
Lewis,
Loggie,
Truax,
Turriff,
Walker,
Wallace,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Sir Thomas),
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wright.—118.

NAYS.

Messieurs

Achim,
Barrette,
Bellemare,
Bickerdike,
Boivin,
Boulay,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Brouillard,
Bureau,
Cardin,
Chisholm,
Copp,
Delisle,
Demers,
Descarries,
Devlin,
Ethier,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fortier,
Gauthier, (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Guilbault,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Kay,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lafortune,
Lanctot,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Lapointe (Montreal, St. James),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lemieux,
McCrea,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin,
Michaud,
Molloy,
Mondou,
Murphy,
Oliver,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Paquet,
Patenaude,
Power,
Proulx,
Robb,
Seguin,
Tobin,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Wilson (Laval).—55.

Pairs on motion for second reading of Military Service Bill:

D. D. McKenzie,	Dugald Stewart,
W. Carroll,	H. B. Tremaine,
Wm. Pugsley,	J. J. Carrick.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden for the adjournment of the House:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What business shall we take up this afternoon?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will go into committee on this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5.07 a.m. Friday.

Friday, July 6, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

PRIVILEGE—MR. LAFORTUNE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I see in this morning's Ottawa Journal-Press:

Wild Talk from Lafortune.

Mr. D. A Lafortune, of Montcalm, declared that Canada owed nothing to England, and it was England who must defend the finest colony of the Empire. He added: "Never will we spend one cent for the Laurier navy before consulting the people."

I declare that I never used that language. I repeated yesterday what the late Mr. F. D. Monk had declared in this House and outside of it. I repeat, I never used that language, but the very man who used that language was a member of this Government. That is what I said. If the reporter of the Journal-Press is here I suppose he will be gentleman enough to make the correction and to report what I said correctly, adding that it was Mr. Monk, the late minister in this very same Cabinet, who used that language, and not the member for Montcalm.

MINERS' STRIKE IN THE YUKON.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Some days ago, when I read to the House certain telegrams from parties in the Yukon the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) was good enough to say that he would make inquiries in regard to the matter and give the House the benefit of the information received at a later date. I would like to know if he has the information?

Mr. CROTHERS: The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Thompson) received, yesterday, a message from the Administrator of the Yukon in these words:—

Am glad advise you that after repeated conferences between the Manager Yukon Gold Company, the striking employees and myself, an adjustment satisfactory both employer and employees has been reached and the men have practically all returned to work. The strikers were the four dollar per day men. They demanded an advance of one dollar but compromised for fifty cents.

Williams.

I forwarded to the Administrator of the Yukon a copy of the telegram which my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) read to the House a few days ago, and asked him to let me have his answer to the allegations contained in that message. I have not yet received any reply from him, but I probably will this afternoon. I am expecting at any moment to get his reply.

SECOND READING.

SUPPLY BILL.

Bill No. 108, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service ending 31st March, 1918.—Sir Thomas White—read the second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

CONSIDERATION OF THE BILL IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE.

House again in committee on Bill No. 75, respecting Military Service.—Sir Robert Borden, Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Before taking up the first clause, I would like to have the permission of the committee to refer for a moment to some observations made by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), in regard to slowing up on recruiting. My hon. friend, on the 19th June last, in the debate upon this measure, said this:—

The leader of the Government on more than one occasion—take the very day when Mr. McDougall was present, the leader of the Government asked me again if I could not let up on recruiting—

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is the right hon. gentleman referring to me?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I have not heard one word yet. I would like to hear it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was referring to these observations of my hon. friend on the 19th June, 1917.

Sir Sam Hughes: The leader of the Government on more than one occasion—take the very day when Mr. McDougall was present, the leader of the Government asked me again if I could not let up on recruiting; and, moreover, the right hon. leader of the Government later on pointed out—if he wants the whole story I will be glad to give it—pointed out that there was a tremendous agitation in Toronto over the subject, that he had had various communications from Toronto, that the Finance Minister had told him there was a perfect storm brewing there, and that agitation was due to the fact that men could not be obtained as workers.

Further on, the hon. member for Pictou interposed as follows:

Mr. Macdonald: Speaking at Lindsay, Ontario, on April 28, regarding the conditions of which he spoke and the agitation, the hon. gentleman said:

"This 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 has been dead in Canada for fighting purposes."

Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the statement made by him in Lindsay is quite correct?

Sir Sam Hughes: I am quite surprised at the hon. gentleman asking any such question. That speech is issued by myself, and I am not in the habit of issuing statements that I do not endorse. I will prove it before I have finished.

I desire to take the strongest possible exception to the statement of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence, so far as it referred to me, and to repeat what I said in this House, on the 29th day of January last. I shall quote and I now repeat that portion of my statement then made, which is relevant:

I desire to assure the House and the country that neither to the Ontario Recruiting Committee on the occasion mentioned nor to any other organization or individual on any other occasion, did I ever give any such intimation as that suggested, or anything that could be tortured into such an intimation.

In connection with the whole subject, I think it is desirable to point out that on the 17th of January, 1916, in the debate upon the address, I used this language:

I realize that 500,000 men is a large force for us to undertake in Canada; and I realize further that the national strength of Canada must be maintained, and that in proceeding with our effort to increase our forces in Canada we must have regard to the necessities of the agricultural and industrial interests of this country. Canada, in all the elements of her national life, must be kept strong, and we shall have regard to those considerations.

The subject was also alluded to during the present session, when on the 1st day of February, 1917, in reply to my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I spoke as follows:

The recruiting proceeded with a great deal of vigour and earnestness, and the fact that we succeeded in the first three and a half months of the past year in recruiting a hundred thousand men or more is an indication that the work was carried on with a good deal of vigour and with a great deal of success. The criticism has been made that proper regard to selection was not made. I discussed that question with the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence more than a year ago—I think in the autumn of 1915 for the first time. The course which my colleague took in that regard was that he did not think at that time that any more systematic method was necessary, and he said that it would be possible, through instructions given to his recruiting officers, to prevent unwise selection, selection which might result in the closing up of industries essential for the prosecution of the war, when recruits might have been obtained from other classes whose work and service were not so essential. I was informed by General Hughes that instructions had been given in various instances to adopt methods which would give some system to that purpose.

Mr. Oliver: About what time was that?

Sir Robert Borden: I think it was in the autumn of 1915 or early in 1916.

Sir Sam Hughes: Early in 1916.

And then, a little later on in the debate, my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence gave some illustrations of cases in which he had acted upon that principle, and he alluded again to his interview with Mr. McDougall, of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not to my interview, but to the right hon. the Prime Minister's interview. I was present.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, and the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) was present also. I may say that I have received from Mr. McDougall, without any request on my part, a statement of his recollection of what took place at that interview. It corresponds with my own, and he most emphatically declares that there was not any suggestion on my part at that interview that recruiting should be slowed up, but merely that we should endeavour to prevent unwise selection. That is to say, instead of endeavouring to enlist men who presumably might be of more service to the country in the occupations in which they were then engaged than if they enlisted for service at the front, the activities of recruiting officers should be directed to those whose services at home were not valuable to the same extent to the country.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the Prime Minister the date of Mr. McDougall's interview with him?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really do not remember the date. It may be in Mr. McDougall's letter. I shall send a copy of it to my hon. friend. It is not necessary that I should read it now.

Indeed, the course which I was endeavouring to carry out—and I think with the concurrence of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes)—was based on precisely the same principle as the Bill which is now under discussion; that is to say, to endeavour to have each man give to the State the best service of which he was capable; not to send to the front men who were of more service to the State in the occupations in which they were engaged, but rather to direct recruiting among those who were not capable of performing service at home of the same value.

I should like to say that my attitude with regard to recruiting is very well set forth in a letter which I wrote to Colonel Mulloy of Kingston, who was President of the Eastern Ontario Recruiting Association. I give this letter because I repeated practically the same thing to another delegation on the 10th of May, 1916.

Ottawa, Ont.,
29th September, 1915.

Dear Professor Mulloy,—

I expressed in Toronto my appreciation of those who have given help in recruiting at various meetings throughout the country. For your

personal and confidential information, I may say that the Chief of the General Staff reports that we are hardly able to keep pace with the organization and equipment of recruits now being enlisted in various parts of the country. That, however, is no reason why any effort should be relaxed, and we hope that all efforts hitherto made will be continued, as later on the needs may be greater than the response then forthcoming.

On Saturday, Monday and Tuesday I saw, in all, some twenty thousand men who have enlisted and who are in training for overseas service. Their physique, their spirit and their bearing were all that could be desired. Their training seems also to have proceeded very satisfactorily.

Faithfully yours,
(Sgd.) R. L. Borden.

On the 10th of the following May, (this letter was written in the September preceding) a delegation, I think of the National Service League of Canada, an organization which had devoted its efforts to assist and promote recruiting, came to see me in Ottawa, and I repeated to them substantially the view which I had expressed in the letter to Colonel Mulloy, and I have a statement from one gentleman present at that interview confirming my recollection of what took place at that time.

It would not, therefore, be possible that I could have directed my hon. friend in the previous March to slow up recruiting. Doubtless he made the statement in good faith; I am not imputing any blame to him in that respect.

With respect to certain correspondence which has been referred to by the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence, the letter dated June 9, 1916 and the reply to it were marked confidential. I wrote to my hon. friend saying that I did not think it proper to read my letter without reading his reply which was marked confidential; and asking if he would give me permission to read it. He was good enough to say at once that he had not the slightest objection to my reading his letter. The two letters are as follows:

Ottawa, Ont., June 9, 1916.
Confidential.

Dear General Hughes,

The question of raising new regiments was not only discussed in Council but in the House of Commons and general approval was given to the proposal that as far as possible units already authorized should be completed before authority was given for new regiments. There was special criticism of a policy by which half a dozen regiments are being recruited at the same time in one community.

It is remarkable that General Hodgins did not communicate to you the policy which I announced to the Militia Council early in May; and that on the other hand he gave me no intimation whatever that you were authorizing new regiments from time to time in ignorance of what I had declared.

The situation is so embarassing that I am passing an Order in Council to-day to remedy it for the future.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd) R. L. Borden.

To which the ex-minister replied on June 27, 1916, as follows:

On C.P.R. train going west, June 27, 1916.
Confidential.

Re new Battalions.

Dear Sir Robert,

Yours of June 9th just came before me on my trip west. I am very much surprised at the letter and its contents.

I did not know of the discussion in Council or in the House of Commons, but you will permit me to differ entirely from the conclusions arrived at. I know of no one community where half a dozen different regiments are being recruited at the same time, but it appears certain that the gentlemen who have been doing the criticising have no conception of how recruiting should be carried on. It is absolutely necessary, in large centres, that two or three regiments should be going on at the same time, each appealing to a different community.

I have been pursuing the policy of recruiting which has been unsurpassed in history, without friction excepting from selfish agitators each looking at his own personal ends, rather than the needs of the Empire.

I do not know what your Order in Council may be like but I certainly think I was entitled to see a copy thereof before it was passed.

This, therefore, accounts for the great falling off in recruiting.

However, I will speak to you about the matter the first time I see you.

Faithfully,
(Sgd) Sam Hughes.

The Order in Council to which allusion is there made has already been laid upon the Table, but it may be desirable that I should read it to the committee. An Order in Council was passed on January 12, 1916, by which the total authorized military forces of Canada were increased to 500,000 men. The Order in Council of June 10, 1916 is as follows:

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report by the Prime Minister, dated the 8th January, 1916, with respect to the steps which have been taken under the Order in Council (P.C. 36) approved 12th January, 1916, copy of which is attached, by which authority was granted for increasing the Canadian Expeditionary Forces to five hundred thousand officers and men, including those raised for garrison and guard duties in Canada.

The Prime Minister observes that it is expedient that the steps taken from time to time to raise the forces authorized by the said Order in Council, should be brought to the attention of the Advisers of Your Royal Highness in each instance and that this can most conveniently be accomplished by providing that such units as are to be raised in the future must first be authorized by Your Royal Highness in Council.

The Prime Minister therefore recommends that before any further units of the force, or any special units asked for by the war office shall be authorized, or authority given for raising the same, authority shall be obtained from Your Royal Highness in Council for that purpose.

The Committee concur in the foregoing and submit the same for approval.

In that connection I should mention that during part of April, the whole of May and June and the early part of July, 1916, I was administering the Department of Militia and Defence, under circumstances which are familiar to the Committee. I presided at meetings of the Militia Council during each of those months—on the 19th, 27th and 29th of April; the 8th, 16th and 19th of May, the 2nd of June and the 6th of July. I learned at one of those meetings—I cannot recall which one—that a number of battalions had been authorized by the then Minister of Militia and Defence while I was administering the Department. I am not attributing blame to my hon. friend in that respect; I have no doubt he may have considered that he was acting within his rights. I merely mention the fact to show what took place and to explain the reason for the passing of this Order in Council. In order that I may make that perfectly plain, I will quote a criticism made by the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) on May 8, 1916. This criticism was in line with a number of communications which had come to me from different parts of the country complaining that in certain localities altogether too many battalions were being recruited at the same time. The member for Edmonton said:

I know there was recruiting for a regiment to be known as the Bantams of Vancouver, at Edmonton. They may have ceased their operations at Edmonton now. This fact demonstrates that no discrimination whatever is used in the securing of recruits, in the way of having regard to the requirements of civil life; that the department simply goes after recruits whenever and wherever it can get them, without regard to any other circumstance. And more than that, the fact that so many units are being recruited in the same place at the same time tends against the success of the work. There is instituted a spirit of competition between the different officers who are engaged in recruiting that does not tend to success. I admit that probably to have two battalions recruiting at the same time and in the same place may give a healthy measure of competition; but when more than two are recruited it certainly is injurious rather than beneficial.

To which I replied:

My hon. friend no doubt has in mind that these regiments are recruited, I suppose, from a considerable district around Edmonton. I remember one which went through not long ago whose members had come to a considerable extent from the Peace River country. There has been an endeavour in some cases at least, to my certain knowledge, to adjust the recruiting to the requirements of local conditions. I cannot recall that any representations ever came to my attention concerning Edmonton, but I do recall other cases; and in those cases an endeavour was made by the department to meet local conditions through the guidance of recruiting officers.

That is the policy to which I have already referred and which has been repeatedly referred to in the House during the last as well as during the present session.

During the period between April 6 and June 6, both inclusive, when I was administering the department, the ex-Minister of Militia authorized eleven new battalions in all. Through some misunderstanding I was not advised of the fact that these battalions were being authorized, and that explains completely the reason why the Order in Council of June 10 was passed—in order that we might have some check upon the authorization of battalions and in order that too great a number might not be recruited at one time in the same locality. I think that the extent to which the raising of battalions in the same locality was authorized is greater than the ex-Minister of Militia himself realized.

I have procured from the Adjutant-General a statement showing the number of battalions recruiting at any one time in various cities and towns in different parts of the country. It would appear that for a certain period about sixteen battalions were authorized to recruit in Toronto.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the Prime Minister give me the dates?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will send to my hon. friend a copy of the statement which has been handed to me by an officer of the department.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I should have been pleased to have had it in advance, but that does not matter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are several other illustrations of the same character, where half a dozen battalions or more were being recruited in one locality at the same time. The Order in Council of the 10th June, 1916, was designed merely for the purpose of having fuller consideration given to the number of battalions that should be recruited at one time in one place. I do not think there is anything further that I need to say on the subject at the moment. I will also send to my hon.

friend Mr. McDougall's letter to which I have already alluded, and with which I do not think it is necessary for me to trouble the House at present.

There is one other matter which I think I ought to communicate to the House, and it might be convenient to do so now.

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the Prime Minister kindly explain how he believes that the ex-Minister of Militia could have been acting bona fide in thinking he was within his rights in authorizing the raising of battalions, when the Prime Minister was administering the department?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am hardly in a position to be cross-examined by my hon. friend as to how I form my opinions. I have stated them and they are quite sincere.

Mr. KNOWLES: How could they be?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have already, in speaking upon this Bill, explained to hon. gentlemen that the number of casualties during the past year has, in my judgment, indicated the imperative necessity of obtaining an adequate supply of reinforcements with the least possible delay. The figures, however, that I have already given to the House do not in one respect set forth the facts as they ought to be understood and realized.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Prime Minister is proceding to another matter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Before the Prime Minister does so, may I have an opportunity of replying to his statements; the opportunity may not present itself again.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think I can reply offhand to most of the statements that have been made. I will take up first the question of letting up on recruiting. I do not know whether or not the Prime Minister wishes to have it inferred that my statements are not borne out by the facts. I will state the facts. From time to time, we had gentlemen interested in various organizations coming to the department and complaining that our recruiting officers were taking away their employees. On every occasion I explained to them that I had no authority under the law, and that consequently I would not attempt to step over any authority under the law to prevent any man who wished to go to the front from doing so. One case came from a town in the West where a man engaged in the manufacture of blankets wanted us to let up upon recruiting in that locality. The manufacture of blankets may be very important in time of war, but it struck me that persons capable of running a blanket machine could be picked up at any street corner in a town, and I declined even to suggest to my recruiting officers that they should let up on recruiting so far as that class of work was concerned. Why should a blanket manufacturer be left at home and the farmer go? That is the position I took then. I distinctly drew the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that I believed German gold was at the bottom of the agitation to prevent men going. Rumours of that nature were being whispered all around.

I do not know what Mr. McDougall's letter is about, but I will give the facts concerning him. I was called up to the Prime Minister's office, and I met there the Prime Minister with the Minister of Labour and Mr. McDougall. Mr. McDougall told us that we should not recruit in his locality because he wanted the men in the mines or industries—I do not know which.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Coal mines and iron and steel industries.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. McDougall was afraid that if we continued recruiting in that locality, the mines or industries would have to be shut down. I had been in that locality some years before and had seen many splendid Scotch Canadians working in those industries. I had been there subsequently, and I found many enemy aliens, and at the time I asked the reason why the splendid Scotch Canadians had been taken away and these aliens brought in to fill their places. It was long before the war that this occurred. I brought that matter up before the Prime Minister, as he and the Minister of Labour will most likely remember. I asked why these Scotch Canadians had been scattered to the four winds of heaven, and why Mr. McDougall came to me to stop recruiting amongst men who had never before worked in those mines. I declined to interfere and stated that all I could do was to ask my recruiting officers not to concentrate their efforts too much on one locality, the complaint having been that we had been doing that. The request was that our efforts should be equally distributed over the whole district. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour will remember the ground I took, namely, that we had no

authority to interfere with their employees any more than we had authority to interfere with farm hands who desired to go to the front. All that we agreed to do was not to let the recruiting officers concentrate on any one industry. This agitation continued, and there was a good deal of hysteria throughout the country, but I will pass over the details until the day when the Prime Minister used the expression "let up on recruiting." I have explained to him before and also to the House that I took the ground that the only time not to stop recruiting but to let up on our activities, would be between the winter and the spring campaigns. I will recall the incident to the memory of the Prime Minister. I asked who was talking this nonsense about recruiting. I knew that around the doors of the factories in Montreal and Toronto there were thousands of men clamouring for work, and I could find no scarcity of men whatever in any part of the country. I also told the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, and I also told Council on more than one occasion, that there was no dearth of labour in the community. The Prime Minister, on another day, when he sent for me, the day on which I quietly ceased any new activity, distinctly told me that there was a tremendous agitation going on in Toronto and in other communities and that the people there were annoyed and feeling was running high that their men were being taken away and were going to the front whereas the enlistment was so slack in Quebec. The Finance Minister also on one occasion asked me if I did not think it proper that we should let up. He thought Canada had done her full share in sending men to help England. I pointed out that we were not helping England, but helping the Empire and the cause of human liberty. This conversation was not conducted in the presence of the Prime Minister, but witnesses can be had in large numbers in the city of Toronto to whom the Finance Minister made the same statement. He thought we had done so much more than was to be expected of us that we should let up. He thought there was going to be a dearth of labour. The cry would be heard in every part of the Dominion that the country would be held up for labour. I felt the whole thing was patched up and paid for by German gold in order to stop recruiting. On the occasion to which I refer, when I was speaking to the Prime Minister about recruiting, I pointed out to him—if my memory serves me correctly, and I think he will admit it has served me correctly in regard to the steel and other incidents—that we could not exempt the members of labour organizations without exempting farmers, street labourers and every other class of the community. In connection with this agitation a man named Murray—I thought at the time it was Mr. James Murray, but he told me afterwards that he had nothing whatever to do with it, and I subsequently found out that it was another gentleman by the name of Murray who had been active in some work in Toronto—had been making representations that these labour men were absolutely necessary to the industries of the country. I will not enter into what I believe, and indeed know, to be the causes of that agitation. When the Prime Minister not in the presence of McDougall asked me, not in an ordering way but in a kindly manner, about letting up on recruiting, I suggested that the only thing I could do would be to direct that the energies of our recruiting officers should not be centered too much on this particular work, and he said that that would be satisfactory to him. "If it is at all possible," he said—I remember his words distinctly—"I should like you to let up for the time being on recruiting as far as possible." I do not say that there is anything to apologize for particularly in that, because the Prime Minister was not connected with the motive behind the agitation, but I say frankly that this matter of letting up on recruiting was a perfect torment to me every day of my life. I did not stop recruiting, but simply entered into no new activities.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: On what date does my hon. friend understand me to have made that statement?

Sir SAM HUGHES: All the data I have on the subject show it was before I left for England, and I left for England in March. I also heard from another gentleman in Toronto that the Prime Minister told him that if he had his way he would not enlist another man. I spoke to J. M. Godfrey about it. I said, "What's all this talk about the Prime Minister having spoken to you about recruiting?" He said, "That is exactly what occurred," and he mentioned one leading member of the Opposition who is not now in his seat. I have had it from a dozen gentlemen in Toronto that Mr. Godfrey stated positively that the Prime Minister's statement was to the effect that if he had his way he would not recruit another man.

These were the influences that were surrounding the minister. Some of the officers of the department were inspired with the same idea that we had done our full duty. Let me say here that during the time I had the honour to be minister under the voluntary system in Canada we raised in proportion to our population a higher percentage of men of British birth of British descent than the British Government raised under both the voluntary and the compulsory system in Great Britain and Ireland. Therefore hon. gentlemen need not be so anxious to know why recruiting has fallen off. I could give other reasons why recruiting has fallen off, but it does not help the cause at all. Recruiting has been magnificent in Canada in spite of the drawbacks we have had to contend with. I do not know whether the Prime Minister read Mr. McDougall's letter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not read it to the House. I sent it to my hon. friend but the leader of the Opposition has it at the present moment.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The leader of the Opposition is welcome to it. The facts are as I have stated. I put it up to Mr. McDougall in the presence of the Prime Minister that these places had been filled originally by Canadian boys of Highland descent, and subsequently by Germans and Austrians, and I asked him why he had made the change. He repudiated that he had anything at all to do with the change, and that was absolutely true. He was not the general manager. He is of Highland descent himself, and I am sure he would have been inclined to stick to his Canadian-born boys in preference to bringing in aliens and scattering to the four winds of heaven the lads who had been working in the mines. I may say that previous to this I had seen that McDougall was a likely fellow, that he was a man of courage and knew how to handle men, and I asked him if he would undertake the organization of a field battery in that locality. He said that he could not do it. But to show that my judgment of him was correct, McDougall came to me afterwards and asked me for authorization to raise a battery from these very men in the locality of Sydney.

As to the organization of new battalions and the Order in Council, I have done the House the honour of giving the figures quoted by my hon. friend from Edmonton the other day, and have shown that in the whole six or eight months only a limited number of battalions were raised in the Edmonton district, and that district runs from the Pacific to the Arctic ocean, and as far east as Lloydminster, but the battalions were centered in Edmonton because that was the only place where there was convenient housing. The number of battalions raised in that district was far from representing one battalion to every 40,000 population, even if the battalions were all raised at the same time, but they were not; they were spread over a period of from six to eight months from the time of authorization, although some were organized within three weeks of the issue of authorization.

My hon. friend has given me a list from the Adjutant General of the number of battalions authorized in Toronto. I find that in one day, on the 12th of December, 1915, we authorized five battalions, and two had been authorized only a month or so before; that made seven battalions for the city of Toronto and surrounding district authorized in the months of November and December, from a population of upwards of five hundred thousand souls. On the basis of this allotment of one battalion for about 40,000 population, I should have had twelve battalions going on at the same time in Toronto and its locality. In place of that, I had only five in one month and two in a previous month or so. So, taking the utmost that had later come from the city of Toronto, I was still five battalions short to put it in the same category as counties such as Peel, Victoria, Durham, Northumberland—all the country district where we were to raise, and did raise, one battalion to every 40,000 of the population. Waterloo, our German centre, raised two battalions with a nearly similar population. I do not say this to find fault, but to meet the argument which had been made before the country that we were raising too many battalions in one centre. That argument is perfect nonsense. After a battalion is authorized, you must choose your officers, arrange for your non-commissioned officers and for their training, and generally complete your organization. This can hardly be done in less than six months. The urban centres, such as Toronto, Edmonton, Hamilton and Montreal, ought to raise more regiments in proportion to their population than the outlying districts, because they are centres to which men from these districts had to go. For instance, upwards of 600 men from my own county volunteered in the First Division from Toronto alone. In this way, Tor-

onto gets credit for results that should really be credited to the area around.

Reference is made to the Bantam battalions being recruited. We did authorize one Bantam regiment in the West and one in the East, and gave them authority to enlist the undersized men wherever they should find them, for no one community, not even Toronto, nor even the city of Edmonton—where they are all great men—could furnish bantams enough for a battalion.

The whole thing simmers down to bear out the statements which I have made. The Prime Minister did yield—he knows that he was agitated over the efforts made by these organizations and committees to stop recruiting so far as these special men were concerned. That is about the time he commenced to get the National Service idea going. They know that efforts were abroad to bring about a let-up on recruiting. I gave the instance before of my attempt to stop this general recruiting of skilled men. I said to Capt. Rosamond: "Why should you fool away your time as a second lieutenant or lieutenant? You should be in skilled employment where you would be worth more to the country." But it had to be left to each man himself, and I could not stop them. I have a letter from Captain Rosamond after the fourth time I tried to get him out, dated just two days before he met his death, refusing everytning else and saying that he had decided to stay with the boys. I do not blame the Prime Minister—did not blame him at the time. That is, I do blame him for listening to the whispering that went on. These fellows should have been thrown out—they learned to dodge me. He should not have listened to the whisperings of these men; he had my assurance that there was no dearth of men and nothing in this agitation; that thousands and tens of thousands of men were idle and begging for work and fitted for the jobs that these boys were leaving in order to go to the front.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really must state in the most specific terms that I did not at any time direct my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) or impress upon him, to slow up on recruiting; nor did I at any time, either in conversation with Mr. Godfrey or with any one else, use such an expression as has been alluded to. I have not the slightest idea that Mr. Godfrey will take the responsibility of saying that I ever said anything of the kind to him. I did not say anything of the kind to him. My hon. friend must be mistaken in saying that he did not engage actively in recruiting after March, because during the period from April 6 to June 6, when I was supposed to be administering the department, he authorized no less than eleven new battalions. That does not indicate that he had ceased his activity.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is what I say—during the period between winter billetting and spring camp.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman says that I made the request in March; but I say that between April 6 and June 6 he authorized—though I was administering the department—no less than eleven new battalions. I point that out as indicating that he could not have ceased his recruiting activity during that period. I do not wish to detain the House further on the point. I lay on the Table a memorandum of the regiments recruited.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Perhaps I may be permitted another word. In connection with the carrying out of the offer by the Prime Minister of 500,000 men, an offer concerning which I was not consulted on till afterwards, I pointed out to him on one occasion that I had planned to raise 400,000 men under my system of one battalion to 40,000 of population. I had most of these corps authorized and under way, and the men were coming in as they never came in under any system of local recruiting areas in the whole history of the world. In order to raise the extra men, I proposed to raise another regiment for every 80,000 to 100,000 of the population. Any one who figures it out will see that that would bring about 500,000 men. I do not see why there should be any effort made to bring this matter up here. What I do say is that there was a great deal of talk going on on the part of friends of the Government influenced by these agitators and others connected with the matter. So far as Mr. Godfrey is concerned, he did not make the statement to me, but I know gentlemen in Toronto whose word is unimpeachable to whom he did make the statement, as reported in the papers, and also that he notified prominent members of the Opposition. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is named as one with whom he had communicated.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Godfrey has personally discussed what took place on that occasion and he gave no such version of our conversation as the hon. gentleman has given—he gave an absolutely different version of it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am glad to hear it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am ready to leave it to Mr. Godfrey's memory, so far as I am concerned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is an issue of fact between the Prime Minister and one of his former colleagues, now no longer in the Government, as to which I will not offer a word, except upon the bearing which it has upon the present measure. This measure is based upon a statement in the preamble that voluntary recruiting has ceased. Now, whatever may have passed between the Prime Minister, and the former minister at the time referred to, certainly there was some communication, and, in consequence of that the former Minister of Militia let up on recruiting—did not press it. The Prime Minister says that at the time when the Minister of Militia was letting up on his efforts, he authorized no less than eleven new battalions. But, knowing the energy of the former Minister of Militia, the authorizing of eleven new battalions is not necessarily incompatible with his having relaxed his efforts in recruiting. There was evidently a misunderstanding between the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia at that time. The ex-Minister of Militia states that the Prime Minister told him to let up on recruiting; the Prime Minister retorts that he did nothing of the kind, but that what he did was with a view to preventing overlapping in the formation of regiments.

It will be found to be beyond doubt that in consequence of the conversation which took place between him and the Prime Minister he let up in his efforts and did not pursue, with the same energy as he had done before, his policy of recruiting. We are told that this Bill is founded upon the fact that recruiting has practically ceased. If there has been such a misunderstanding as that between the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia, it is no wonder that there should be some relaxation in recruiting. If there had been the same efforts as there were before perhaps we would not have had this Bill to-day. But it seems beyond dispute that this legislation, which is regrettable at the present time from many points of view, is partly brought about by the misunderstanding which took place in the ranks of the Government themselves. There was no unanimity, no unity of action. This is the reproach which we have made from this side of the House against hon. gentlemen opposite and at last there is confirmation of the information which we have received in that respect.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I began a moment ago to give the House certain information as to the enlistment of infantry, and as to casualties, during certain periods which are important in dealing with this measure. I shall read from a statement which has been prepared in the Department of Militia and Defence and I shall give it to the House upon the authority of the officers of that department. It is this:

Statistics Relating to the Infantry of the C. E. F.

1 (a). Infantry enlisted during twelve months ending May 31st, 1917: 42,523

(b). Infantry enlisted between 1st January, 1917, and 31st May, 1917: 13,353.

(c). Infantry enlisted during April and May, 1917: April, 1,794; May, 1,208.—3,002.

2 (a). Infantry casualties during twelve months ending 31st May, 1917:

Killed in action	12,171
Died of wounds	3,872
Died of sickness	421
Prisoners of war	1,115
Presumed dead	1,524
Missing	1,937
	21,040
Wounded	45,996
Total casualties	67,036

(b). Infantry casualties between 1st January, 1917, and 31st May, 1917:

Killed in action	5,894
Died of wounds	1,705
Died of sickness	281
Prisoners of war	135
Presumed dead	881
Missing	1,143
	10,039
Wounded	17,187
Total casualties	27,226

Thus it will be seen that during the twelve months ending 31st May, 1917, the infantry enlistments were 42,523 and the infantry casualties 67,036. During the five months beginning 1st January, 1917, and ending 31st May, 1917, the infantry enlistments were 13,353 and infantry casualties 27,226.

Mr. TURRIFF: Could the Prime Minister say what proportion of those wounded or slightly wounded would go back to the trenches?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not that information at the moment but my hon. friend will understand that it could only be given in an approximate way. It varies in different engagements. During the taking of Vimy Ridge the proportion of slightly wounded was larger than usual.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is there not an approximate rate?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid I could not give that to my right hon. friend. I will make inquiry, but it would have to be a very rough approximation because it varies a great deal according to the circumtances of different actions.

(c). Infantry casualties during April and May, 1917:

Killed in action		4,572
Died of wounds		1,386
Died of sickness		137
Prisoners of war		55
Presumed dead		603
Missing		750
		7,503
Wounded		13,861
Total casualties		21,364

The total casualties in the entire force during the same period amounted to about 24,000 but in the infantry alone they were 21,364, while the infantry enlisted during that time numbered not more than 3,002. The casualties exceeded the enlistment of infantry during that period by more than 18,000. The number of killed in action, prisoners of war and missing was a good deal more than double the actual number of men enlisted in the infantry during that period.

That hon. gentlemen may appreciate still more the condition with which we are confronted in the endeavour to maintain the Canadian Expeditionary Force at full strength, I remind them that I made my announcement on 18th May last that the policy of the Government would include compulsory service. It might be instructive that the hon. gentlemen should realize what our casualties have been while the subject has been under consideration during the intervening period. During those seven weeks the infantry casualties have been as follows:

(d) Infantry casualties between 18th May, 1917, and 4th July, 1917:

Killed in action		1,240
Died of wounds		420
Died of sickness		76
Prisoners of war		64
Presumed dead		—
Missing		369
		2,169
Wounded		4,529
Total casualties		6,698

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I suggest that while the figures give a great deal of detail they do not afford complete information. The object of my right hon. friend in contrasting the figures of enlistment with the casualties is to show that voluntary enlistment cannot keep up with the casualties. It will be necessary to give us some information as to how many of these casualties are of such a character that they are not permanent casualties, but of such nature that the men have been able to return to the front. We are aware that, fortunately, a good many of those wounded are not so seriously wounded that they cannot return to the front. A good many have received scratches only, and are able to take their places in the ranks again within a few days. I wish my right hon. friend would give us information as to the proportion of permanent disabilities, so that we may estimate how many we have still in the ranks upon whose services we can count.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have already said that I shall endeavour to get that information, but I believe it can only be given in a very approximate way. I saw about 10,000 of these men at Hastings just before I left England. They were being trained and hardened. Men with mere scratches do not go to hospital. There are many who have been wounded, sometimes pretty severely, and who have returned to the front three, four or five times.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The percentage of those wounded who return to the front within a period of four or five months is about sixty-five. At first we returned only a small number, but we kept increasing it by the convalescent system until there are now sixty-five per cent who return within a very limited period.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There must be some general ratio on which we could base our calculations.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall endeavour to get that information. But I should again like to emphasize the point that for April and May the total casualties were 21,364 in the infantry as against 3,002 men enlisted, and that those who were killed, died of wounds, are presumed dead, or are missing, numbered not less than 7,504, or two and one-half times the number of enlistments.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would the Prime Minister state whether the 100,000 men to be conscripted will be used as reinforcements or for the formation of new divisions?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The object is to keep the Canadian army corps at the front up to strength.

Mr. DEVLIN: That would be how many divisions? There are at present four, and a fifth is in course of formation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The infantry of the fifth division will have to be used for reinforcements.

Mr. OLIVER: The information that the Prime Minister has given is very much to the point, but I would respectfully suggest that it would be of interest and might be of advantage if a similarly definite statement were made to cover all enlistments and all branches of the service. I notice that a general statement is made that we have recruited something over 400,000 men. At the same time we find that we have sent overseas something less than 240,000 men, and it is said that we have less than 20,000 men in Canada. That is to say, we have actually something like 350,000 or 360,000 men, while we claim to have recruited over 400,000 men. This is a matter of record and could easily be settled. I suggest that the minister, at a later date, bring down such figures covering the whole of our enlistments and military establishment as will give a clear idea of what men were enlisted and what men we have actually on service, and where they are serving.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As to those matters, the Minister of Militia will give information.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: A question has been raised by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and also by other hon. gentlemen, as to the discrepancy between the number of enlistments in Canada and the number of men who have gone overseas and the number of men who are still in Canada. There is a discrepancy. Up to the 31st of May, 1917, 64,552 of these men can be accounted for, which would leave 10,910 with respect to whom an investigation is being made. I am now quoting from a memorandum as to the 31st of May. I cannot get it to a later date owing to the difficulty of getting such figures compiled. In the first place, there are 5,345 who enlisted, but who were not likely to become efficient and who consequently were discharged. Those men were discharged under the King's regulations and orders, paragraph 322, after they had been in the service for three months. They were discharged for various reasons; some men are not fit to become soldiers owing to mental and other reasons. Up to that date some 33,887 men, after they had enlisted, were found to be medically unfit. They developed defects and diseases in active training; they could not stand the strain of active training.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Did these men pass the medical examination?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Yes. They were rejected for defects and diseases which developed in active training, which could not be detected by the medical authorities.

Mr. NESBITT: How long were they retained, on an average, before they were discharged?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Under the regulation to which I refer, in all probability they would be in the service about three months, perhaps more. The period would vary. Perhaps it would be more convienient if I read this table, so that it may appear in Hansard:

CLASSIFIED TABLE OF DISCHARGES IN THE C.E.F. FROM THE COMMENCEMENT MAY 31st, 1917.

Previous Total.	——	M.D. 1.	M.D. 2.	M.D. 3.	M.D. 4.	M.D. 5.	M.D. 6.	M.D. 10.	M.D. 11.	M.D. 12.	M.D. 13.	Total.
5,314	Not likely to become efficient	....	5	....	4	....	6	13	....	2	1	5,345
32,899	Medically unfit	94	297	45	64	15	108	109	14	214	28	33,887
12,856	Absentees struck off	16	99	12	8	16	3	14	8	....	49	13,081
1,977	Under age	....	28	8	5	....	18	26	11	7	6	2,086
1,248	By purchase	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1,248
2,358	Misconduct, Undesirable, etc	....	5	....	2	....	2	....	2	1	1	2,371
908	To accept Commission	....	....	....	....	....	2	2	1	....	6	919
1,077	Special cases	....	29	9	....	....	6	....	5	....	1	1,127
560	Deaths	....	2	....	....	1	6	3	....	....	....	572
1,028	Miscellaneous	....	19	4	2	10	....	15	2	5	....	1,085
1,106	Not classified	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	1,106
1,715	Irregularly attested	6	....	1	....	....	2	....	....	....	1	1,725
63,046	.....Total	116	484	79	85	42	153	182	43	229	93	64,552

There are some absentees who are not on the records, and for whom we cannot account. For 13,081 absentees, however—in other words, deserters—there are records.

With regard to the 1,248 who were discharged by purchase, in the early stages of the war a man could, under some old regulation, purchase his discharge for $15. Later that amount was raised to $50 so that after enlisting and becoming an expense to the country a man could not secure his discharge by the payment of a merely nominal sum.

The 2,371 men who were undesirable included men discharged for misconduct.

I have not the details as to the 1,127 who were let out because of special requests of one kind or another. I suppose, however, that these special requests would be largely granted upon compassionate grounds.

It is difficult to know just why the men who come under the head of miscellaneous and not classified—the figures are 1,085 and 1,106—cannot be accounted for. It will be noted that the attestation papers of 1,725 were irregular, and for this reason that number of men were let out. The total shrinkage and wastage in Canada, therefore, of men who were reported as having enlisted amounts, according to these figures, to 64,552.

The figures of enlistment which are recorded and to which publicity is given come first from the commanding officers of the different battalions, who make returns to the Adjutant-General. Figures based upon these returns are then made public. There are 10,910 men for whom it is difficult to account. The officers of the department have investigated this very carefully; they have given a good deal of attention to the matter of finding an explanation for this disparity. They account for it roughly by the fact that some men have been counted twice; that some men have enlisted in more than one unit—have joined one unit and left it to join another—

Sir SAM HUGHES: In order to get to the front.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Yes, or for some other reason. Others have been transferred to other units. Considering the large number of enlistments since the war began, the number of those who cannot be accounted for is really very small indeed. As time goes on these figures are becoming more definite and more reliable. Difficulties of this sort will in time be overcome.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it open to a soldier to join a unit and, of his own motion, without the consent of his commanding officer, leave that unit and join another?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: No, of course it is not. But some of them do it; in fact, men leave the Royal Navy, I am sorry to say, and enlist in the Canadian army units on the Atlantic seaboard. That is, of course, contrary to the rules and regulations, but it is difficult to overcome.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In the early part of the war—even yet, for that matter—upon a unit leaving Canada men have been so anxious to get to the front that they have deserted, assumed new names and joined some other unit that was going to the front. Hundreds of them have done that.

Mr. TURRIFF: The minister said that about 1,700 men had not been properly attested. Was that the fault of the men themselves, or of the officers of the department?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The officers of the department do not attest the men; they are attested all over the country, in the villages, towns or cities where recruits are sought. In the filling out of such a complicated document, there are bound to be irregularities. The number of the irregularities, however, is very small compared with the total enlisment.

Mr. TURRIFF: Is the fact that the attestation paper has not been properly filled out sufficient ground for a man's discharge?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Sometimes, in addition to being irregular, the attestation papers were not sworn before a man competent to administer oaths. If men who were sworn irregularly claimed their discharge on that account, it could be granted to them. In that case they would not be soldiers; they would be in the same position as if they had not enlisted.

Mr. NESBITT: Do I understand that 64,000 and 10,000—I give the rough figures—indicate the difference between the men you can account for overseas and the total enlistment?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Yes. The total is 75,462, including 10,910 for whom it is difficult to account.

The following is a statement of enlistment in the Canadian Expeditionary Force up to May 31, 1917, together with the figures as to the number of men overseas, the number of men in Canada or about to embark, and discharges:

Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Reported enlistments to 31st May, 1917..		418,102
Gone Overseas to same date of whom 136,400 in France; 127,543 in England and elsewhere; 31,010 killed, died, missing, and prisoners; and about 20,000 discharged or returned for discharge.	319,828	
In Canada, or about to embark	22,812	
Discharges, etc., in Canada.—Reported discharges as shewn on detailed statement attached. . .	64,552	
Discharges not yet reported through Districts, or for whom Documents are not yet available for classification, about..	10,910	
	418,102	418,102

(Sd.) C. S. MacInnes,
Colonel,
D. A. G. Orgn.

Mr. NESBITT: Has the minister anything to show how many of the 127,000 men in England are infantry?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: The figures were laid on the table of the House in a very elaborate statement that was prepared and printed. The statements that are furnished to the department come out here every two or three weeks. One has come out since May 14, 1917, but as the statement dated May 14 is the one which is printed for the use of the House, we had better use it for the discussion of the Bill, because there are very few changes in the latest statement. This table shows 126,241 troops in England on the 14th May, 1917. The number of infantry in England at that time was 67,387, composed of category "A" (1) 6,499 men; category "A" (2) 15,073; category "A" (3) 3,941 men. The men in category "A" (1) are the men who are ready, technically and scientifically trained, to go at once into the trenches. Category "A" (2) and (3) comprise men who are not quite fit. In category "A" (4) there were under eighteen, 284 men, and over eighteen, 1,549. The balance of the total number of infantry is in three classes under category "B" in three classes under category "C" in categories "D" and "E" unclassified, and in hospitals where there are 14,219. The details of the categories were put on Hansard by the Prime Minister when he introduced this Bill, so that I need not take up the time of the House in explaining about them. In addition to the infantry to which I have referred, there are in the Fifth division, in reserve, 8,221 men in category "A" (1) who are ready for the trenches.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood from my hon. friend that the number of unfits, that is of men who, having been enlisted and passed as medically fit, had been subsequently rejected, totalled 33,000. Am I right in that? Were these men rejected in Canada?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Those unfit to whom I referred in the first part of my address were men who joined the forces in Canada and who, after they had been subjected to training and the severe tests required in connection with training, were found, for one reason, or another, medically unfit. Out of the total enlistments of 418-102 there were something like 33,000 who were found to be men who had to be let out because of being medically unfit.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: From statements made in the press and elsewhere an impression has been raised that a good many men who had crossed over to England had also been found to be unfit and were therefore rejected. The other day the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) said that 12,000 men of the troops now in England ought to be sent back at once.

An hon. MEMBER: 12,900?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: 12,000 is the figure which impressed itself on my memory. Are these men also unfit and likely to be sent back because of unfitness?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In reply to a communication on this subject, I have the following information from Sir George Perley:

With reference to categories B and C, last fall there were considerable numbers of these men here without very much to do, but we have been gradually absorbing them in useful work. All B men are fit for forestry, railway or labour Battalions and are being used for that purpose as fast as available. Many C men also fit for same work and C three men are being used under Medical Service, also Records Office and for working around camp, etc. Any surplus C three men not required here are being sent to Canada as fast as possible. Nineteen hundred have already gone and another nineteen hundred now selected for return as soon as ships available. We quite realize desirability returning to Canada for farming or industrial work all men who cannot be usefully employed here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no statement as to the reasons why those men cannot be usefully employed in England. I should imagine every available man can be usefully employed in forestry work, or in railway construction or in other ways.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Sir George Perley says that the greater number of them can be so employed, but a certain number are not fit for any of those occupations, or, if they are fit for some particular service, there are enough men already at work in that service, such as working around camps, in the Records office or in the medical service. All who cannot be employed in those services and who are not fit for active work of some kind are being returned to Canada as fast as possible.

Mr. TURRIFF: Can the minister explain the very high percentage of men who, after having been passed by the medical examiners in Canada, have been rejected in Canada, and also the high percentage of men who, after passing a special examination before going overseas, have, after their arrival in England, been found to be medically unfit, after they have been in the service for from one to two years and have caused a heavy expenditure to the country? There must be some terrible laxity or lack of professional knowledge on the part of the medical examiners. There must be something seriously wrong somewhere when such a large percentage of men who have undergone a special inspection before sailing for England are rejected as medically unfit when they get over on the other side.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I am afraid it will have to be largely attributed to the frailty and complicated machinery of the human frame. Recruits undergo a rigid examination. Undoubtedly mistakes have been made, but this same difficulty exists in the British army and all other armies. The soldiers of a citizen army who have not been accustomed to athletic exercise but have been doing sedentry work all their lives, when put under canvas and subjected to severe exercises are apt to develop weaknesses which otherwise would not show themselves. One of the diseases which has developed to a greater extent than we expected is tuberculosis, although the men had been examined by the most skilled physicians in this country and declared physically fit. The percentage of wastage from this cause is very high indeed. As the hon. member for Assiniboia says, the men are also subjected to different climatic conditions in England. As the Prime Minister pointed out when reading the despatch to the House, men who are not fit for the trenches nevertheless perform very important work in connection with the war. The sheet which has been distributed amongst hon. members gives a list of the different branches of the service in which men who cannot stand active service can be utilized on work which is almost as useful as the service performed by the fighting men at the front. A man has to be bodily perfect and an athlete in every sense of the word to stand the tremendous strain of trench warfare.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There is a good deal in what the hon. member for Assiniboia says in regard to the unevenness of the medical examinations. I will cite only one case. Colonel Ashton, who is now Brigadier General Ashton, determined that in one battalion there would not be a single man rejected as medically unfit. These were all hand-picked men, but when they were sent over from England to France half of them were returned as medically unfit. Some doctors have a faculty for finding little pinpricks in men, and rejecting them. One of the chief causes of rejection is flat feet, of which there are three degrees. A man with flat feet in the third degree is not fit for marching at all. Many of the men with the second degree walked hundreds of miles to Edmonton from the Peace River district carrying their packs all the way, yet they were rejected when they crossed the water although they could out-march any doctor in England. They had the second degree of flat feet, and under the regulations, which are very strict, they could not go to the front. The first degree is also objectionable from the medical standpoint, but it largely rests with the doctor making the examination.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: During my visit to England I made inquiries as to the numerous rejections for flat feet. The strictness of the practice dates back, I believe, to some incident in the career of the British army when men were unable to march as far as they should have done in a great emergency. A great many men who were rejected for flat feet in England worked in our lumber woods and used moccasins during part of the year. I told the military officers with whom I discussed this matter that I was confident these men were perfectly fit and would have an equal capacity for marching with any man that could be turned out against them, but the British authorities adhere to the rule very strictly. I do not know whether I made any impression on them, but I did my best to convince them that men who had been used to working in the lumber woods would be perfectly fit for work in the trenches. They thought, on the other hand, that as these men had been accustomed to wearing moccasins during part of the year they would

give out when put to marching in heavy-soled boots on hard roads.

Mr. TURRIFF: I appreciate what has been said in regard to flat feet, but it seems to me that this is another case of War Office red tape. They should not be allowed to reject hundreds of our volunteers who have been passed as medically fit, and who can probably out march any other class of men. As the ex-minister has pointed out, many of these lumber jacks have walked hundreds of miles into Edmonton from the Peace River country and from the back settlements of Ontario to Toronto or some other centre, covering 30 or 40 miles a day. These men should be allowed to go to the front instead of being put in forestry or construction battalions, because they are as good men as Canada produces, whether their feet are up to the military standard or not.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I might point out that such men if they are not allowed to go to the front, are employed at work of the highest importance, such as that performed by the railway construction and forestry battalions.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: There has been a great deal of discussion about flat feet since the war began. There is no doubt that some men who are rejected for flat feet are otherwise just as fit as any soldier who goes to the front. Most of these rejections are in the case of men who have been used to working in the lumber woods and wearing moccasins or shoe packs, and walking on a soft surface. The moccasin, of course, has no arch to sustain the centre of the foot. If these men were allowed to wear moccasins at the front there would be very little difficulty, but I am informed that when they are put in heavy soled boots and marched on a hard road they frequently have to fall out, though in every other respect perfectly fit. I am quite satisfied it is not a question of red tape on the part of the British War Office. It is more a question of a foot that can stand marching on the hard roads of France and Belgium in a heavy soled boot.

Mr. MURPHY: I understood the inquiry of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) to refer to rejections generally. The Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp) gave, according to my judgment and in the light of information submitted to a committee of which I happened to be a member, almost the correct answer, but not quite. He said that a large number of rejections were due to the frailty of the human frame.

If he had said they were due to the frailty of human nature, his answer would have been absolutely correct.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: That is a very frail thing.

Mr. MURPHY: As displayed by the medical examiners appointed by the Government, a very frail thing.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Nearly all Liberals.

Mr. MURPHY: The ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) was not present at the meetings of the Committee to which I have referred. My hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) was chairman of that committee, and I take this opportunity of paying a tribute to the industry, aptitude and thoroughness which he brought to bear upon its work. A great deal of very frank evidence on the subject of these rejections was submitted. Beyond doubt, the fault lay, in the first instance, for a considerable time, in the lack of proper medical examination. My recollection of the evidence is that the period at which that stopped and the method was improved, is thoroughly well defined; and I believe that if the minister would confer with the Chairman of the Committee he would get some information which would be informative and useful to this committee in considering the Bill. It would make discussion of some points unnecessary. And not only that, but it would be reassuring as showing that an improvement has been made.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: According to what my hon. friend Mr. Murphy says the difficulty would be more in laxity of acceptances than in sincerity of rejections.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, the Minister of Militia went on, in explanation, to say that these men when subjected to physical training developed defects that could not have been detected. But no amount of physical training could develop, for instance, a glass eye.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Many went to the front who had one glass eye, and one of these men, to my knowledge, won the Distinguished Service Order. I was instrumental in getting one of these men to the front myself. I never could see any reason why a man with one glass eye should not go to the front, if he would assume responsibility and, in the case of the loss of that eye, would claim only for the loss of one eye and not for the loss of two. These men make good soldiers. Of the men of the First Division, who at St. Julien, won eternal renown and brought glory to Canada,

there were fully twenty-five per cent who would have been rejected had they been subjected to the technical examination carried on at the present time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The proportion of those accepted and afterwards rejected as medically unfit seems very high, but we have nothing before us to show that it is higher than in the case of other armies—and in every army there must be a certain proportion of this class; what that proportion is, I do not know. There is something peculiar in the statement made by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) to which I call attention. I refer to page 2769 of Hansard. The hon. gentleman said:

> There are in England about 12,900 men who should be returned to Canada Personally I do not believe that any man should be kept in England who is unfit to fight in France, or about to become unfit.

The necessary inference there is that these men are all unfit for active service. But I suppose that they are employed, as the Prime Minister has stated, in duties that are fit for them, and in that case I do not see why they should not remain where they are. But I gather from the statement I have just read that they are not fit for anything, and that that is the reason they should be returned to Canada. The hon. gentleman goes on:

> Every man in Class B now in England should be returned to Canada in order to provide the necessary labour required on our farms and in our factories.

I think that there is something in this that should be further explained. If a man is to be returned to work on the farm, or in the factory, in Canada, he must be physically fit. But, in that case, why should he be returned? Is it because it would have been preferable in the interest of the country that these men should never have been enlisted?

Mr. ARTHURS: I had reference to men who were then attached to different reserve units in England. When I was there I believed, as I believe now, that there was an excess of these men there, and that all were not usefully employed. They were unfit for service in France, according to the classification adopted by the authorities in England. The contention I made was that, if these men were not to be employed usefully in England they should not be left around the camps in England, but should be returned to be engaged in useful work in Canada. There are about 900, I think, according to the list furnished by the Minister of Militia, who are listed for return to Canada. These men are not necessarily medically unfit. Nor is their acceptance anything against the examination in Canada. In many cases they are men over age, who, on enlisting, perhaps gave their age at much less than it really was. But the winter conditions in England tell very rapidly on old men from this country. They develop rheumatism and other ailments which caused them to be classified as unfit for active service. These are the men to whom I referred.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would point out to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the statement made by Sir George Perley is not inconsistent with that made by the hon. member for Parry Sound. I would remind him that Category "B" includes those fit for service in France, but not fit for general service, that is, not fit for service in the trenches at the front. Class I includes those who may give service in garrison or provisional units. Class II includes those who are fit for service in labour and construction units, or for other outdoor employment. Class III includes those who are suitable for sedentary work only. Category "C" includes those who are fit for service in the United Kingdom only. Class I takes in those who are fit for service in garrison or provisional units. Class II includes those who are fit for service in labour and construction units, or for other outdoor employment. Class III includes those who are fit for sedentary work only.

Sir George Perley, replying to my inquiry based on the statement of the hon. member for Parry Sound, says:—

> Last fall there were considerable numbers of these men here without very much to do, but have been gradually absorbing them in useful work. All B men fit for forestry, railway or labour battalions and are being used for that purpose as fast as available. Many C men also fit for the same work and C III men are being used on the medical service, also Records Office and for working around camp, etc.

There is a great deal of work around the training camps in England, and these men are used for that service, not for service at the front. Then the message continues:—

> Any surplus C three men not required here are being sent to Canada as fast as possible; nineteen hundred have already gone and another 1900 now selected for return as soon as ships available. We quite realize desirability returning to Canada for farming or industrial work all men who cannot be usefully employed here.

Mr. ARTHURS: I might state that I inadvertently used schedule B for schedule C. The figures I gave were for schedule C.

Mr. NESBITT: A good many young men coming home wounded say that they could and properly should be used around camps and hospitals in place of men who are sent over there and who occupy those positions. It is stated by the Prime Minister that a good many men of class C are used for that purpose.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: In England?

Mr. NESBITT: In England. A good many young men who are convalescent, or practically cured, believe that the men who have been used there ought to be sent back and that these convalescents should be employed in that service. That statement has a great deal of sympathy amongst the people of the country. Whether it is true or not I am not saying, but I have heard what the Prime Minister has stated as to how many of these men are employed in that sort of service. I am telling the minister that these young men, who have been over there, who have done their part at the front and have been wounded, should have these positions kept open for them if they want them.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: They do obtain these positions. It is the intention and policy to employ men in different categories and occupations whenever they are suitable. Wounded men who are convalescents often can do a certain amount of work and there is no question but that the authorities on the other side are employing this class of men around hospitals. In Canada the soldiers who keep discipline in the military hospitals are all returned men. There is a unit known as the Military Hospitals Commission Command.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not mean in Canada.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: As far as Canada is concerned, when these men approach a state of convalescence and are fit for disciplinary duty we employ them in connection with hospitals and work of that sort. But we are going to do more than that. There are a large number of these men who are approaching a state of convalescence, who are very nearly well, who are now in the pay of the country but who have not received their discharge and may not receive it until the end of the war. Some of them may entirely recover and be fit for further military service. We are going to make use of these men in Canada because they are in the pay of the country and give them some occupation. We believe that they will recover even more rapidly if they have some occupation. We propose to put them in some of the camps in this country in order that they may carry on instruction in different directions. No better instructors could be got than those who have been at the front. They will be in much healthier surroundings in these camps than they would if they remained in the cities. That is the policy I mean to pursue in regard to returned soldiers. This can be done without incurring extra expense because they are in the pay of the country at any rate until they are discharged.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There was another statement made by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) that I would like to get some explanation about. He appeared to have found a regiment over there that was largely composed of officers and that had very few private soldiers. If that is so, it is an extraordinary state of affairs. This is the statement made by the hon. member:

> There is in England one reserve battalion composed entirely of French Canadians. I was in close touch with them for a week or two when I was in England, and I know that the battalion is largely composed of officers and N.C.O's., and there are very few privates in the battalions.

I understand that a full staff of officers in a battalion is 32 approximately.

Sir EDWARD KEMP. Thirty-one.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The larger number of the members of this battalion are officers and N.C.O.'s drawing, I presume, the pay of officers and N.C.O.'s. It is an extraordinary state of affairs if such is the case and I would like to know if there is any mistake about that statement and, if it is true, if this regiment of officers is still maintained in England. If it is true that there should be about 32 and that instead there is the largest part of a thousand, it is a matter that ought to be dealt with by the minister.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I am unable to answer the question which my hon. friend raises. I do not know of any condition existing whereby the non-commissioned officers who form the battalion draw the pay of officers while they are really privates in the ranks. This situation, however, has developed in England. There has been a surplus of officers in England. There have been a great many subalterns, lieutenants, captains and others who could not get to the front because there were more

officers than were required and some of these men have reverted to the ranks. I do not know anything about this because the matter has never come to my attention. It may be that there may be a regiment, or part of a regiment in Great Britain in which there are a great many of these men who have reverted to the ranks for the purpose of getting to the front.

Mr. ARTHURS: The remark I made in connection with the 69th reserve battalion represents the facts just as I have stated them. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is under a misapprehension as to the conditions. It is quite true that an ordinary battalion is composed of 1,000 men but these reserve battalions may have a greater or less number of men according to the circumstances. A reserve battalion is for the purpose of absorbing other reinforcements or units and it takes in the officers of the units which have been absorbed. There may very often be as many as a hundred officers or even more than a hundred officers in a reserve battalion until they have been sent to France or absorbed in some other way. The same applies to non-commissioned officers. Some battalions, on arrival in England, were broken up by order of the authorities and the non-commissioned officers immediately reverted to the ranks. That is not done in all cases. In the case which I mentioned the non-commissioned officers had not so reverted. They had not received any ordinary private for some time and the result was exactly as I have stated, that of the total number on the roll the greater number were officers and non-commissioned officers. There was a decided lack of privates in this battalion at that time. It was no reflection on the Government or military authorities that this should occur because conditions are such that sometimes a reserve battalion may absorb within a week or two, three or four other battalions and it takes over the officers of these battalions that it has absorbed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many men did compose this reserve battalion?

Mr. ARTHURS: I was not in command of the battalion and I cannot tell the exact number.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand that this case of the 69th Battalion is not an exceptional one?

Mr. ARTHURS: The point I made was that there was a lack of men going forward for the reserve battalions belonging to Quebec. These battalions in the reserves are set aside for certain sections. The fourth reserve battalion serves western Ontario outside of Toronto; the third reserve battalion supplies reinforcements for those battalions which are from the city itself. In the same way the 69th reserve was presumably for the purpose of reinforcing the 22nd at the front. My point was that it had lots of officers and non-commissioned officers to go forward but no privates. This was exceptional. As a rule there are close to 2,000 men in each battalion, and in the vast majority of cases they are privates.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend said there was no reflection on anybody in connection with having a regiment with hundreds of officers and non-commissioned officers and practically no men. It seems to me that there is a great reflection on somebody when that state of affairs can possibly exist. The Government knew that men were wanted to fill up battalions. Why did they, just for the sake of patronage, appoint dozens and scores of officers more than they could possibly use and send them across to the front? The statement made by the minister to-day shows that there were 9,000 extra officers in Great Britain. Could the minister give the number of officers serving with the forces in France and Belgium, somewhere about 136,000 all told, and in Great Britain, about 127,000 men?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Reference has been made to surplus officers in Great Britain and we have been asked why we appointed more officers than were necessary. That question has been threshed out in the House. There are 31 officers to a battalion of about 1,000 men. The policy adopted in Canada at the beginning of the war was to recruit by battalions. I do not believe that any other system would have produced as good results under the voluntary system. If we had placed a non-commissioned officer at each station and had him recruit batches of 200 or 250 men to be sent across the seas, we would not have attained anything like the same results. The system pursued under the battalion method was to select a man prominent in a locality and entrust to him the raising of a battalion. He selected as his officers to assist him in the raising of that battalion, other men of prominence, and the young men who were asked to enlist knew the officers of the battalion and consequently were more willing to join it. When our troops went to France, it was found that the casualties among the rank and file were greater in proportion than among the officers, and

consequently in due course we had a surplus of officers in Great Britain, and to some extent a surplus in Canada, because it backed up, so to speak. If a battalion went overseas under strength, say with 600 men, it would have with it only a number of officers proportionate to the number of the rank and file. I shall endeavour to find for my hon. friend the information about the number of officers in England and France respectively.

Mr. ROSS: Is not the surplus of officers in Britain caused to some extent by battalions being sent over under strength with full complement of officers? We speak about the scarcity of recruits and the necessity of conscription, and that may exist, but is it not a fact that in the pay and record office in London there are 2,700 clerks? Are these women or soldiers, and if soldiers what kind of soldiers? Would it not be possible to comb that office out and send a battalion and a half or so over to France to do some fighting if they are soldiers? There are 2,700 people in that office to pay 270,000 men. That seems preposterous. On that calculation one man is looking after the pay and records of 100 soldiers. According to the evidence given before the Returned Soldiers Committee, in the Separation and Assigned Pay branch in Canada there are 638 clerks looking after 192,000 accounts. That is bad enough, but if the whole service in England is overburdened and encumbered with unnecessary assistants to the same extent as the pay and records office, surely some of these men could be used in France.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: My hon. friend seems to be under the impression that when half a battalion or part of battalion went overseas, the full complement of officers went with them. I thought I had made myself quite clear on that point. The rule has been very rigidly adhered to, and the consequence has been a great deal of disappointment on the part of officers who did their best to work their battalions up to full strength and who were told that they could not all go over. Sometimes in a half battalion there would be four, five or six officers in excess of the proper proportion. The rule has been that only a number of officers proportionate to the number of men comprising the rank and file may go over with the troops.

Mr. ROSS: Since when?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I do not know how far back the rule extends; it covers a considerable period; I have no doubt. Up to a certain date the battalions went over at full strength, but since I became minister, some battalions, owing to circumstances generally understood, have gone over at less than full strength. In those cases the number of officers has been reduced so as to make it proportionate with the number of men making up the rank and file. It has been a difficult matter to handle; sometimes strong representations are made, but it is left to the commanding officers to select the officers whom he wishes to take.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have gathered from reading the accounts of the casualties that there were more casualties among officers than among men; that, speaking proportionately, more lieutenants than privates have been killed or wounded. If that is true, how does the minister account for the large accumulation of officers on the other side?

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I thought I had explained that point clearly. There are 31 officers in a battalion. There has been an accumulation of officers in England, apparently because of the fact the casualties have been proportionately heavier amongst the rank and file than amongst the officers. Otherwise, that accumulation of officers would not have occurred. There is, I suppose, another reason: the policy adopted in the British and Canadian armies is to grant commissions on the field to competent men. Many a splendid fellow goes out from Canada who has not seen service in the trenches. It is a question whether it is advisable to put such a man over the head of a sergeant, for instance, or other non-commissioned officer, who has been in France for a year or two and has done splendid service.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The non-commissioned officers are brought back for training.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: Certainly. To some extent—not altogether—that may account for the condition referred to.

The member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) refers to the large number of persons who are employed in the pay and records office in England and in the assigned pay and separation allowance branch here. But the hon. gentleman must remember that it is not fair to compare the number of employees in the pay and records office in England with the number of employees in the assigned pay and separation allowance branch here. We have

the records branch in Ottawa, which is separate from the assigned pay and separation allowance branch. We have about 600 clerks in the records office—many of them work nights as well as during the day—and 600 or 700 in the other offices.

Mr. ROSS: Twice too many in both.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: I often hear assertions of that kind from my hon. friends opposite. I wish that these hon. gentlemen would take time to inform themselves by going round and seeing what is being done in these offices. If they did they would not come to any such conclusions as that which my hon. friend has apparently reached. There is a staff of faithful, honest workers in the department at Ottawa. At the heads of these staffs are competent, conscientious men. When I discuss with them matters connected with their different branches, I find that they are anxious to serve the public to the best of their ability. Many of these men were in the department before the war broke out and had to take charge of much wider work in the different branches. They have performed and are performing a splendid service. I do not believe that there is a surplus of employees; I do not think the member for West Middlesex is justified in saying that there is, nor do I think that he can produce evidence to prove his assertion. I should be glad to produce evidence that he is mistaken in that regard. There is a tremendous amount of work in looking after the details connected with the 400,000 men, sending out thousands of cheques every month, adjusting the accounts, and so on. Our men are scattered all over this continent; they are in England and in France. They move around from place to place, their addresses change. Unfortunately, some of them are killed; others are wounded. When the men are wounded they are transferred to a hospital in France. From there they may be transferred to a hospital in England, and they may be further transferred to Canada. All these movements involve a certain amount of work in the records office. Then, the families of some of these men have gone to England, and have forgotten to give their addresses. This sort of thing involves attention to a tremendous amount of detail. I am informed that the employees in the offices in England are mostly female employees; any men who are employed are unfit for other kinds of military service. According to this sheet to which reference has been made, there are 42 male employees in the Canadian Records Office. It is probable that more males are employed in the records office than that, but they are attached to other units in the service. I assure my hon. friend that no able-bodied men would be employed to do clerical work—unless his services were indispensable—if he was fit for more important military duties.

Mr. ROSS: I do not want to criticise the minister unduly; I know that his duties are very onerous and that the times are trying. But I am informed by officers returned from England that the condition of the Pay and Records Office there is an open scandal; that the employees are so numerous that they are simply falling over each other. I would be much obliged if the minister would furnish me with information as to the number of persons employed in the Pay and Records Office, their sex, and how many officers of the militia are employed, if any, who have seen active service. I should be glad if he would give me the general details in regard to the matter. If my criticism is unjust, I shall be only too glad to retract it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will endeavour to get the information for my hon. friend. But I really think that hon. gentlemen should take care to be well informed before they cast aspersions upon men who are just as upright and have just as good a status in the community in which they have hitherto lived as any hon. gentleman in this committee. I did not see the Pay and Record Office this year. I know that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries visited the office and he told me that his visit indicated to him that the work was being carried on in a most satisfactory and systematic manner, and he was very much impressed with it. That was the impression I derived when I visited the Pay and Records Office in 1915. I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House has much conception of the quantity of work that is done there. How many thousand inquiries does my hon. friend imagine are made in that office every day in the year about the men, 300,000 or thereabouts, who are in the United Kingdom or in France? The complications which call for these inquiries are very considerable. Reference has been made to the hospitals. Wounded men are very often moved from one hospital to another, and the clerks in the Pay and Records office have to keep an exact account of when a man leaves a hospital and where he goes to. They have to keep an account of transfers from one battalion to another, from

one service to another. There are thousands of details.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The estates of the dead.

Mr. ROSS: That is a separate department.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, that is in the Pay and Records Office, because I happened to sit at lunch alongside one of the officers in charge, who was a native of my province, and who told me of incidents that had to be dealt with there in connection with the administration of that department, and which I am sure would never occur to my hon. friend. He has to deal with the law of nearly every country in Europe.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Probate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The next of kin of some poor man who has been killed may live in Switzerland, or Norway, or Russia, or Italy, or somewhere else. The officer has to make arrangements with the Governments of those countries for all the formalities in connection with the administration, so that the Government of Canada can get a good discharge. In just that one respect alone that has been brought to my attention by the hon. member of Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), the work is enormous, and the legal complexities that this officer has to deal with are by no means inconsiderable. This gentleman was a lawyer who had gone overseas in the Expeditionary Force, and he had eventually been transferred to these duties, because they were important, and he was very well qualified to fulfil them. I must confess I should gravely doubt whether there is any room for the criticism which my hon. friend has put forward, but we will make some inquiries. It is most undesirable, I am sure my hon. friend will agree, that men who have been taken from the best communities in this country, men having as good a status and as good a reputation as any man in this House, should be subjected to undeserved aspersions, and I am not disposed to accept them unless some better evidence is brought to my attention. Colonel Ross is a man at the head of his profession.

Mr. ROSS: That is a good name.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is a good name, and it deserves better treatment from my hon. friend from West Middlesex than to have aspersions cast upon it without sufficient evidence. Colonel Ross, so far as my information goes, is a man of the highest character. He is the best man that the then Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) could find for the very important duties which are entrusted to him. He has gone over to England, and so far as I could observe, he has discharged those duties with the utmost fidelity, ability and energy. I hope my hon. friend will not take for granted all those rumours, some of which have come to my attention through the press. It is the easiest thing in the world to exaggerate rumours, and, of course, they acquire a considerable importance when they are quoted by a member of the House. I have no information that would lead me to suppose that they are correct.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I admit frankly that in 1915 the Pay and Records Office was all upside down. I then appointed a very prominent auditor who put things in proper shape. I later on appointed Colonel Ross to go over and take charge. Later on the Auditor General went over, expecting to find something wrong, but he reported that things were, to his surprise, in ship-shape order. The reason for the trouble to which my hon. friend refers is this. There is more or less truth about the mistakes being made because many of the clerks are soldiers who, after having served at the front and having been wounded, have returned to England and are employed in the Pay and Record Office to take the place of men who have become convalescent and fit for service again, and have gone to the front. These lads require two or three weeks training in order to learn the business. That is the condition that I found last year was the chief cause of the trouble, namely, these men making mistakes before they understood the routine of the work.

Mr. ROSS: I would not want the Prime Minister to think I was endeavouring to cast any aspersion on any persons, nor that I would make the statement that I have made on information I have personally. I must candidly say, however, that I have heard statements to the effect that I have described, made, not once nor twice, but many times, by officers of high standing in the Canadian Expeditionary Force of just as good character and just as reliable as even the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I hope the statements are not true. If the matter is looked into, and if the Prime Minister will kindly furnish me the information for which I have asked with regard to the encumbering of that branch

with an excessive number of employees, I would like to have it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: My hon. friend does not impute any dishonesty on the part of the employees?

Mr. ROSS: Not at all, but statements have been made to the effect that the department is over-manned.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to bring to the attention of the House the information which I have here bearing on the subject that was under discussion a few minutes ago in regard to the number of unfit men in England and how they got there. Dr. Bruce's report, which has been laid upon the Table and which is a public document, begins with this statement:

> Many hundreds of soldiers obviously unfit for service overseas have been sent from Canada to England.

The report of Dr. Jones, who was in charge of the medical service, and on the discharge of whose duties Dr. Bruce reported, says:

> There is no question of doubt that a large number of men have been sent over from Canada who must have been medically unfit when they were enlisted. This has resulted in an unnecessary burden being thrown on the medical and other services in England that deal with the weeding out of these men and their disposal.

The report of the Babtie Commission which investigated Dr. Bruce's report deals with the same subject also in its first paragraph.

> The Board is agreed that large numbers of soldiers have come, and continue to come, from Canada who are unfit for service at the front.

Dr. Bruce's report is dated September 20, 1916; Surgeon-General Jones' report, September 28, 1916, and the Babtie report December 22, 1916. So the different authorities are absolutely agreed upon the existence of the condition, and they all agree that it is very far-reaching. I have an opinion here which I shall take the liberty of reading to the House as to how far-reaching this condition is. It alleges that:

> The number of soldiers arriving in England from Canada physically unfit for service at the front is steadily growing.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: What report is that?

Mr. OLIVER: This is not a report. It is information that I have at hand and is dated October 27, 1916. It goes on:

> In the case of twelve battalions recently arrived the number has reached the serious proportion of over 16 per cent. The medical examination of these men has shown that the great majority of them have for a long time been suffering from obvious physical disabilities and should never have been enlisted. These unfits by reason of their disabilities form an undue proportion of the patients in hospitals in England, and are thus placing a heavy strain on the medical service. They present a very serious question from the pensions point of view owing to the very great difficulty of establishing the facts as to whether the disabilities were the result of, or aggravated by military service. These men who are not suitable for active military service are nevertheless capable of productive work in Canada, and practically all of them were taken from productive work in Canada and enlisted in military service for which they are useless at enormous expense to the Government, so that not only has the value of their labour been lost to the country, but they have been a heavy charge during their period of service without giving any return.

The Babtie report not only agrees with the Bruce and the Jones reports as to the conditions existing, but gives the reasons why those conditions exist, and this is a matter which I think should be placed before the House and the country.

> The Board is satisfied that there have been large numbers of men passed who ought not to have been passed by the medical officers, but it was, perhaps inevitable under the circumstances of raising the Canadian Expeditionary Force that examinations could not be conducted with all the care necessary. This it believes to have been due partly to inexperience on the part of examining medical officers, partly to hurry, partly to carelessness, and lastly, in some instances, to the opinion of the examining medical officer being overridden or ignored by commanding officers. These defects in recruiting continue to exist, despite medical examinations by recruiting medical officers, by battalion medical officers on joining units, and before sailing for the United Kingdom.

To show the extent to which this improper passing of the medically unfit has taken place, I will cite an instance or two from the Bruce report, which I think the House will find somewhat startling. Dr. Bruce gives a number of pages of unfits where the cases are described by name, regimental number, and place of enlistment. The first one I will cite is:

> No. 602397, Pte. W. J. Clements of the 34th Battalion, age 80 years, 79 years when enlisted at Guelph, March 19, 1915. Disability, advanced hardening of the arteries, examined by Major Ratz, Guelph.

The other case is:

> Pte. R. Mick No. 297454, enlisted with 224th Battalion March 17, 1916, at Pembroke, Ont. He is 16 years of age, weighs 80 pounds only, undeveloped and weak muscles in the right hip and thigh. He was passed by a doctor at Pembroke and was again examined and passed by a military medical officer at Quebec. On both occasions he says he was stripped and passed as medically fit. He left Canada three

weeks after enlistment and has been in a hospital in England most of the time since arriving, suffering from his legs.

I again draw attention to the Babtie report, which says:

The inefficent character of the medical examination in some instances is due to the opinion of the examining medical officer being overridden or ignored by commanding officers.

I think the evidence there is absolute that the commanding officer was exercising his authority not as a military man but as a man having political pull. We have in that fact a very great part of the reason why recruiting conditions in Canada are as they are. Certainly we have the evidence of the Babtie Commission that that is one large part of the reason why we are carrying on the military strength in England to-day thousands, if not tens of thousands, of men who are absolutely unfit for military service.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The 224th Battalion which my hon. friend mentioned is commanded, I believe, by one of the best Grits in the Dominion.

Mr. OLIVER: It makes no difference who commands it. The point is what he did.

Mr. HANNA: How would he get his political pull if he was a Grit?

Mr. OLIVER: I cannot answer that.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I think his name is Alec McDougall.

Mr. OLIVER: It makes no difference what his name is. In that particular case it might have been because the medical officer got his appointment by political pull, and was incompetent, or as the Babtie report says, "in a hurry or careless."

Sir SAM HUGHES: It might also be that he was one of the 80 per cent of Grit doctors appointed.

Mr. OLIVER: It makes no difference whether they were Grit doctors or Grit colonels. This Government is responsible, and the Minister of Militia is directly responsible, for the conduct of our military forces. That is the condition that exists and that has existed, and the Government and the Minister of Militia are responsible for it. And out of that condition grows—as it of necessity must grow—the dissatisfaction with the management of our military affairs, which, again, results in the depression of military enthusiasm that we find throughout the country at the present time.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That was my work last year in England—to get this medical business on as satisfactory a basis as I could.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not finding fault with the former minister's efforts to make things right. I say that study of the Bruce report shows that Dr. Bruce was most energetic, and, so far as a layman can judge from reading it, most efficient. What may have been the family troubles in the Government I am not prepared to say, but, apparently, Dr. Bruce's report was not allowed to come into effect. He was investigated, and the result of that investigation was the Babtie report, and Dr. Bruce is not in the service of the Dominion of Canada to-day.

Mr. BLAIN: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) is well acquainted with conditions in the Edmonton district. Does he know of cases of this political influence of which he speaks in that district?

Mr. OLIVER: I am not here to answer questions about the conditions in Edmonton.

Mr. BLAIN: But the hon. gentleman is making a charge that it was because of political influence that a large number of men got past the local medical officers. So, I ask if he knows anything about political pull having been used in his own district concerning which he is well informed. My information is that the medical officers generally did not belong to the political party of the Government, but rather to the other party.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not discussing matters in Edmonton. I brought up two instances, one in Guelph and the other in Pembroke. It was not necessary to refer to Edmonton; I think that perhaps the same conditions did not exist there. But, looking over the Bruce report I found such scandalous cases as those to which I have referred. I am not discussing the locality, but the fact as reported. I am not giving my opinion to the House, I am giving the statements made in the report of the Babtie Commission, which shows that certain conditions existed partly because of the inefficiency of the medical men, or, possibly, because of the decisions of the medical men, being overridden by the commanding officers. I say this is a condition for which the military administration of the Dominion must accept full responsibility. I bring it to the attention of the Minister of Militia on this occasion, and

I hope we shall hear further from him with regard to it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Before the committee rises, I have a suggestion to make. This Bill has been under discussion for two weeks. To-day's sitting has been quite argumentative, and yesterday's was exhausting. I understand that a great number of members are out of town. It seems to me therefore ,that we might well postpone further consideration of this Bill until Monday morning and, for the balance of the week, take up other business. I think that, on the whole, our progress will be just as great. And possibly the Prime Minister might consider the suggestion of an adjournment now.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Along similar lines, I was going to take the liberty of suggesting that members who have suggestions to make for changes in the Bill might make them in writing to the Minister of Militia, or to the Minister of Justice for their consideration, and so avoid taking up more time than is necessary with discussion in this committee. My object is to get on with the Bill with the least possible delay. Let us get through the Bill as soon as we can. If my suggestion were adopted, progress would be made with the Bill even though the consideration of it in this committee were not proceeded with until Monday.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Has my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) opposite anything to suggest?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I hope that the Prime Minister will be content to have the House adjourn now.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am quite prepared to go on this evening, and so far as I am concerned. I should be glad to do so. At the same time, I do not wish to insist upon my own view. To-day we have not touched any of the clauses of the Bill, the time having been occupied with general discussion—and I suppose that general discussion is necessary, though much of what has gone on this afternoon has not been relevant to the Bill. I am prepared to adjourn now. I should like to go on tomorrow, and especially to get through with clauses of the Bill that are not controversial. There must be some of a formal character which might be passed, and thus some progress would made. If we come to clauses which are controversial or as to which information is desired, they can be allowed to stand for the time being.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There will be just a general consideration of the Bill to-morrow, I suppose?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should prefer that those clauses that are not controversial should be passed, I should like to make some progress with the Bill which has been before the House every day for two weeks. With that understanding, I am willing that the House should adjourn.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

Saturday, July 7, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Progress Report Manitoba Hydrometric Survey for calendar year 1915.—Hon. Mr. Roche.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 103, concerning the payment of salaries or wages of employees of railway companies.—Mr. Boys.

PRIVILEGE—MR. PUGSLEY.

On the Orders of the day:

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question of privilege which arises out of some observations made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), on the 6th of June, in connection with a certain investigation of the affairs of the Central Railway Company of New Brunswick. These remarks were made upon a motion which was made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers). The right hon. the Prime Minister alleged that I had made an infinitely stronger attack upon Mr. Justice Landry than the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) had, in a letter to the Prime Minister, made upon Mr. Justice Galt. The Prime Minister also made some remarks with regard to the course which he said had been taken to prevent proper inquiry at that time. My statement will take some little time and I have no desire to delay the House upon the discussion of the Military Service Bill; but I realize that if one delays too long he is not allowed to bring up a question of privilege. If it could be understood that there would be no prejudice from the delay, that my rights would stand as they are now, I should be willing

to let the matter stand until the Military Service Bill is out of committee.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think that is a very reasonable request, and it should certainly be granted.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

CONSIDERATION OF THE BILL IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE.

House in committee on Bill No. 75, respecting Military Service.—Sir Robert Borden (Resumed from Friday, July 6.)

Mr. RAINVILLE in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I beg the indulgence of the committee while I refer to a statement which was made in my absence from the House yesterday by the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes). On page 3200 of Hansard he is reported as follows:

> The Finance Minister also on one occasion asked me if I did not think it proper that we should let up. He thought Canada had done her full share in sending men to help England. I pointed out that we were not helping England, but helping the Empire and the cause of human liberty. This conversation was not conducted in the presence of the Prime Minister, but witnesses can be had in large numbers in the city of Toronto to whom the Finance Minister made the same statement.

I am sorry I was not present yesterday afternoon in order that I might have given a prompt and emphatic denial to that statement. I desire to say that it is fiction pure and simple, that it is wholly and absolutely untrue in every particular, and without the slightest foundation in substance or in fact. I desire to say further that no such conversation ever took place or could have taken place, because the sentiments attributed to me are entirely incompatible with my known views with regard to the war, and my official conduct during its progress. During the fall of 1915 and the early part of 1916, it was brought to the attention of the Government—I should say to the attention of nearly all the members of the Government—that in certain districts in which recruiting had been brisk, vital industries such as coal mining, iron and steel, agriculture, and the munitions industry, were suffering by reason of the fact that the recruiting was not in any degree selective; that is to say, that skilled mechanics were being recruited, and that it was not possible to replace them because of the long training required to qualify a man in those trades. I received many communications upon the subject, both orally and by letter, and in order that this matter may not depend upon the statement of the ex-Minister of Militia upon the one hand and of myself upon the other, I desire to read a letter which I found this morning among my correspondence of the early part of 1916, which substantially sets forth the views I had at that time respecting recruiting. Before reading it I desire to say—although I do not think it is necessary that I should say it to this House—that I have always been in favour of this country putting forth the utmost of her effort in recruiting, in order that our military strength at the front should be as great as possible, that we might play our part with increasing vigour until this war was successfully concluded.

The letter which I shall read is as follows:

> Ottawa, February 19th, 1916.
>
> Dear Mr. Harmer,—
>
> I am obliged for yours of the 17th instant enclosing a copy of your letter to Mr. Flavelle, which I have read with much interest. The questions raised have been before us for some time but are exceedingly difficult of solution as you will, I am sure, realize. According to the British authorities the great need is for men and more men. If we discourage men in one or more callings from going to the front would it not tend to discourage recruiting generally? I am aware of the force of the arguments presented as I have canvassed them many times during the past few months. There is a point beyond which over-recruiting weakens the strength of a nation for a long drawn-out struggle. On the other hand, if an early and complete decision could be obtained it would appear better to sacrifice production to a certain extent and make the strongest possible effort in the field. I have great confidence in the situation adjusting itself with the exercise of reasonable discretion on the part of the Militia Department. You may depend upon it we shall do what we can here to keep the nation strong and at the same time put forth our best efforts in the field.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> W. T. White.
>
> R. Harmer, Esq.,
> President, Sawyer-Massey Company, Limited,
> Hamilton, Ontario.

I had the view, during the concluding stages of voluntary recruiting, that the essential industries were being crippled to a certain extent by the enlisting of skilled mechanics, some of whom—I do not say all of whom—could have rendered better service, or as good service, in connection with the prosecution of the war, possibly, as if they had enlisted, although I am the first to say that I admire above all the man who enlists and goes forward to the front. Nevertheless in certain industries which are vital it is necessary, in my judgment, that a certain selection should be

exercised; in other words I have always had the view that the proper course for a nation to pursue in time of war is to adopt selective compulsory military service, such as is provided for in this Bill?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Always?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My right hon. friend asks, "Always." I said the other day in this House that while I had realized that the voluntary enlistment system was unjust, in that it cast the burden of the war upon the most patriotic, at the same time, I had desired that we should not resort to compulsory service until the national need was clearly apparent, as it is at the present time, as I desired that we should maintain national unity in this country and the appearance of unity before the world. That is all, Mr. Chairman, that I desire to say upon the subject.

On section 1—Short Title: Definitions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This section does not require any comment, at all events so far as I am concerned, but I will observe to my right hon. friend that the Army Act is made a part of this Bill.

This section says:

"The Army Act" means the Army Act for the time being in force in the United Kingdom and all regulations and orders made under the authority thereof.

It would be not only convenient, but I should think indispensable, that we should have the Army Act before us. A copy of the Act has been placed upon the table of the House, I think, but nobody has seen it and nobody can form any opinion about it. If it is to be part of the law, it should certainly be produced for the convenience of members in discussing the measure.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is only made part of this Act in so far as it is applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Certainly, but the part that is applicable ought to be made public. There is one part of the Act which is part of the law which we are going to enact, and I think it should be printed with the Act itself. In the meantime we should have it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I might say that the Army Act has for many years been applicable in this country, just in the same way; the Militia Act has made it applicable.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But my right hon. friend will remember that the Militia Act was not resorted to, but this Act is to come into force and very lively too. If there are provisions in the Army Act applicable to this Act, it is only right that all should go together.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I quite agree with the right hon. leader of the Opposition that it is very desirable that we should have the Army Act before us. I think we ought also to have the regulations which were referred to by the Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp) yesterday. He made a statement which surprised me very much—that under those regulations, if a man enlisted was able to pay $50 he would be able to purchase his discharge. I should like to see those regulations. We ought to have them. I understand there are certain provisions for the punishment of deserters. I believe the Army Act provides for the execution of a deserter. I am not sure and perhaps my hon. friend can tell me as to that. Looking at this Bill, I find there are different provisions, and one is that a deserter may be tried by court martial, and punished by imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years. The subsection reads:

On summary conviction to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three years.

It is important to determine whether that would over-ride the provisions of the Army Act, which provide for execution—a deserter is liable to be shot, under the provisions of the Army Act. I do not know whether this would over-ride the Army Act, but it is a matter to be considered quite carefully.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The King's Regulations and Orders for the Army for Canada, approved in Canada, are the regulations under which a man, heretofore, has been able to purchase his discharge for $15. More recently the amount was raised to $50. It is the intention that the provisions that deserters are punishable by imprisonment for three years shall over-ride the provisions of the Army Act which provide a much more drastic punishment. The law heretofore has made desertion punishable by the very extreme penalty mentioned by the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Pugsley).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it the intention that this regulation, which allows a conscript or a recruit to buy his discharge, shall be applicable under this Bill? Will the conscript be able to avoid conscription by paying $50 and getting a substitute?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then the regulations are included, I understand, and under the regulations, as stated by the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), a recruit can purchase his discharge for $50. It was $15 when the war began, but it has now changed to $50. It is provided here that these regulations are part of the law. This means that under this regulation the conscript can purchase his discharge and hire a substitute for $50. Is that right?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Even to-day a man is not entitled as of right to purchase his discharge. There are certain conditions under which the purchase of a discharge may be allowed, which conditions provide for the payment of $50. Under this Bill he has no right whatever to enforce the purchase of his discharge for $50 or any other sum.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Under the regulation he cannot claim his discharge as of right on payment of $50. But he can apply for it, and his application can be granted or refused on conditions which are dependent, I suppose, on the will of the minister of the department. It would be the same under this Bill, I suppose?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no provision in this Act for it. It is a question whether the regulations and orders bearing upon such cases would be applicable under this law. A man is entitled to apply for discharge, but he would not be entitled to get it as of right. Until I am familiar with the conditions which apply to such a case and which have heretofore enabled a man to get his discharge, I cannot say whether it should be possible to grant such a discharge under this Act. I do not see that the matter is of any force.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is of great force.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not a matter of right; it is entirely within the jurisdiction of the militia authorities.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is a very serious matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be serious if a man could purchase his discharge as of right; but he is not able to do so, and certainly will not be able to under this Act.

Mr. DEVLIN: What are the conditions under which he may purchase his discharge?

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot name the conditions under which he has heretofore been able to purchase it. If those conditions were such as to enable the purchase under this Act they would not apply, because the regulations would prevent their applying. I myself do not know any reason why the same condition should not obtain in one case as in the other, because in neither case is it a matter of right.

Mr. DEVLIN: Can the Minister of Militia or any member of the Government not inform the House as to the conditions under which a man may purchase his discharge?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: These matters will come up for consideration when we take up the clause which adopts the Army Act. They do not properly come under the clause that we are now considering.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it would properly come up for consideration now, in view of the statement of the Minister of Militia yesterday that quite a number of those who had enlisted purchased their discharge for the sum of $50. We should be informed with regard to that. My own view is that the regulation that applies to those who have already enlisted ought to apply to those who may be taken under this Bill. I object most strongly to any kind of discrimination against those who are to be taken by force. The Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) some little time ago stated that members of the Civil Service were to be discriminated against; that those who had not enlisted were guilty of non-recognition of their duty and were to be paid on a different basis. In other words, they were to be treated as if they were members of a degraded conscript army. Perhaps that is a necessary result of having voluntary enlistment for two and a half years or more and then resorting to compulsory service. The Government ought to treat those who will go to the front under this law no less favourably than it has treated those who have already enlisted. I am surprised, therefore, that the Solicitor General should say that the regulation providing for discharge on the payment of $50 will not apply to those who are conscripted. The Solicitor General says that the obtaining of discharge upon payment of a certain sum is not a matter of right. If that is so, it is all the worse, because under previous regulations anybody who was permitted to have his discharge might be released from the service on the payment of $15. Many a poor boy might

be able to raise $15—but the Government raised the fee to $50. I suppose the intention was to make it more difficult for a man to obtain discharge and to make those who desired to obtain their discharge feel the burden of the payment of $50. Whoever explains this matter to the committee ought to be able to state why the fee was raised from $15 to $50. It strikes me that this was a most extraordinary action on the part of the Government. However, under that provision a certain number of men who had enlisted were allowed to purchase their discharge. The committee ought to be made acquainted with those regulations and to have some information as to the conditions under which these men were allowed to buy their discharge and the general conditions which governed the actions of the Militia Department in that respect.

Mr. ROSS: There is a provision in the Militia Act which gives a man who is subject to its terms the right to buy a substitute. If the Militia Act is to read in conjunction with the present law and there is nothing in the present law which is inconsistent with that provision in the Militia Act, I assume that that provision will still remain the law of the land. The result will be that a man of wealth will be able, under the Militia Act, to buy his freedom from service to his country. It seems to me that that should not be permitted. I should like to know whether the Solicitor General interprets the law as I have pointed out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If this clause of the Militia Act is not one of those which are specifically negatived in this Bill, it is because it does not apply under the Bill as it stands. At all events, it is the intention that it shall not apply.

Mr. DEVLIN: Would it not be just as well to insert in the Bill a clause to that effect, so that there would be no doubt about the matter?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My impression is that the section of the Militia Act which provides for this is one of those specifically negatived in this Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If the Militia Act is made part of this Bill and if the Militia Act provides that a conscript can buy his discharge, a man should certainly do so under this Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think so, because the Militia Act is made part of the Bill only in so far as it is applicable and not inconsistent therewith. This Bill specifically says that a man in a certain class on a certain date becomes a member of the militia. It is utterly inconsistent with that provision to say that a man may make another instead of himself a member of the militia. I know that it was contemplated in the preparation of this Bill that that clause of the Militia Act should be specifically negatived. I understand now that it is not one of those specifically negatived; that is because such a clause is clearly inconsistent with this Act and could not apply.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it is not inconsistent, because under the Militia Act a man had to be drafted before he could purchase a substitute. So, under this Act, he would have to be enrolled, and the provisions of the Militia Act enabling him to purchase a substitute would clearly apply and be in no way inconsistent with this law.

Mr. ROSS: I cannot follow the Solicitor General's argument; I do not think it is logical. A man who comes under the provisions of this Act becomes enrolled under the Militia Act, and it is not inconsistent to say that under this Act after he has become conscripted he can buy himself off. There is no inconsistency at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are discussing the definition of certain expressions used in the Act. When we come to section 13, which deals with the application of the Militia Act, it may be proper to include this among the sections specifically negatived. It is not the intention of this Act that substitution by payment shall be allowed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This discussion arose out of an observation I made that we should have before us the Army Act and the regulations made under it, and at once we see the importance of my request. Under this measure the Army Act and the regulations made under it are intended to become part of the law of Canada, and therefore it is important that we should know the provisions of the Army Act and those regulations. On this point I find that section 81 of the British Army Act says:

> If a recruit within three months after the date of his attestation pays for the use of His Majesty a sum not exceeding £10, he shall be discharged with all convenient speed, unless he claims such discharge during a period when soldiers in army service who otherwise would be transferred to the reserves are re-

quired by a proclamation of His Majesty in pursuance of this Act to continue in army service—

This is made part of the Bill, and therefore we should have before us the Army Act and the regulations when we come to discuss section 13.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not made part of this Bill in the way in which my right hon. friend suggests; it is made part of this Bill in so far as it is applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Exactly, it is made part of the Bill in so far as recruiting is concerned. Suppose you make the levy, and men are recruited, the Army Act is quite germane to the subject. The recruit might say: Under the Army Act I can purchase my discharge; I do not want to serve; here is my money; free me. I do not see that there is any inconsistency.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will take that into consideration. I see by the Militia Act, as revised by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and re-enacted in 1904, this provision:

The Army Act for the time being in force in the United Kingdom, the King's regulations, and all other laws applicable to His Majesty's troops in Canada and not inconsistent with this Act or the regulations made thereunder, shall have force and effect as if they had been enacted by the Parliament of Canada for the government of the militia.

That is section 74 of the Militia Act as it has been in force since 1904. I do not recall that my right hon. friend printed the Army Act at the time that Bill was under discussion. But I will take into consideration his request, as he is naturally more concerned about the matter now than he was then.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Exactly. I do not recall that we printed the Army Act then. I do not know that my right hon. friend asked that it be printed. But the circumstances in 1904 were different from those in 1917, because now we are passing a law which must be of immediate application, as my right hon. friend said it would be applied.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The British Military Service Act makes applicable their Army Act and does not specifically negative the provisions referred to by my right hon. friend. At the same time, no man can purchase his discharge under the British Military Service Act. But, coming to the point raised by my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), if the section of the Militia Act to which he refers were to apply, it would clearly be inconsistent with this Act. Subsection 2 of section 27 of the Militia Act, says:

Any man balloted or notified for service may, at any time, be exempt until again required in his turn to serve, by furnishing an acceptable substitute, on or before the day fixed for his appearance.

The men here are not balloted or notified for service; a man could not release himself from his liability.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is that an answer, that under this measure men are not ballotted?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, because the section I have quoted applies only to men balloted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: By this Bill you do not ballot, but every man is made a conscript, or he has to prove that he is exempt.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How could a man come forward and say he is entitled to furnish a substitute under this Bill, because the Militia Act says that he may furnish a substitute? Under this measure he is not balloted.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Under the present law, on the payment of $50 the Government has granted discharges to men who have enlisted and sworn to serve the King. The Solicitor General says that that provision will not be applicable to those who are hereafter enlisted under the Military Service measure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not said that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understood the Solicitor General to argue that discharges would not be given.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never said that at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did not the Solicitor General say that because, under the Militia Act, men are balloted for and, by reason of being balloted for, they become liable to service, therefore the provision for hiring a substitute, or the provision in the regulations allowing a man to buy his discharge for $50, would not apply to a man who enlisted under the Military Service Act? If that is so, we would, as I said before, have one law for those who have enlisted voluntarily and another law for those who are conscripted. That would be very objectionable. If it is the intention not to allow the procuring of a substitute, or dis-

charge on payment of a certain sum, there should be a section in the Bill clearly covering those matters.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have already pointed out that that will come up under section 13, and, if it is not perfectly plain, it will be made so. The matter does not come under this section which deals with definitions.

Mr. DEVLIN: The Solicitor General distinctly said a few minutes ago that a man, not as a matter of right, but under certain conditions, could purchase his discharge. Now he says that he cannot do so because the law is changed and there is no ballot. Which statement is correct? Can a man purchase his discharge conditionally, or can he not?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend will read the remarks in Hansard, he will understand the matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member is mixing the two cases up. What I referred to was the furnishing of a substitute. That applies only to balloted men.

Mr. TURRIFF: From the present discussion, it is not at all clear whether a man will have the right to purchase a discharge or not, or whether he will have the right to furnish a substitute or not. If the Bill does not make the matter clear, will the Solicitor General have the Bill amended so as to make it clear?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have twice said that we would make that clear when we came to section 13, if it is not already clear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We will take it on trust till then.

Mr. DEVLIN: I would suggest that section 1 should stand in the meantime until we have considered section 13.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really do not see any occasion for section 1 to stand; it deals with definitions.

Mr. DEVLIN: There is a great deal of doubt as to the meaning of the section, and as it is a defining section, it should be perfectly clear.

Mr. MARCIL: The Minister of Militia stated yesterday that in the early stages of the war 1,248 men had been discharged by purchase, at first for $15 and later for $50. He gave no reasons why these men were discharged after having enlisted, and the committee is entitled to some explanation on this point.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Militia gave the only explanation that was possible, I think. I am informed that the reasons in each case were of a special character; such a case, for instance, as that of a man with a family who has had the misfortune to lose his wife—they were chiefly cases of a compassionate nature.

Mr. MARCIL: Would a man be permitted to purchase his discharge under this Act under similar conditions?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think there should be any general provision of that nature, but we can discuss that under section 13.

Mr. OLIVER: Yesterday we were discussing the administration of the Militia Department. I do not know that the discussion was altogether in order, but it having been begun, I for one am prepared to continue it. At the same time I do not wish to interfere with the discussion of the clauses of the Bill. I observe that neither the Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp) nor the Parliamentary Secretary of the Department (Mr. McCurdy) is present, so I presume the Government do not wish to have a discussion of the administration of the department at this moment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it would hardly be well to have a discussion of that kind on a clause which deals purely with definitions, but there is probably some other clause in the Act on which my hon. friend could take this matter up. The Minister of Militia is unavoidably absent. He is, of course, much more familiar with the administration of his department than I am and I should like him to be present when my hon. friend takes the matter up.

Mr. OLIVER: I quite appreciate that. Personally, I did not think the discussion was in order yesterday.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not think so, either.

Mr. OLIVER: But it having been begun, I feel that we have the right to continue it, and if we drop the discussion now I should like it to be understood that we shall have an opportunity of resuming it at a later date on some other clause of the Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I hope that can be arranged. I will speak to the Minister of Militia about it.

Mr. TURRIFF: I wish to discuss, on some clause of the Bill, the matter of sending parcels to prisoners of war in Germany, and

the unsatisfactory handling of this business by the Red Cross so far as Canada is concerned. I do not wish to discuss this question now, unless it is quite convenient to the Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it would be better to discuss it on some other occasion. It would be proper to bring the matter up, for instance, on a motion to go into Committee of Supply, if that would suit my hon. friend.

Mr. TURRIFF: I should prefer the Minister of Militia to be present.

The CHAIRMAN: This discussion is quite irrelevant.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We shall have an opportunity of discussing this matter when the Minister of Militia is here. If it relates to postal facilities I think it would be well for the Postmaster General also to be present. We will see that they are both present at some time that will be convenient to my hon. friend.

Mr. DEVLIN: I would suggest that this section stand until we have considered section 13. I cannot conscientiously vote for this section without understanding it. I do not understand it, and the Government does not understand it either.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This section will have no effect until section 13 is carried. I should be very glad to accede to my hon. friend's request, but I can see no reason for it whatever.

On section 2—persons liable for service:

2. (1) Every male British subject who comes within one of the classes described in section three of this Act, and who,—

(a) is ordinarily resident in Canada; or

(b) has been at any time since the fourth day of August, 1914, resident in Canada,

shall be liable to be called out as hereinafter provided on active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force for the defence of Canada, either in or beyond Canada, unless he

(a) comes within the exception set out in the Schedule; or

(b) reaches the age of forty-five before the class or subclass to which he belongs, as described in section three is called out.

Such service shall be for the duration of the present war and of demobilization after the conclusion of the war.

(2) Nothing in this Act shall prevent any man from voluntarily enlisting in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, so long as voluntary enlistment in such force is authorized.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The section says: "so long as voluntary enlistment in such force is authorized." Does that mean that the Government intend to pass an order preventing voluntary enlistment?

[Mr. Turriff.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is merely precautionary. There is no such proposal in contemplation at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not leave the words out then?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was thought desirable to include these words from the standpoint of good drafting.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the reason for the difference between the language of this section and the language of the Militia Act? This section says:—

Every male British subject who comes within one of the classes described in section three of this Act and who,—

(a) is ordinarily resident in Canada; or

(b) has been at any time since the fourth day of August, 1914, resident in Canada.

Section 10 of the Militia Act says:—

All the male inhabitants of Canada, at the age of eighteen years and upwards, and under sixty, not exempt or disqualified by law, and being British subjects, shall be liable to service in the militia.

I need not say that it is always better to have uniformity in drafting except where something different is intended. Is this a better drafting than the language of the Militia Act? What is the meaning of this: "(b) has been at any time since the fourth day of August, 1914, resident in Canada?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are two differences. In the Militia Act, the word "inhabitants" is used as against the term "ordinarily resident" in this Act. In the Militia Act only those who at the date of the putting into force of section 10 were inhabitants were included in its operation. Under this Act all who have been ordinarily resident since the outbreak of the war are included. The reasons are these: The term "ordinarily resident" has a well-established judicial meaning. It is the term used in the British Military Service Act and has been defined throughout the operation of the Act there. I think that is a sufficient reason for the use of the words. I do not know of any special judicial interpretation of the word "inhabitant." But the main difference is that this Act is made to cover those who have been ordinarily resident since the outbreak of the war. It is felt that the Act should apply to all who have been ordinarily resident in Canada since that time, for the reason that if it were otherwise worded it would distinctly permit to escape some who were said to have gone from Canada for the purpose of avoiding anticipated military service. It was not thought well that the Act should not at

least apply to these persons, whatever means, if any, should be taken to enforce it as against them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why do you not use the word "domiciled?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: Again I repeat that the words "ordinarily resident" are in the British Act. I am satisfied they are in the New Zealand Act. They have been interpreted in many cases. Consequently we get the advantage of the interpretation in regard to exactly parallel cases in British countries. I quite agree that the word "domiciled" has a judicial meaning, but the term "ordinarily resident" has been found to be that used in such an Act as this.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I notice that every male British subject who comes within one of the classes described is liable to service. I understand that this would apply not only to born British subjects but to naturalized British subjects. Having regard to that circumstance, does not my hon. friend think an announcement should be made now of the policy of the Government in view of the statements made in this House, notably by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett), that the Government intended to present to Parliament during the present session a new Franchise Bill by which even naturalized British subjects will be debarred from the exercise of the franchise?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You would not believe it?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I cannot believe it, but it has been stated in this House by one of the most prominent members of the ministerial party and I think by one minister—if I mistake not the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) gave us a broad hint to that effect. In view of the fact that all British subjects, whether born British subjects, as nearly all of us are, or naturalized British subjects, are going to serve under this Bill, should the Government contemplate the passing of a law which will deprive those naturalized British subjects of their rights as citizens of this country?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend's imagination has run away with him judging from his reference to what has been said in this House on that subject. I can only say in reply to his inquiry that the subject has not been under consideration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And will not be?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Has not been.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And will not be?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I speak for the past, not for the future.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to be rude to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, but I heard distinctly—and if I had time I would lay my finger on it in Hansard—the hon. member for Calgary, in answer to a question which I interjected into the debate, declare that even French and Belgian reservists in Canada would be deprived of their votes by the new franchise law, and that all naturalized British subjects who belonged to countries where a military law could reach them from abroad should be disfranchised. So, my imagination is not at work at all, but my ears and my memory serve me well.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would advise my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) not to rely too much on what the hon. member for Calgary says, because he said, in the presence of the Prime Minister, that there would be no conscription law.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not remember that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And it is said that he said there would be civil war. Many things are said in these dog days.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am satisfied with the explanation given by the Solicitor General (Mr Meighen) that these words "ordinarily resident" are taken from some authority.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, from the Military Service Act of Great Britain.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is all right; the moment there is an interpretation for them I am quite satisfied, because when this Act is to be enforced we shall have a precedent. But, I come now to another consideration. Section 2 provides that every male British subject who comes within the class as described and who

> —reaches the age of forty-five before the class or subclass to which he belongs, as described in section three, is called out,

—shall be liable to service. I do not know whether my right hon. friend has heard of this or not but it has been represented to me that the age of 45 ought to be reduced to 35. The old provision was 18 to 45, but my right hon. friend has altered the "18" to "20" and for good reasons. I have been told that for similar reasons you should limit the age to 35. In the

olden time it was found by experience that men between the age of 18 and
4 p.m. 45 could bear the fatigue of military service, but the conditions of war have changed and everybody knows that the conditions of service to-day are far more severe than they were in the time of the wars of Napoleon. To-day a man is subjected to a far more severe strain in training, and especially in service, and I have been told—I give the information for what it is worth—that, while a man could serve up to 45 in the old days, under the present system of warfare the strain is more than he can endure. I submit the matter for the consideration of the Government. I should not be at all surprised if my right hon. friend has heard protests, as I have, against the limit being fixed at 45 instead of 35.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I acknowledge that there is a great deal of force in what my right hon. friend has said as to the capacity of a man above the age of 40 to endure the hardships of warfare as it is carried on at present. I agree that it is a perfectly open question as to whether we should go to the age of 45 in this measure. We thought it best to leave the Bill in this form for debate in the House. At one time I was rather inclined to think that we might adopt the very suggestion which my right hon. friend has made before we brought down the Bill; but there is no probability whatever, as I understand conditions in this country, of calling out the class of 45, or even 40, in order to provide the number of men authorized to be enlisted under this Bill; there would be sufficient men in the lower classes to provide the required number. There is, however, the consideration that there are certain purposes other than combatant services—because my right hon. friend has been speaking of combatant services—for which a great many men have been required and will be required in the future. It was that consideration that led us to leave the age as it is in the Bill. I quite agree as to the inadvisability of attempting to send men above 40 into the combatant service. In England the compulsory provision of the Act fixes the age at 41, but there is provision that men may be enlisted up to the age of 48 for voluntary service. There are, of course, exceptional cases. I remember one man from British Columbia who has been at the front for over a year, and who, I believe, was well up to 60 when he enlisted. He was a vonderfully well preserved man.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He must have been.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He had been an athlete and was wonderfully well preserved. They said that he had endured the hardship of trench warfare better than men half his age.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I hope my right hon. friend will reserve this clause.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought we might pass it with the understanding that if, upon the discussion of the next section where the question will definitely come up, we should reach the conclusion that an amendment should be made, we could return to this section.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If it is understood that we can take it up subsequently, I have no objection, but I would impress on my right hon. friend the advisability of limiting the age to less than 45, or even 35. I have had correspondence impressing the advisability of reducing the age.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Has my right hon. friend taken into account the consideration I have mentioned?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is, the use of men for service of a non-combatant nature—in the forestry corps, railway construction corps, labour corps, army service corps, medical service corps, and army transport. A man who is incapable of military service in the trenches may be able to perform one of these other services, as for example driving a motor, or performing work of a certain character in a lumber camp or in railway construction.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What you want is fighting men. That is the raison d'être of this Bill. I understand that in these days the fighting man has to be trained as an athlete is trained; he is made to carry enormous weights and to march long distances, and unless he is in the prime of life and health he cannot stand it. This view has been strongly recommended to me, and I submit it for the consideration of the Government. I intend to press my views later on when we return to this section.

Mr. MORPHY: In subsection A of section 2 we find the words: Every male British subject who

(a) is ordinarily resident in Canada; or
(b) has been at any time since the fourth day of August, 1914, resident in Canada.

Has any provision been made to reach the several thousands of young men who left this country since the war broke out? That is to say, is there any arrangement with adjoining governments whereby co-operation may be had and that class be reached? It seems to me it would be unfair to the young men who are here if the Government did not take some measures to get after those who left Canada, and also to prevent the manhood of Canada from leaving now.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: An Order in Council passed under the War Measures Act has been in force for several weeks to prevent people leaving Canada except with the consent of the authorities. No definite arrangement has been made with the United States Government pending the passing of this Bill. The subject, however, has been discussed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I notice that by the last paragraph it is enacted that such service shall be for the duration of the present war and of demobilization after the conclusion of the war. Has the Government any policy as to the mode of demobilization? I notice that in England Mr. Garvin, the well-known writer, has published a series of articles in the Observer with the object of calling the attention of the Government to the necessity of appointing a Minister of Reconstruction whose chief duties would be to look after the demobilization and the work resulting from demobilization. It may be premature to talk of demobilization now, but I mention it since my right hon. friend referred to it the other day in a way which I did not like, when he introduced his Bill. He really threatened those who are not in favour of conscription with the returned soldiers. I should like to know first if the soldiers are coming back to Canada with their arms, or if they will leave their arms in Europe when returning to Canada. To be serious, I shall read Mr. Garvin's views about demobilization. The article is as follows:

> Mr. Garvin urgently demands that consideration be given the problem of "making work" for the vast army of discharged soldiers. Daily needs make work, and this will continue while man fulfills his destiny on the planet. The returned men will continue consumers, will cease to destroy, and will become producers. In this connection Mr. Garvin seems to discern the economic paradox of want through too many able and willing hands ready to produce all things wanted—of destitution through overproduction. Many feel, clearly or dimly, the paradoxical fear that the turning of a great army from destruction to production will cause widespread want. Mr. Garvin's warning comes none too soon. Men in authority who think something should be done must be supplanted at once with men who know what must be done and have courage to do it. There is a ray of hope in the resumption of coal mining in Alberta. In other industries, too, the attitude of stupid helplessness must be ended. The needs of the men in the trenches have been supplied by the men and women at home. The return of these men to industries in which they supply their own wants can be made a calamity by governmental stupidity or a great relief by governmental capacity. Preparations for peace have certainly been delayed too long. Paralyzing timidity regarding the money of the profiteers and the votes of those whom they let work must be ended. A minister with a reconstruction policy is an immediate need.

The other day I was reading a little pamphlet on the establishment of labour bureaus in the various British commonwealths, and I was struck by the remarks of Mr. Layton, of the British Board of Trade. Speaking on the aftermath of the war, he said:—

> Clearly it is far easier to throw the industrial machine out of gear than to put it back in order again. Finally, history affords no precedent as to the immediate industrial aftermath of the war, but the destruction of wealth, the dislocation of markets, have been so general and on so large a scale that it is rash to assume on historical analogies, which are really inapplicable to the present situation, that trade will quickly be able to resume its normal conditions or that spending power in the form of either commerce or credit will at once be available for those who will have urgent need of material goods. Hence, the re-absorbtion of European armies together with the re-transference of those work-people who have been diverted to many occupations to produce guns and war equipment generally may be slow in process and will present our own, as well as European Governments with a problem in organization which will tax their utmost capacity.

Mr. Layton is speaking for the European countries, but, as we have an army which, in importance, is as much of an army as any of the European armies, the effect of their return to demobilization will be the same in Canada as in the warring countries. Has the Government taken any precautionary measures for the return of those soldiers? It is a well accepted fact that nearly all of our industries, from one end of the country to the other, are producing for war purposes only. As soon as peace is concluded and demobilization begins, concomitant with the return of our soldiers to the industries of this country, the vast army of workers in the war industries of Canada will be out of work. Then what will happen, with soldiers returning by the thousands and hundreds of thousands to resume work, simultaneously

with men going out from establishment dedicated only to war industry? The reason I mention this is that I would like to have a declaration from the Government of their policy on this question. I think it is very important. No two men meet on the street to-day without speaking of the effect of demobilization on the Canadian industries and Canadian labour.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The question which my hon. friend has brought up has engaged the attention of the Government. More than that, it has engaged the attention of the Imperial War Conference. Some of the resolutions which have not yet been made public relate to the two questions which he has mentioned and which might be summed up as the demobilization of the soldiers from military activities, and their mobilization to civil life. So far as the military side of it is concerned, I am under the impression that the Minister of the Overseas Service has appointed a board to deal with it. Certain principles were laid down—I cannot refer to them at the moment—and were accepted by the Government of all the overseas dominions as embodying the right course to adopt with respect to demobilization; with respect to the activities of the troops during the period which may intervene after the conclusion of the war and before they can be transported to the country from which they came, and with respect to the places from and to which the should be conveyed, the manner of their conveyance, and the probable time that it should occupy. I hope hon. gentlemen of this House will realize that it is going to be a very great task to bring 300,000 men, with all their equipment, across the Atlantic. If a ship capable of conveying a thousand men could sail every week day for a year, it would just about accomplish the task, and the capacity of the railways of Canada to convey them to their several destinations must also be taken into account. They must not arrive so rapidly that they cannot be transported. Referring to the difficulty to which my hon. friend alludes, of converting this country from war conditions into peace conditions, that question has, of course, engaged the attention of the Government. There is a resolution already before the House with regard to land settlement, upon which we hope to make some progress as soon as this Bill is passed. Measures are also being taken for vocational training of men. Many other activities have been contemplated, which I need not allude to more particularly at present. I am not at all sure that, in the two or three years immediately after the conclusion of this war, the difficulty as to industrial occupation will be as great as my hon. friend has suggested. That subject was very fully gone into in the Imperial War Conference and in the Imperial War Cabinet, and the question arose as to whether or not the industrial capacity of the world would be capable, within the desired time, of making the restoration that will be necessary in Northern France and in Belgium. Those who have not had statistics placed before them, and have not given close attention to the subject, will probably fail to realize what an enormous task it will be to restore Belgium and the northern districts of France to the condition in which they were before the war. I believe the effort to bring that about will pretty fully occupy the industrial capacity of the Allied nations for two or three years after the war. It may be that, after all, the condition after the war will not be of the character my hon. friend suggests. I only desire to say, for the moment, that these matters have been under consideration. Referring to the particular portion of my hon. friend's remarks relating especially to demobilization, the subject has engaged the attention of the Government, and has engaged the attention of all the dominions of the British Empire, and I think arrangements are being made which will be found satisfactory.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Since the subject has been broached, I might call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the fact that in 1915, before his death, Lord Kitchener and the War Office entered into an arrangement with the Board of Trade Labour Exchange Department for bringing the soldiers back to civil employment after peace is declared.

The following are the chief terms agreed upon:

Insurance policy against unemployment valid for a year.

Working furlough on full pay and allowance for four weeks during which separation allowance will continue to be paid.

Travelling warrants from place of disbandment home.

Money gratuities for services and awards on a scale to be fixed by Parliament.

Help in finding work.

The same applies to the men serving in the British navy. In the United States since the beginning of the war the Department of Labour have for the same purpose made arrangements for the establishing of labour bureaus and also in view of the

large immigration which is expected from the warring countries when peace shall have been made. The Government have received on this question a petition which is signed by the most prominent persons and the most prominent associations in the country. The question is being discussed all over Canada to-day: what will become of our soldiers and the workers in the various industries in Canada which are engaged in manufacturing munitions and war supplies when demobilization takes place? I am glad to say that all creeds and denominations have taken hold of this matter. Last year I attended a meeting, presided over by the Lord Bishop of the Anglican church in Montreal, at which I represented the Roman Catholic Bishop of Montreal. This matter was discussed at that meeting and a petition was sent to the Government. I have here a copy of that petition, which I will read if my hon. friend thinks it is proper to do so under the clause that we are now considering.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are some phases of this subject to which the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) have given special attention. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has suggested to me that he would like to say something on the subject when it is discussed, and perhaps my hon. friend would be good enough to let his remarks stand for the moment. We can find him a suitable opportunity of discussing it later.

Mr. MARCIL: Many more than 100,000 men will come under the provisions of this law. How will you select the required number?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are called out by classes.

Mr. MARCIL: Suppose there are more men in those classes than are required?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend has, perhaps, not observed a provision in the Bill which is designed to meet that difficulty. If we called out two or three classes we might get more than the necessary number of men. There is a provision that in calling out the classes regard can be had to age, so as to prevent any possibility of securing a number in excess of that which is authorized by the Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my right hon. friend will allow me, I wish to proceed with a few remarks that I have to make on the subject to which I have just referred. The Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Labour will, by reading the document that I am going to place on Hansard, be in a position to answer me later. At the meeting presided over by the Lord Bishop of the Anglican Church in Montreal, the important question of the effect of demobilization was discussed. As a result, the following petition was addressed to the Governor-General in Council:

Sir:—

The undersigned petitioners respectfully desire to lay before you and the members of the Government certain facts and reasons why it is desirable in the interests of the nation that a national system of labour bureaus be organized immediately.

According to the best authorities, the present devastating war will create in all belligerent countries, and even in neutral countries, new conditions for which there are no historical analogies that offer precedents for their solution, particularly in the readjustment of the commerical and industrial dislocation which will inevitably follow; the problems being national and interprovincial in character.

This Dominion of Canada, up to the summer of 1915, has been suffering from an increasingly acute period of unemployment, with consequent heavy congestion of the larger centres of population, which has been largely caused by the lack of a national organization for providing efficient machinery for distributing labour and immigration.

In addition to our present industrial and agricultural problems, conditions will beset Canada at the close of the war, that must be fully met if she is to take her proper place in the councils of the Empire; they are:

I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce especially to this:

1. Provision must be made for the employment of our soldiers on their return to civil life, who will number at least 200,000.

2. It is generally recognized there will be an influx of immigration when hostilities have ceased.

I must take exception to that statement. I do not see how immigration to Canada will be very large after the war. It will take some years to get the same influx that we had during the years preceding the war. (Reading):

3. The displacement of over 100,000 war equipment workers will accentuate the situation.

I think the number there should be greater than 100,000. I have heard it stated in this House that about 300,000 men were working in munition factories and other places where war supplies were being turned out. (Reading):

As an indication that to meet these new and complex problems our present machinery is lacking in completeness, we point out:

There are no standing records of the labour market, and no place to obtain them. The

statistics sent out by the Labour Department are largely made up from volunteer reports from labour unions and charitable societies, and we have no reliable knowledge of the amount of casual labour and seasonal work, the amount of wage earning time, and of idleness and its effect upon the worker; practically nothing is known of the dovetailing of trades, or how workers, either agricultural or industrial, carry over the dull seasons.

There is no co-operation between the education authorities and the Labour Department for the intelligent direction of the technical and industrial training of children with the consequence that thousands of boys and girls are sent out annually into the unskilled market of this country.

While the Government gives a bonus for the securing of agricultural and domestic workers no provision is made for their settlement, with the result that our cities are crowded each winter with a large body of immigrant unemployed.

Canada presents the anomaly of the immigrant mechanic not being recognized by the authorities, and no reliable information as to conditions and openings is procurable by him, though the Dominion has in the utilization of her natural resources become a manufacturing country, and the industrial worker is as essential to her progress as the agricultural.

No successful attempt has yet been made for the distribution of our large foreign immigration which has concentrated in large communities, both in the town and country, to an extent that it is well nigh impossible to inculcate principles of Canadian citizenship, and unless this is remedied, assimilation of British standards is impossible.

To meet such conditions Government Labour Bureau systems have been established in Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, the reports covering their administration and expansion indicate their great and growing usefulness in dealing with national problems.

It is believed by your memorialists that the cost of the system would be comparatively insignificant compared with the benefits realized from it by the workers, and the economic advantages gained by the whole nation.

Therefore we respectfully beg to suggest:

1. That legislation be enacted this session of Parliament providing for a permanent commission which will be responsible to Parliament to organize and administer a system of Labour Bureaus, the salient points to be:

(a) A commission or authority at Ottawa, with executive power over the whole Dominion.

(b) In the chief municipalities, a small local board representative of the city council, employers and labour, with power in the agricultural districts to co-opt a member of a Farmers' Association, with the agent of the central authority acting as secretary of the Board.

(c) A strict neutrality on the part of the Bureaus during strikes and lockouts.

(d) Co-operation with the educational authorities, for the better vocational and industrial training of children.

(e) Co-operation with all Government departments working towards the control and direction of labour and immigration, particularly the post office, in the franking of letters and the distribution of Bureaux literature.

(f) The officers appointed to carry out the system to be tested as to business efficiency and vocational fitness by a board of examiners.

(g) Where necessary separate waiting rooms shall be provided for men and women under proper supervision.

(h) Owing to the number of women engaged in industry, it is recommended that a woman be a member of the commission and local boards.

2. That your Government take such steps as they in their wisdom may deem expedient, in order that some immediate action be taken to ameliorate our present conditions and with greater efficiency and success meet the new conditions arising after the war.

This partly applies to immigration, it is true, but I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and of the Minister of Labour to the particular section of this petition which concerns the returned soldiers. This petition which was sent to His Royal Highness and to the Government is signed by Winnipeg Builders Exchange, Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council, Winnipeg Ministerial Association, Winnipeg District Board Sons of England, Boards of Trade for Timiskaming District, Fort William Board of Trade, Fort William Trades and Labour Council, Fort William City Council, Fort William Patriotic Fund, Port Arthur City Council, Port Arthur Board of Trade, Port Arthur Patriotic Fund, Port Arthur Trades and Labour Council, Guelph City Council, Guelph Trades and Labour Council, Hamilton Trades and Labour Council, Toronto Board of Control, Toronto Board of Trade, Toronto Builders' Exchange, Ottawa City Council, Ottawa Board of Trade, Ottawa Builders' Exchange, Montreal City Council, Montreal Board of Trade, Montreal Chambres de Commerce, Montreal Builders' Exchange, Toronto Social Service Council, and various similar associations in the western provinces. It is also endorsed by the Imperial Dominion Royal Commission which assembled at Vancouver in 1916. Several of the Prime Ministers of the different provinces have signed this petition, and it has also been endorsed by various public associations. I would like to know from the Government if any action is to be taken with a view to meet such a contingency. As we are speaking about demobilization, it is time for the Government to give us its policy. I notice with pleasure that my hon. friend stated that the question had been debated at the Imperial Conference, but unfortunately the discussion at the Imperial Conference relating to the question of returned soldiers is not made public. I hope it will be made public very soon, because public opinion is agitated at the present time as to what shall be done with the returned soldier and in regard to the dislo-

cation of industry when the soldiers do return.

I am asked to put this question to the Government. Do the words "after the war and during demobilization" mean that conscription and recruiting will be continued, and will conscripts be liable to be called to the colours after the war and during demobilization?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It merely defines the term of service. The term of service includes the war and demobilization after the conclusion of the war. Until the men are discharged from service, they must be subject to discipline.

On section 3—divisions into classes:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will ask that this section stand for to-day in view of what my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said, but if there are any suggestions which any hon. member desires to put forward in regard to it, I shall be very glad to have them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As this section should be generally discussed, my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) should explain to the committee the reasons for making such a radical departure from the provisions of the Militia Act in providing for ten different classes. In the Militia Act, there are only four classes. First there is the distinction between unmarried men and married men, and there are only two classes of unmarried men and two classes of married men, so that, apart from the question of marriage there are only two classes. Section 15 of the Militia Act says:

> The male population liable to serve in the militia shall be divided into four classes:
>
> The first class shall comprise all those of the age of eighteen years and upwards, but under thirty years, who are unmarried or widowers without children;
>
> The second class shall comprise all those of the age of thirty years and upwards, but under forty-five years, who are unmarried or widowers without children;
>
> The third class shall comprise all those of the age of eighteen years and upwards, but under forty-five years, who are married or widowers with children;
>
> The fourth class shall comprise all those of the age of forty-five years and upwards, but under sixty years.

The Militia Act provides for only two classes of unmarried men, those from 18 to 30, and those from 30 to 45 years of age. This Bill creates ten classes, some of them married and some unmarried. The first class is from 20 to 24; the second from 24 to 28, and the third from 28 to 34. It seems to me that the committee should be apprised of the reasons for this very grave departure from the provisions of the Militia Act. I myself am unable to see why there should be a distinction between boys from 20 to 24 and young men from 24 to 28. There may be some very good reasons for it, but there would seem to be less justice in calling out first of all boys from 20 to 24 years of age, for they were mere boys when the war broke out and never had the opportunity of voting for members for this Parliament. But they are to be the first ones called out to serve the State, and just why they should be called upon to bear the first burden of military service I am unable to understand.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In order to understand a little more distinctly what my hon. friend has in mind, perhaps he would state just what he would suggest.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am merely asking for the reasons which have induced the Government to make this very wide departure from the Militia Act. My right hon. friend would not expect me to make a suggestion. It might be considered presumptuous for me to do so until I have heard the reasons which have induced the Government to make this change. Under this Bill the first burden of military defence will fall upon boys who are at school or college, young men attending high school or at work in banks, students in law offices, dental and medical colleges—young men who are just preparing for the work of life. I cannot see why they should be taken before young men between the ages of 24 and 35, who are in the vigor of manhood and likely to be stronger and to possess a more mature judgment. There may be some excellent reasons which have induced the Government to place the first burden of the defence of the State upon these boys of from 20 to 24 years of age, and if so, I am sure the committee will be very glad to hear those reasons, because in this Bill the Government are making a very grave departure from the provisions of the Militia Act.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The request which my hon. friend has preferred is a very reasonable one indeed; although I might be permitted to observe that he is more modest about offering suggestions than I have usually found him. This Bill is designed to the selective—selective as to age, physical fitness, the service that any individual may be required to give to the state. and selective in other respects. If we were to embrace in one class all the men, say, between the ages of

20 and 35, we should run into the difficulty of calling out a very much larger number of men than is contemplated by this Bill. We therefore thought it best to divide the men into ten classes. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has suggested that some of these classes might be omitted. That is an arguable question as to which I have a perfectly open mind, and as to which I shall be glad to get the opinion of hon. members either now or at a later date. We thought it best that we should call out in the first instance those who had no family ties.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My right hon. friend says "those who have no family ties." Several of the following classes are for unmarried men. A young lad of twenty might have family ties, a mother, sisters, and so on, just as great as those of a married man of thirty with no children.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When I said those who have no family ties, my hon. friend will understand me to mean that we were endeavouring to exclude those who had become settled in life through marriage, who had to support a wife and possibly children. We desired to call out the unmarried men first, and we made the first class from 20 to 24 years of age because there would probably be a greater proportion of unmarried men in that class than amongst the men of more mature years. My hon. friend speaks of young men of from 20 to 24 years of age as not having been capable of exercising the franchise. I am quite unable to appreciate the relevancy of that observation although possibly my hon. friend may make it clearer later on. He says that only a few years ago these young men were at school or college. Yes, and if you go a little further back still, 20 or 24 years ago they were infants in arms. But we are not dealing with conditions of 24 years ago, but with the conditions that confront us to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I said that boys of from 20 to 24 are to-day very largely at schools or colleges, attending high school or the universities, preparing for the work of life; that is what I intended to say at all events.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend's appreciation is correct in that regard there would possibly be some ground for his suggestion, but it comes to me as a very great surprise that the young men of this country from 20 to 25 years of age are chiefly at school, high school or college. I do not for one moment believe that any such condition obtains in this country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the province from which I come students at law cannot be admitted until they are twenty-one. I venture to say that you will find in New Brunswick scores of young men who are engaged in the study of law and who are not yet 21.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Whatever injustice this may inflict on that portion of the population of New Brunswick which is engaged in the study of law, and has not yet reached the age of 21, I think will be cheerfully borne. I do not imagine we shall have any protest from them. I have no other explanation of the mode of division than that which I have mentioned. It seems to me to be a perfectly reasonable, and I should think even convincing, reason for the course the Government has taken. But, as I said, the Government is open to suggestions. If my hon. friend has any better suggestion which will commend itself to our judgment we are prepared to consider it. Would it be worth while to place all those between 20 and 35 in one class, call them out at once, and, perhaps, get 300,000, or 400,000, or 500,000, when we really only want 100,000? We may get 100,000 men in the first class, or the first two classes; I do not know how it may turn out. It may only require two classes, or three classes—you cannot tell. It is for that reason that the classes have been so selected. I think the selection is a fair and reasonable one. But, I repeat, the Government are open to suggestions on this point.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does my right hon. friend think that the fact of a young man being 25 or 30 years of age, not a widower, and therefore having no wife or children, should relieve him of equal military service with the young man between 20 and 24 who is exactly in the same condition? I can understand that there might be a reason given for calling unmarried men first, but if a man is unmarried I do not think my right hon. friend has given any reason for taking the young unmarried man between 20 and 24 and leaving the unmarried man between 24 and 28 unless it may be that my right hon. friend feels that as young men get a little older they get more responsibility and more influence than the young boys between 20 and 24. I can conceive of no other reason. It may be that by reason of their increased years they are more needed by the country than the young lads, but as far as family

ties, next of kin and family relationships are concerned, the boy between 20 and 24 is likely to have these ties to an even greater degree than the boy between 24 and 28. Indeed, when a boy gets to be 28 or 30 years of age, in most cases, the family ties begin to be broken, because he gets out into the world. He ceases to remain in the old home, but in the case of the young boys of 20, 21 and 22 years of age, they, in most instances, are still at home, and therefore the break and the hardship caused by their separation from their mothers and sisters may be, and is likely to be, infinitely greater than is the break and the hardship which would result, so far as mothers and sisters are concerned, in the case of young men who have attained to a greater age. I regret that I am unable to see any reason for the distinction which has been made by the Government. I think the Solicitor General had better try to give us some stronger reason than has been afforded by the Prime Minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I can give the same reason in another way, and, connecting the two questions of the hon. members for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and St. John (Mr. Pugsley), answer them together. Inasmuch as only the enlistment of 100,000 men was contemplated by this Act, it became necessary to make such a division as would enable us in the working out of the Act to see that more than 100,000 were not obtained, and as far as possible not render necessary the release of any who were obtained, because in the releasing difficulties would arise. Consequently, divisions had to be made, and the best basis of division possible had to be resorted to. Now, inasmuch as divisions have to be made, we must have regard to the best principle that can be found upon which to make those divisions. We provide against over 100,000 being obtained by having different classes. It is not contemplated that the 100,000 will be obtained on the first call of those from 20 to 24. Possibly they may be, but it is not contemplated that they will be. But the machinery of the Act will be based upon that call, and a very good estimate can be obtained from the number received as to how many may be expected from class 2. After the call of class 1, if it appears likely that class 2 will provide more than 100,000, then class 2 may be divided into such subdivisions as will make it tolerably certain that practically the right number will be obtained. The necessity for the divisions is there, and the necessity for a considerable number of them is also there, because we want to be as certain as possible that the machinery will not be clogged. How should the division be made? We chose the line of marriage and the line of age as the two principles that were to obtain. Marriage is a domestic restraint, but it is not the only one. It is the most general one. You never could reach each and every individual case and make a law that would of itself, not left to the discretion of tribunals, work out absolute and exact justice to every man. But, broadly speaking, the line of marriage is the boldest line of domestic restraint. We take unmarried men between the ages of 20 and 35, and we make them liable to call first. Any within that age, of course, can plead any domestic restraint other than marriage which they are under and that binds them when they come before the tribunals—any obligation of any kind—and they may obtain exemption. However, if we took from 20 to 35 alone, it is by no means impossible that we should secure much more than 100,000. Consequently a division was necessary. The division of age then became the only available principle to follow, and we have thought that we certainly should not start at the top, at 35.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will explain that to the hon. gentleman, but I will assume that he thinks we should start at 35.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not my hon. friend think that a man of 35 will make as good a soldier as a man of 20?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. If my hon. friend will read the words of the head of the British army in France, he will find that that authority has stated that, generally speaking, the best-equipped man for the field is the man between 18 and 25. The air service perhaps requires the severest physical test of all, and from 18 to 25 is the limit within which men are accepted for that service. It requires physically a perfect man, not only from the mere point of view of health, but the point of view of nerve-strength, which is a fundamental requirement.

There is another reason, although I think that reason is forcible enough to bring any man's mind to the conviction that we ought to start at 20 to 24 instead of 30 to 35. As a man advances from 20 to 35, he becomes more and more fixed in the community, more and more an essential factor in production; not, of course, in every case, as

many a man is more useful at 20 than another would be at 40 or 50, but, speaking generally, a man's usefulness to the community as a civilian increases between 20 and 35; and that affords another reason for first taking those from 20 to 24 instead of those from 30 to 35.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Do I understand the Solicitor General to mean that boys between 20 and 24 have not as much at stake in the country as men of 30 and that they should go to protect the men who have a larger stake in the country?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. The hon. gentleman may have been anxious that I should say something like that—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Pretty near it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —but I did not say anything of the sort; I said nothing close to it. I did not say that the country was more use to the man, but that the man was more use to the country; his powers of production become greater; he becomes more and more a fixture in the community, and more essential to the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But you exempt the essential man whether he is 25 or 35.

Mr. ROSS: I suggested the night before last that the age limit be raised from 20 to 21. The arguments advanced by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as to a man of 35, more especially apply to a man of 20. The nervous strain of this war in the trenches is greater than that of any war the world has known, and a man of 20 is not as well able to stand that strain as a man of 21. The man of 20 is not mature, he has not had the experience that a man of 21 has; and that there is something in this argument is shown by the fact that the Government, of its own motion, raised the limit from 18 to 20. If the limit is raised from 20 to 21 it does not prevent the boy of 20 enlisting, or the boy of 18 if he wishes to do so. The Government are going to present this to the country as one of their measures. The Franchise Act says that the boy of 20 shall not have a right to say whether he shall go or not go, but the man from 21 on has a right to coerce the boy of 20, who has no say at all. You are virtually striking a man whose hands are tied. I do not think the right should be given to any government to compel a boy of 20 to go and fight in Europe unless he is given the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship and the right to vote, whether he shall go or stay at home.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister said that on the point raised by the right hon. leader of the Opposition whether the application of the Bill should be restricted to men under 35, he had an open mind, and was ready to hear any opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is as well that this point should stay in the same position. I do not see that the franchise affects the point at all, because a man has not reached the age of 20 and consequently is not entitled to that one privilege of citizenship, the franchise, it cannot be argued that his country is not under those obligations to him of protection of life, of liberty and of property which entail on his part a corresponding obligation to his country. It is a fact that although a man does become a member of the forces at 20, he is not likely to reach the battle line until he is 21 or close to it. For three years this war has been going on. The young men of Canada have flocked to the colours from the age, not of 20, but of 15 up to the age of 45. I know of one young man, who I believe gave his wrong age and consequently, being large of stature, reached France before it was observed that his parents had the right to demand his return, who actually was killed in France at the age of 15.

Mr. ROSS: A volunteer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course. Others have gone from the age of 16 on. A call has been out for three years for the young men of Canada to voluntarily enlist from the age of 18 to 45. That call has been responded to. Many a family has had sons enlist from 18 to 20, others next door have still sons at home between 18 and 20. It might reasonably be objected on the part of those who have felt it their duty to go, that it was scarcely fair, now that compulsory enlistment was coming in, that an age too far in advance of 18 should be fixed. I do not advance any one of these considerations as final; I simply say they have to do with the subject, and that it should stand in the same position as the suggestion of the right hon. leader of the Opposition as responded to by the right hon. the Prime Minister.

Mr. ROSS: In the United States they have, no doubt, watched the progress of the war and the experience of the nations engaged in it as we have in Canada, and they have fixed the age limit at 21. Can the minister advance any reason which would induce them to do that which would not equally apply to Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They had not, up to the time of the going into force of their Act, enlisted any men. Consequently the proportion of their population that their Act calls for is very small compared with the proportion that this Act calls for, added to those who have already enlisted, of our population. We have had an appeal out all over Canada and the more virile, forward and patriotic class have gone forward, many at the ages of 18 to 21. In the United States that was not the case, so that no element of unfairness could possibly be argued there, where it could here. I do not say that it can be argued with final force, but it could be argued with some force that, inasmuch as we have already appealed to the parents of Canada to have their sons enlist at the ages from 18 to 45, now that we have applied compulsory enlistment, we should apply it to the same ages as the voluntary enlistment applied to before.

Mr. PARDEE: It appears to me that, in calling out men under this Act, the first class should be the unattached—that is men with no dependents. In the first six classes married men or widowers who have children are included. Class 7 is made up of those older but unattached. Why should not the first call be on men from 20 or 21 to 45 who are absolutely unencumbered, instead of taking the married men or widowers with children?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman suggest to call them all at once, or by classes?

Mr. PARDEE: By classes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That all the unmarried should be called before the married?

Mr. PARDEE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That has been considered, but we must have regard to the fact undoubtedly established, in this war above all other wars—I do not know whether it was ever established before or not—that men between 20 and 35 are much better fitted for the conflict than men over 35. It was felt the married men of that age should be taken before the unmarried over that age were called out. That was one consideration. While marriage is a general line of division, as to domestic responsibility and obligation, still by the time a man get to be 35, the line is not so clearly marked. Men of 35, still unmarried, have many more domestic obligations upon them as a rule, although they are unmarried, than young men below that age. I do not know that it would be too much to say that their domestic obligations are very much greater than the obligations of those who are below 35 and married. Those are the two reasons. The first one has the greater force.

Mr. PARDEE: It is a very great change from the Militia Act, and I can hardly agree with the Solicitor General when he says that a man of 35 ordinarily will have as many dependents as the younger man who is married. As a matter of fact, when you come down to the last analysis, it appears to me that the class of men who should primarily be drafted under this Act are those who have no dependents. If a man has reached the age of 35 and has not taken upon himself the full duties of citizenship, to my mind, he should be one of the first to go. Production of course is aimed at. It is quite true—I say it in all seriousness—if you are to take the married man of 25 before you take the unmarried man of 35, you are lessening the productiveness of your country in a most material way, because a man does not often marry after the age of 35. I want to impress this question on the committee, because my view is strong that before any draft is made on married men with children, or widowers with children, the first men that should be drafted are the unmarried, non-productive men without dependents, between the ages of 20 and 45. I think that is well worth the serious consideration of the committee. As I understand it, that is the present militia law, and it appears to me that in making such a radical change as this Bill makes, the Government is taking rather a large step, if the premises I have stated are correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does the hon. gentleman think of the physical fitness of the men over 35?

Mr. PARDEE: I am quite willing to admit, with the Solicitor General, that it has been decided by experts that the men between 18 and 25 in this war are the best men. But you must take some other things into consideration. Even on the assumption that men between 18 and 25 make the best soldiers, yet there is no question that a man between 25 and 35, physically fit, cannot be beaten on earth. If a man between 20 and 35 presents himself, or even up to 40—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Over 35, it is a different matter.

Mr. PARDEE: Take it up to 35. If that man is physically fit, there is no reason why he should not go anywhere on earth.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We take him first.

Mr. PARDEE: No. Some classes of married men go before that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We take married men under 35 before we take unmarried men over 35.

Mr. PARDEE: Quite so, but I do not think you should.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because 35 is the dividing line.

Mr. PARDEE: I am giving you my own view of the matter. Take a man up to 40 years of age, having no dependents and physically fit, in my opinion he should be taken before the man who has a wife and children, or a widower with children is taken.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend's observations are entitled to every consideration. We want to get the best selection in the public interest. He will remember, however, that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, urged very strongly some time ago, with a good deal of force, that under the very strenuous conditions of warfare which have to be undergone, men over 40 years of age, and possibly over 35, are found to be not capable of standing the strain for any considerable period. So that we take all unmarried men between the ages of 20 and 35 in the first three classes. I think we are agreed with my hon. friend up to that point. The question at issue is this; is it better that we should next take unmarried men from 35 to 45, or whether we should revert to married men within the ages of 20 to 35. Rightly or wrongly, we took the latter course, for the very reason which my hon. friend has urged this afternoon, that it is not safe to go beyond the age of 35 for combatant service. We thought that, having exhausted the first three classes, namely, the men between 20 and 35 unmarried, then in order to obtain those who are most fitted for this warfare, we should resort to married men between the same ages. I admit that there is good ground for argument on both sides. I should like to hear the opinion of members of the committee. Those are the grounds, however, upon which we made the classification set forth in the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the required number of men can be obtained from the unmarried classes, the expense of the war will be very materially reduced. When you select for military service a married man who has a family, you at once increase the expense, because separation allowances have to be paid, aid has to be given from the Patriotic Fund, and so on. If, therefore, the men can be obtained—I am not inclined to think that they can—without drawing upon those who have families, it will mean in the years to come as well as at the present time, considerable relief to the taxpayers. I am not sure that this selective method is better than the method of selection by lot which is provided by the Militia Act. The Solicitor General said that the somewhat large number of divisions was provided lest a greater number of men should be secured than were required. I think that men between the ages of 20 or 21 and 30 are physically fit, so far as age is concerned; I would suggest that men between those ages constitute the first class. I am not now arguing the merits of 20 or of 21 as a minimum age; I simply suggest that the maximum age for that class should be 30 years. If the maximum age of the first class were 30 and a greater number of men than were required was secured when that class was called out, I would suggest the adoption of the Lincoln system: obtain the required number through selection by lot. That would be an easy and fair way of getting over the difficulty which the Solicitor General seems to apprehend: the securing of too many men.

The remarks of the Solicitor General brought another point to my mind. Many boys 18, 19 and 20 years of age have returned to Canada from the trenches. I have in my mind a young man who went over when he was 17 and who returned recently wounded and gassed. Is this suggestion not worthy of consideration: that in making this new selection of men, the boy under 20 who has returned from the trenches under such conditions as I have mentioned, be not asked to return; that he be releaseed from duty? His place could be taken by another man secured under this proposed law. Perhaps not very many of them would desire to take advantage of such a provision; but it seems unjust that these boys, whom the Parliament of Canada declares to be too young to serve, and who, having served, have been wounded and sent home, should not be allowed to stay home if they so desire.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend has said; I shall take that suggestion into consideration.

Mr. PARDEE: I agree with the Prime Minister that the effectiveness of a man commences to deteriorate after he reaches the age of 35. As I understand it, however, this is a measure of selective conscription. Although it is designed primarily to obtain combatants, it is true that certain men employed in other branches of the service in France are just as important as the combatant men. Men from 35 to 45 years of age might well be employed as motor drivers or assigned to some arm of the service where they would be quite as useful as the combatants who, because of their age, are fit to go to the front and take up the harder work. I repeat that for economic and other reasons we ought to keep at home the men who have wives, children and dependents, and send to the front in some capacity—even to the extent of having them replace those who are in the capacity of non-combatants, but who are within the age of combatants—those men who have no dependents. I want to impress upon the committee my conviction that every man who has no dependents and who is between the ages of 18 or 20 and 45 should go in some capacity before the men who have wives, children, or other near dependents are called upon to serve.

Mr. MARCIL: I agree with what the member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) has said. In the committee which had to deal with the matter of returned soldiers, we had a great deal of evidence of the hardship suffered by the dependents whom some of our men left behind in Canada. I think that in every case where a man can be sent without leaving anybody behind him in Canada, he should be selected. In a note which I have recently received, a definition is requested of the exemption which is made with regard to the clergy. The member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) pointed out that those who study law are not admitted to the bar until they are 21. In the province of Quebec persons are not fully ordained to the priesthood until they reach the age of 25; the age used to be 21, but it has been raised to 25. The inquiry which I have received is whether a student in theology, wearing the cassock, or soutane, as we call it in French, denominated as ecclésiastique, who has received minor orders, but who does not receive the full orders of the priesthood until he reaches the age of 25, is included in the exempted class. Does he not become a clergyman in the full sense, within the meaning of this law, until he has received the full orders of the priesthood?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not prepared to answer my hon. friend at the moment. I will take his query into consideration. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) might take this into consideration in connection with the argument which he has made. He suggests that we should leave classes 1, 2 and 3 as they are, and then, for classes 4 and 5, we should substitute those classes which are now numbered 7 and 9. If the classification were adopted, and classes 1, 2 and 3, did not produce the number of men sufficient to fulfil the infantry requirements, which are the chief need at the present time, then, as the Government has no discretion except to call out in the order enumerated in this section, we should be obliged to call next those who would not be suitable for combatant service. There is that objection which strikes me at the moment. As the section is to stand, however, we will take all the hon. member has said into consideration.

Mr. DEVLIN: Might I repeat the question which was put a few moments ago by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). The moment this Bill passes, all men who are called out under section 1 become conscripted unless exempted. If more than 100,000 men are conscripted, what is going to be the test as to the selection of 100,000 men? Will they be taken in proportion to the population of each province or by provinces, or what system will be followed?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We really did not expect that contingency would occur under the provision contained in subsection 4 of this section:

> The Governor in Council may divide any class into subclasses, in which case the subclasses shall be called out in order of age beginning with the youngest.

We hope in that way to avoid any possibility of exceeding the number mentioned in the Bill, and it is our expectation, therefore, that the contingency to which my hon. friend alludes, will not occur.

Mr. MARCIL: When a man has been conscripted, can he choose for himself whether he will go into the infantry or into the artillery? Who is to decide where he is to go? The volunteer selected the service he desired.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill would not be a compulsory service Bill if it gave a man, after he is taken on, the absolute choice as to the service he goes to. He has to go where he is placed, but in placing him, I have no doubt regard will be had to his own individual wishes, particularly to his own individual qualifications.

Mr. MARCIL: He has a right to ask that he may be placed in some particular service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has a right to ask, and his wishes will be considered, but he will not have a right to say finally where he will be placed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is any registration contemplated under the Bill to ascertain what men are over twenty years of age?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The necessity of registration is avoided by the provisions of the Bill. The objects of registration are served by the man reporting for duty on the day set forth in the proclamation.

Mr. ROSS: How is the Solicitor General going to get at the proportions each province or district or county is to supply? Is he going to take into consideration the heavy enlistments that have been made in many districts? There is nothing in the Bill that indicates what shall be done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Bill is no respecter of persons or provinces. This is not a selective conscription by provinces at all. The Dominion is considered as a whole, and there is no special levy of so many from any province. The provisions of the Bill are such that every district will, under the Act, supply the available men of that district of the class called out; that is to say, the numbers already enlisted from any special district or province will only have to do with the number called for by this measure in this sense; if more have not gone, there will be in the district or province more to whom the provisions of the Act will apply. In so far as more men are available, more men will be called out.

Mr. ROSS: Might one imagine a situation in which all would come from one province, or all from seven provinces and none from the other two?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would surpass my imagination because the hon. member will agree that in every province in Canada, and in every township and county, there are men who are most obviously of all entitled to go to the front who stay at home, just as obviously entitled as could possibly be the case in any other province. Consequently the law will undoubtedly be applied to such men in every province in the Dominion. The most extreme cases can be found everywhere.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the minister intend, in a rural constituency, to require the men called out to report at the county seat, or may they report within the confines of their own municipality or district? The distances to the county seats are, in most districts, very great and communication is not always easy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member refers to reporting for duty?

Mr. MARCIL: Yes, when a man is called out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He does not refer to applications for exemptions? Both, however, will be taken care of by regulations. No policy has been mapped out as to the best way in which reporting for duty may be done, but I presume regard will be had to the convenience of those reporting for duty.

On section 4—calling out by classes:

4. (1) The Governor in Council may from time to time by proclamation call out on active service as aforesaid for the defence of Canada, either in Canada or beyond Canada, any class or subclass of men described in section three and all men within the class or subclass so called out shall, from the date of such proclamation, be deemed to be soldiers enlisted in the military forces of Canada and subject to military law for the duration of the present war, and of demobilization thereafter, save as hereinafter provided.

(2) Men so called out shall report and shall be placed on active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force as may be set out in such proclamation or in regulations, but until so placed on active service, shall be deemed to be on leave of absence without pay.

(3) Any man by or in respect of whom an application for exemption is made as hereinafter provided, shall, so long as such application or any appeal in connection therewith is pending and during the currency of any exemption granted him, be deemed to be on leave of absence without pay.

(4) Any man who is called out and who, without reasonable excuse, fails to report as aforesaid or to remain on active service where placed shall be guilty, according to the circumstances, of desertion, or of absenting himself without leave and shall be liable

(a) to be tried by court-martial and convicted and punished by imprisonment, for a term not exceeding three years, or

(b) on summary conviction to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I presume that the first subsection means that all men called out are soldiers, unless exemption is granted?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the meaning of " leave of absence without pay " in the subsection 2?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may take some time to determine in just what branch of active service a man should go. In the meantime it is not desirable that he should be kept from his ordinary vocation. He reports for duty, and until he is actually placed he is on leave of absence without pay. Again, in case he applies for exemption, it may be that his case is not decided upon in time, and until it is actually decided that he is a soldier and he is placed, he too is on leave of absence without pay. But he is a soldier all the same, and is liable to military discipline and liable to punishment if he deserts. It is not wise to put him on the paylist in the meantime, for the reason that he is not actually on service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is, he remains at home?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When a man of 21 is conscripted by law and appeals before a tribunal, and from that tribunal to the central appeal judge, I understand that by this section he is considered as a soldier without pay?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has my hon. friend considered the length of time these processes of law should occupy before the courts? Are special rules of practice going to be framed to deal with these cases?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was thought wise not to cover this by regulation for this reason. A member of the Supreme Court of Canada is to be made the central appeal judge, and he will have the final decision of all appeal cases. Consequently, it was thought wise that he himself should have the framing of regulations concerning appeals which will come ultimately to himself. The machinery is here in general, but no details are worked out as to time or otherwise, because the services of that Supreme Court judge will be utilized in working them out.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A case may be pending for days and weeks and months. A rich man could keep the judicial machinery in motion as long as he liked, unless some limit were fixed. The central appeal judge of whom my hon. friend speaks may for good reasons be silent for a long time before adjudicating on a special case. That does not seem to me to be fair or just. It just comes back to what my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said very aptly the other day, that the Bill seems to favour the rich against the poor. The machinery of law may be put in motion by the rich man, and an appeal may be pending for weeks and months, and although under the law he will be a conscript he will be considered as a soldier on leave of absence and wil be able to stay at home. It seems to me that if my hon. friend is not willing for the central appeal judge to frame those regulations, the Department of Justice should frame rules which would put a definite limit upon the time a case shall occupy from its inception to its close. Otherwise, the rich man who is unwilling to enlist could keep the wheels of justice rolling and rolling for months and months.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the regulations were poorly framed, that might be the case. I did not hear the address of the hon. member for Pictou, but I say now with all the emphasis in my power that any one who can see in this Bill any attempt to favour the rich over the poor is labouring under a very dangerous hallucination. How could any one get an advantage over the other under this Bill that he could not get under any Bill that human ingenuity might frame? The provisions for appeal are simple: We do not even go to the extent of stating the terms and conditions of appeal, but leave them to be framed by the central appeal judge, who is to be a member of the Supreme Court of Canada, none of whose members, I might point out, were appointed by this Government. Consequently, unless one imagines that that central appeal judge is going to frame such regulations as will allow the rich man by the use of money to prolong his appeal indefinitely, one can never imagine that this Bill is intended to favour the rich.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I did not make that suggestion. I understood my hon. friend to suggest that the Supreme Court judge might not take upon himself the framing of these regulations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not anticipate that. I do not think there is a member of the Supreme Court who would not be glad in this crisis to render any service in his power, and when it comes to framing rules of practice, that is clearly within his power; no one would be more capable of doing that. Let me say with all the finality in my power that it will undoubtedly be the design of those regulations so framed and to be approved by the Governor in Council, that no possible advantage shall be given the rich over the poor, and provision will

be made for expeditious and easy practice in appeal such as will put every man on an absolute level, as far as regulations can. The regulations, as I said, will be formulated by the central appeal judge, who is to-day a member of the Supreme Court. I can only repeat that any one who sees in this Bill anything designed to favour the rich over the poor is under a very dangerous hallucination.

Mr. DEVLIN: Who will pay for the service of the subpoenas required by a person claiming exemption.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That will be a matter to be covered by regulations to be framed by the central appeal judge, who is a member of the Supreme Court of Canada. Inasmuch as very grave and heavy duties will be imposed on the central appeal judge, he is permitted, by a later clause, to name other judges at different points in Canada to perform the duties delegated to the central appeal judge. The great object, of course, is to ensure that it will be possible for the central appeal judge to efficiently execute the duties that are imposed upon him, but another object will be to enable him to see to it that such convenient methods of carrying out the appeals are made available as will enable the poor man to take an appeal as well as any one else. Regulations may be provided to meet all such conditions as to costs as they may at the time present themselves. It may be provided by the regulations, if deemed wise, that any one who is not in a position to pay his costs of service can have them paid for him. I do not say that will be done, but the Bill provides that if that is deemed wise by the central appeal judge it may be.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no doubt that the Government has no sinister design in this Bill. I am quite prepared to believe that my right hon. friend is filled with good intentions, but he knows there is a place which is said to be paved with good intentions, to which I might compare the Government with regard to this Bill but I shall not do so. I want to understand the meaning of this clause. The moment the proclamation issues calling out the men of a certain class, say between 20 and 25, they become soldiers, and they continue to be soldiers from that moment unless they are exempted from service. It will work out in this way: A man will have to report at a certain point, and then he will be obliged to present his reasons for exemption. If a father comes with his son and says: My son is exempt because he is not of age, he will be required to prove that before the tribunal. It may take some time; he may have the proof or he may not. In the province of Quebec it will not be very difficult, of course, because we have a very complete system of registration, but in other provinces it may not be so easy. Then there is an appeal from the decision, and from that appeal there is a second appeal. In the meantime, I presume, the father will be told: Take your boy home and keep him there until it is decided whether he is eligible or ineligible. I suppose it will work out in that way?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is it. I do not know that I can find any fault with my right hon. friend's understanding, except this: It is contemplated that the local tribunals will sit before the day for reporting; that is to say, the consideration of the application for exemption may be completed before the day for reporting, but if a case is not concluded on the day for reporting then the boy will be considered to be on leave of absence pending the decision upon his case.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Suppose he does not report at all, who prosecutes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has offended against the law of the land and he is liable to prosecution in the ordinary way.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Whose duty is it to prosecute?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is to be covered by the regulations also.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers); he says it is the duty of the provincial governments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is to be covered by the regulations which will be drawn up under the general clause providing for regulations. Officers may be appointed for the purpose of prosecution.

Mr. DEVLIN: Could we possibly by Monday get a copy of those regulations so that we shall know what we are talking about?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the regulations are not made. If my hon. friend will look at the Bill he will see that it provides for the framing of regulations. General principles are laid down and the machinery is provided, but the details are left to be worked out by regulation. This will be one of those regulations.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I see that section 10 provides that:

Any person aggrieved by the decision of a local tribunal, and any person authorized by the Minister of Militia and Defence, may appeal against any such decision.

Does that mean that the Crown may appeal from the decision of the tribunal, or that a person who has been before the tribunal and who has lost his case may get authority from the Minister of Militia and appeal from the decision?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Virtually; he will receive an authorization to enter an appeal against the decision of the tribunal in such cases as he may see fit.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As for the Crown?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As for the Militia Department.

Mr. KYTE: In reference to the return setting forth the number of those who have been exempted from service, as this matter will be discussed in connection with the consideration of clause 13, will the Prime Minister be able to get a list of those who have been so exempted, giving the names, ranks and residences?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know whether that will be possible or not; I will make inquiry.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would suggest that the committee rise and that we adjourn.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend thinks we had better adjourn?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence bring down some information which was asked of the Minister yesterday? I would like to get a statement of the number of Canadian officers who, having reached British headquarters, were told that they could not keep their commissions but that they would either have to return to Canada and not serve or accept inferior rank.

Mr. McCURDY: That information is not available in the Militia Department, and will have to be obtained from overseas. Overseas will be communicated with and the information got at as early a date as possible.

Mr. OLIVER: Would it be possible for the department at this date, or at some later date during the consideration of this Bill, to give the answer that it was unable to give some little time ago in reply to a question on the Order Paper? I asked how many men had gone overseas up to a certain date, how many were on the strength of the force in Canada and how many men had been returned from overseas to Canada as being physically or otherwise unfit. The first two questions were answered, but the third was not; that is as to the number of physically unfit men who have been returned to Canada from overseas. I should be glad if it would be possible to place that information before the House at some time during the consideration of this Bill.

Mr. McCURDY: Does my hon. friend mean to include in that list only those men who have served in France?

Mr. OLIVER: No. The question was as to the men who had not served in France, who have been returned from England as physically unfit.

Mr. McCURDY: I have no personal knowledge of the matter, but to the extent the information can be obtained, it will be submitted to the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Some men are returned as physically unfit, after having served in England. For instance, forestry corps are employed both in Great Britain and in France, and a distinction might have to be borne in mind in regard to these classes.

Progress reported.

CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION FORMS IN FRENCH AND ENGLISH.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to call the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to a grievance which the exporters of Montreal have against the Department of Customs, and a grievance which the travellers between Canada and the United States have against the department of my genial friend, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche). The French-speaking exporters on different occasions have applied at the customs house for blank forms in the French language, which forms are required in their business. Last year, or the year before, I called the attention of the Minister of Customs to the matter, and he promised me at the time that he would see that the forms were provided. They have not been provided, and the exporters of Montreal resent this condition very much. As to the other grievance, I placed a question on the Order Paper, asking if the hon. Minister of the Interior would see that the immi-

gration agents on the several trains between Canada and the United States were provided with forms in French and English. Some forms in English were presented to French-speaking travellers and they could not fill the blanks. They are entitled to a form in the French language. It is very easy to provide the agent with those forms in the French language, and I hope that my hon. friend, who has always been very courteous and considerate in these matters, will see that they are provided in blank forms in French and English.

Mr. ROCHE: I authorized that to be done immediately after the hon. gentleman brought it to my attention, and the instructions were so issued, but I will see that it is done.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You will see that the instructions are carried out?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the hon. Prime Minister see that the blank forms are supplied to the customs house in both languages for the convenience of the exporters?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will bring it to the attention of the Minister of Customs.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.

Monday, July 9, 1917.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

SALARIES OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): Last week the Minister of Finance stated that the Outside Service would be dealt with, as far as the salaries were concerned, in the Supplementary Estimates. I wish to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has received any petitions from the lighthouse keepers, and if it is his intention to have the increase asked for dealt with in the Supplementary Estimates when they are brought down?

Mr. HAZEN: A number of petitions have been received, covering a period of some months past, from the lighthouse keepers in different parts of the country asking for an increase in their salaries. At the present time lighthouse keepers are divided into different classes, with fixed salaries for each class, starting at the minimum, and advancing by certain gradations up to the maximum. The request from these different classes is that the minimum be increased. The petitions have received consideration, but I cannot at the present time give any assurance to my hon. friend such as he asks for.

CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION FORMS IN FRENCH AND ENGLISH.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: In justice to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, I call the attention of the House to the remarks I made on Saturday, with reference to blank forms to be given to travellers between Canada and the United States. I made an application to the minister that these forms be furnished travellers, as requested by them. I stated that some time ago I had applied to my hon. friend to provide these forms to travellers, and I find, from a letter which I received from the head of the Immigration Branch, that the statement of the hon. minister is confirmed, and, therefore, I am glad to say that my hon. friend acquiesced in the request at the time I made it.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 93, to incorporate The Kenora and English River Railway Company.—Mr. Carrick.

Bill No. 101, respecting The Canada Preferred Insurance Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 102, respecting The Western Canada Accident and Guarantee Insurance Company.—Mr. Bradbury.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

HOME DEFENCE RECRUITING OFFICERS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What officer or officers are in charge of Home Defence recruiting at Kingston?
2. When was said officer or officers appointed, at what rate of pay, and how many recruits have been obtained?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

Lieut. Col. W. Y. Mills, 29th March, 1917, pay of rank. Capts. F. K. Mahood, W. E. Swaine, and Lieut. Campian, 9th April, 1917, pay of rank. Major Knight and Lieut. J. E. Taylor, 14th May, 1917, pay of rank. Lieuts. J. C. Newlands, G. K. Mills, W. J. Barrett, 28th April, 1917, pay of rank.

The officers represent the headquarters of the battalion, also the officers of one double company.

It was intended that their services should be utilized in connection with recruiting not only for home defence but also for Canadian Expeditionary Force. It was deemed inadvisable to release them just now. Their services are being utilized in the meantime in connection with recruiting for Canadian Expeditionary Force through the British Mission in the United States.

This battalion will likely be utilized as a depot for overseas reinforcements.

The total recruits received for Canadian Expeditionary Force is not available, but for Canadian Defence Force, they were fifteen in number.

EXPEDITIONARY FORCES, ENLISTMENTS.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What is the number of recruits enlisted in the Expeditionary Forces up to date: (a) Rural recruits; (b) Urban recruits. (c) Unmarried men; and (d) Married men?

2. Will the minister give the statement of these figures by provinces?

Sir EDWARD KEMP:

1. The records have not been compiled in such a manner as to set forth the information asked.

2. Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN.

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. What number of men enlisted in, or transferred to each of the following Canadian Expeditionary Force Battalions, 22nd, 41st, 57th, 69th, 150th, 163rd, 167th, 178th, 189th, 206th, 230th, 233rd, and 258th?

2. What is the total number of non-commissioned officers and men sent overseas with or from the above battalions?

3. How many non-commissioned officers and men remain in Canada belonging to the above battalions?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Levi Thompson: For a return showing the names of all persons employed in connection with the Office of the Commissioner of Live Stock in the Province of Saskatchewan, showing the salaries and expenses paid them; and also showing the number of stallions and bulls placed in Saskatchewan when the said office was established.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

CONSIDERATION OF THE BILL IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE.

House in Committee on Bill No. 75, respecting Military Service—Sir Robert Borden. (Resumed from Saturday, July 7. Mr. Rainville in the Chair.)

Sir SAM HUGHES: In the early part of the debate, there was a discussion as to the number of officers who had been engaged in recruiting in Quebec. I did not at that time delay the House with the names of those officers; in fact I did not know the names of all the gentlemen whom we had engaged in recruiting in that province; but I have here a list—it is not a complete list—of a number of very excellent officers who were in service at that time and who did yeoman work so far as they could.

In British Columbia we had as District Officer Commanding, Col. Roy, a French-Canadian who was in command in the English-speaking district. This officer found favour on every hand, no one finding fault with him. In Toronto we had General Lessard. There was another Roy, an officer of the Engineers, who did recruiting work in the early part of the war, and who went over with the 22nd Battalion, and who, as was mentioned here by the Prime Minister, gave up his life in trying to save some of his comrades from a bomb explosion in one of the trenches. There are two Col. Fages, both very excellent officers, each of whom has done his best in recruiting work. Then there is Col. Louis LeDuc, who is well known to us and who has become a Brigadier in the service. Col. Gaudette, who was in charge of the Dominion Arsenal for many years and who retired, again came to the front and did excellent recruiting work. He went over with the 22nd Battalion, but his health failed him. He now occupies a very high position in munitions work in England. Col. Papineau is a young lad who went over as a lieutenant in the Princess Patricia's and who was promoted to a colonelcy in the service. He is one of the finest officers to be found in the force. There is also a Captain Papineau who has done splendid work in recruiting and who has also served in the war. Col. Paquette of Quebec gave his time recruiting throughout the Quebec district. There are two or three Panets, only one of whom is in Quebec. Col. Labelle has done what he can. Col. Landry has done good work both in Quebec and at the front. Col. Ostel, of the 65th Battalion was unable, on account of his state of health, to go to the front, but he has been one of the best recruiting officers. He has enlisted many boys, all of whom have done very well. Col. Chauveau, of Quebec, and Col. Puize of Rimouski together raised one of the finest battalions that have gone to the

front. They have done fine service in the way of recruiting for that battalion. Col. Puize is regarded as a very fine officer. Col. Dansereau, a Royal Military College graduate, did splendid service under Col. Currie at the battle of St. Julien. He was an old Montreal boy. Col. Gingras has been at the front and has done splendid work. He has been back to Canada for recruiting work and is recruiting in the United States at the present time. Col. Barre all know as one of the most fearless and successful officers at the front. Major Asselin, who declined to take command of a battalion on account of his not having previous military experience, is a most experienced recruiting officer. Col. Leprohon, who went over with the First Contingent, was wounded and came back. He went to the Northwest and raised another battalion, not quite to full strength, and it has gone overseas. Then there is a Col. De Salaberry, who, I understand, is a descendant of the famous De Salaberry who went over with the Princess Patricia's and returned to take the command of a battalion. He has gone back with his battalion. Col. Hector Verret has done yeoman service at the front and now commands a battalion there. Col. Readman, who was given an opportunity of raising a battalion, did his level best and succeeded in raising a certain number of men. Col. Blois, a man possibly a little over age, but a most enthusiastic gentleman, also went to the front and did his work to the satisfaction, at all events, of many of his officers over there. He has come back from the front and has done his best in recruiting. Col. Grothe has also done good work. Col. Tremblay, commander of the 22nd, is a most excellent officer and a splendid soldier. Col. Plante has also done good work. There are two Col. Scotts, who have been over and have come back again, who are engaged in recruiting work at the present time. Then there is Major Dubuc, and then last, but by no means least, the Laviolettes. I am speaking from recollection. I think there are two or three Laviolette boys, one of whom was severely wounded and is now, I am sorry to say, dying at Montreal, another who was wounded at the front, and a third boy who has done yeoman work. These soldiers have all done splendid work in the way of recruiting.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Col. Migneault.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He did splendid work in the Medical Service and also in the recruiting line. He helped to recruit the 22nd Battalion and another battalion, and he then went into the Medical Service. We have met the wishes of these people in every way, and so far as I am concerned, they have not found fault.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Did the hon. member mention Col. Puize?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, Col. Puize raised one of the finest battalions ever raised in Canada.

Mr. GAUVREAU: When he reached England, he was told that he would not be allowed to lead his battalion. Later on he was asked if he wanted to go to the front and was informed that, if so, he would have to take the rank of lieutenant. He accepted the rank of lieutenant and went to the front.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What was done in the way of newspaper advertising for recruits?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not want to go into details or to criticise any particular plan of recruiting, but I am bound to say that those of us connected with the militia can feel on looking back that we are entitled to pat ourselves on the back, because our system was the best of all. I did not find platform recruiting very effective. Our officers with their recruiting committee reached every part of the Dominion, and had they been consulted they would have produced as fine a list—a voter's list, you may call it if you like—of eligible young men from the Atlantic to the Pacific as it was possible to compile. They had lists of the eligible young men in every district of the country, and there were very few of military age in Canada who did not have the opportunity of putting on the uniform if they chose to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My own view is that any newspaper advertising that is done should be done irrespective altogether of party politics. It appears from a return that was brought down to the House recently that in the province of New Brunswick 300 per cent more money was paid to the St. John Standard, the organ of the Conservative party, than was paid to all the other newspapers of the province.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What was the amount?

Mr. PUGSLEY: $1,200 was spent on newspaper advertising in the province of New Brunswick, and of that amount $900 was paid to the St. John Standard—a paper which is only read by Conservatives; at all

events, outside of Conservatives it has a very limited circulation. Papers like the St. John Telegraph, the Moncton Transcript, the Fredericton Mail and all the other papers of the province put together, Liberal and Conservative, received only $300 amongst them.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I thought the St. John Standard was a Liberal paper.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps that is why the mistake was made.

Sir SAM HUGHES: So far as the department is concerned, we never did any advertising at all. Advertisements would sometimes be inserted in papers by local officers, and if everything was found to be proper the account in some cases would subsequently be paid by the Government; but not one dollar's worth of advertising was done by the department for recruiting so far as I can recollect.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am speaking of the return that was brought down the other day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Referring to the question of recruiting in the province of Quebec, I have already stated on two occasions, notably the other day during the debate on this Bill, that the Asselin regiment was a success largely because the ex-Minister of Militia gave us the necessary backing. I am glad to bear testimony to his valuable aid in connection with the formation of that regiment. I think, however, one or two explanations are due in connection with the statement the ex-minister has just made. He mentioned as one of the chief recruiting officers Colonel Roy. My hon. friend must have had a momentary lapse of memory, because Colonel Roy was pensioned off when war was declared.

Sir SAM HUGHES: No, that was later.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was shortly afterwards, then. For several years he had been District Commanding Officer at Montreal. He was later transferred to British Columbia. I do not object to that, except that I think much better results would have been obtained if he had remained in Montreal, because, as my hon. friend states, he was an excellent officer, a born soldier, and he understood the people of my province well. I also know Colonel Paquet, who is a son of the ex-postmaster of Quebec city, who was one of my officials when I was Postmaster General. He is a charming young fellow, very active, and very able, and he was most anxious to have his regiment go to the front. He raised two regiments, and what happened? I had it from his own lips that as soon as they had reached the required strength they were drafted to support units either at the front or on the point of leaving for the front.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They were drafted to the 22nd and the 41st.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As regards the 22nd, my hon. friend stated a moment ago that that regiment had been raised by Colonel Migneault. No doubt Colonel Migneault is entitled to much of the credit.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He assisted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But in justice to the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and in justice to the memory of the late Postmaster General, Mr. Casgrain, I must say on behalf of my province that if the 22nd Regiment ever came into existence it is due to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the late Mr. Casgrain, who appealed to public opinion in the province of Quebec. Col. Migneault benefited by the work they did.

Sir SAM. HUGHES: I only wished to remove an impression in Ontario that we had altogether neglected recruiting in the province of Quebec. On the contrary, the hon. member for Rouville will bear me out that I appealed to him on more than one occasion, and he did his bit in connection with the Asselin regiment and the 22nd.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I might inform the committee that the Asselin regiment was raised in less than two months. We received all the necessary aid and backing from the department, and if the same aid and backing had been given in connection with recruiting in other parts of the province of Quebec many an Asselin regiment would have been raised. Major Asselin, it is only just to say, is an exceedingly brilliant French Canadian, one of the most popular men in the province of Quebec, and it is not surprising that he succeeded in surrounding himself with young officers of ability, some of whom had been recalled from the front to help in the formation of that regiment.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. member must bear in mind that in every battalion area in the province of Quebec we did not have an Asselin or a Lemieux. I took the liberty the other day of suggesting that members wishing to make suggestions on the Bill should put them in concise form, and I should now like to present to the committee a few notes I have made.

On section 4—calling out by classes:

4. (1) The Governor in Council may from time to time by proclamation call out on active service as aforesaid for the defence of Canada, either in Canada or beyond Canada, any class or subclass of men described in section three and all men within the class or subclass so called out shall, from the date of such proclamation, be deemed to be soldiers enlisted in the Military Forces of Canada and subject to military law for the duration of the present war, and of demobilization thereafter, save as hereinafter provided.

(2) Men so called out shall report and shall be placed on active service in the Canadian Expeditionary Force as may be set out in such proclamation or in regulations, but until so placed on active service, shall be deemed to be on leave of absence without pay.

(3) Any man by or in respect of whom an application for exemption is made as hereinafter provided, shall, so long as such application or any appeal in connection therewith is pending and during the currency of any exemption granted him, be deemed to be on leave of absence without pay.

(4) Any man who is called out and who, without reasonable excuse, fails to report as aforesaid or to remain on active service where placed shall be guilty, according to the circumstances, of desertion, or of absenting himself without leave and shall be liable

(a) to be tried by court-martial and convicted and punished by imprisonment, for a term not exceeding three years, or

(b) on summary conviction to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three years.

I prefer the Militia Act as better, more elastic, more workable, less inclined to cause friction, and more inclined to produce good results, but the Government does not so consider it.

I, therefore, will not take one minute in discussing that aspect of the question, merely placing myself on record. I shall loyally support any and every proposition enacted in the Bill when finally completed; and shall, with the least delay, freely give my suggestions.

My preferences are more or less well known.

1. The tribunals are non-military, and are under the administration of the Justice Department. My suggestion would be to place them under military control, but let their composition be non-military.

2. A mere suggestion is, the area unit, instead of being provincial, should be military district.

3. There should be no special exemptions for "financiers" more than for farmers.

4. It would have been advisable to have had registration.

5. Clergy should not be exempt.

6. Section 11, subsection (e) is the only one to my mind that should be retained. Is there a man in Canada who may not be exempted under section 11 as it now stands?

7. Desertions. It might be well to provide for punishment under this, and other sections of the Bill, at the front.

8. But, believing the intention of the Government is to help enlistment, and feeling that it is not meant merely to inflame one section against another, I will give every support, consideration and assistance to the passage, and to the carrying out of the principles of the Bill. It should be law within a week. My one aim is to help, uphold, and upbuild the gallant fellows who are enduring so patiently and performing so nobly at the front.

I regret taking up the time of the House with another matter, important not in itself but in its bearing on the whole public situation, that is, the falling off in recruiting, the causes thereof, and the denials of certain statements made.

The situation from February, 1916, to the autumn of that year was unique. Men were enlisting up till February and March as they never did before in any land. The home locality plan worked well.

Then the Prime Minister, as well as the Minister of Militia, was daily, sometimes hourly, worried by a fictitious agitation—I use the term "fictitious;" it was a very nasty agitation. Suggestions, complaints, advice, appeals, demands, re recruiting were made.

Possibly more than any other, except the Finance Minister, the influence of Lord Shaughnessy was potent in this embarrassment. Both Lord Shaughnessy and Sir Thomas White complained of the number of battalions being raised in Montreal and Toronto respectively at the same time. In the Montreal area, with a total population of nearly a million, including the adjoining counties, there were being recruited three battalions. On our basis of 40,000 for a battalion of 1,000 there should have been at least twenty to twenty-one instead of three. In Toronto there were five, or including two formerly authorized but fully completed, only seven were under way, where, as compared with the country districts, there should have been twelve. From one or other of these two gentlemen the following fallacious arguments were also advanced:

"Industries would be ruined if so many men were enlisted;"

"Farmers could not put in their crops;"

"Munitions could not be made;"

"The war would be over by July or August, 1916;"

"Transports could not be had;"

"It would take a long time to get the troops to England, as only a certain number could be taken monthly."

Mr. LEMIEUX: By whom were those statements made?

Sir SAM HUGHES: By one or other of these gentlemen, and by others, of course. Every one had them in his mouth.

1. From first to last the tendency of the cry was not the upholding and strengthening of the boys at the front so much as the commercial idea at home. The Prime Minister certainly was worried, and be his recollection whatever it may of any particular conference, it is apparent from the results what was running through his mind. He was interviewed by Mr. Godfrey, of Toronto, who, later, spoke of it to the Chairman of the Toronto Recruiting Association, who, in turn, reported to his Association. The data may have been more or less expanded or contracted, but in general terms it appears that the Prime Minister entertained the idea early in the spring of 1916 of stopping recruiting, and that he felt inclined to stop it but for the fear that it could not be resurrected.

2. That large numbers were then already enrolled and in training in Canada.

3. That the demands and needs of labour must be regarded.

4. That transports were not available to carry all the troops, and, at the rate of moving them, there were men enough enrolled to keep the transports busy for many months.

5. It was hoped the war would be over by August, 1916.

Such were the impressions given as coming from Mr. Godfrey, through the chairman, to the members of the Toronto Recruiting Association. Whether Mr. Godfrey got them all from the Prime Minister or from some other source is not given to the public.

Further, I assert, that influences and statements were utilized to the effect that, as Minister of Militia, I was merely forming battalions and recruiting men who would never be used, and all for my own vainglory. I did not learn until later that jealousy, envy, and overweening ambition were actuating those working against the best interests of the great cause.

I leave it to the people of Canada and to the boys at the front to determine who has worked disinterestedly for the soldiers and the cause, and who for vainglory.

On Saturday last, I observe from Hansard, that Sir Thomas White denied he had ever used to me the words "Canada has already done her full duty to England in recruiting in this war." The Finance Minister on two occasions used the expresion to me; on one occasion he put it in the form of a question, prefacing it with the words "don't you think?" etc. On the second occasion he made the distinct statement. On another occasion, not to me, he went farther, and instead of using the identical words "full duty" the expression was "more than her full duty." On the second occasion, I assured him it was not for England but for Canada, for the Empire, and for human liberty that I was in the war. On Saturday last, the Finance Minister quoted a letter to a Toronto gentleman; I do not know whether it was written in 1917 or in 1916—both dates are somewhat mixed up in the report; but no matter when it was written, it bears on its face the imprint that the soldiers in the trenches are secondary to the commercial interests.

I need make no apology here, or elsewhere, regarding my loyalty to the business interests of Canada. When the hon. the Finance Minister had Canada on the verge of financial ruin, at the beginning of the war, my loyalty to their cause was then shown by my actions in establishing industries in Canada which resulted in placing her industries of every class on a sound financial basis; but I have never made any pretence of placing anything on a par with the soldiers in the trenches. They stand first in the heart of every honest Canadian. The Finance Minister's letter in every reference places them secondary.

Considerable interest is evidently manifesting itself on the general aspect of this case. From one of the most distinguished men high in the ranks of the Conservative party in Canada—I may say very high in the ranks of the Conservative party, and one who will be a good deal higher still—one concerning whose loyalty to the party or to the great cause is unquestioned, I have received a report of which the following is an extract:

> Let us look back to 1911, when the piteous, agonizing cry for help was heard from what is now historically known as the anxious, financial, and commercial group, who with the erstwhile protector of 'Nabob's vineyard' urged to the front on their behalf—and who with tearful voice apologizing for his desertion from his party—pleaded for the success of his new and untried love, so that the interests of his superiors could be saved and protected; and then we can understand all that has happened since.
>
> Not satisfied with the saving grace that the party at that time so unctuously threw around

them they have ever since been using their advocate for their own personal gains; and this Government was never satisfactory to them until their interests have been made paramount.

Not even the exigencies of this horrible war were overlooked or unexploited; for, even here, their interests have been served; and some day he who could have been served—and there is none so blind as he who will not see—will see in all its hideousness a wreck which constant and never-ceasing intrigue has made. But he will have for his comfort, if comfort it can be, the sight of others who have been similarly betrayed; for slowly, but surely, Ephraim is returning to his idols and his recantation will soon be due.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me most positively assure this House and the country of the absolute truth of the statements which I have made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has the Prime Minister nothing to say in answer to the statement of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes)?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not making any statement with regard to the Prime Minister at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I asked if the Government has anything to say.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The statement is already made. I have nothing more to add. I am perfectly convinced in my own mind as to what the facts were. I have already stated them to the House, and I repeat them again.

On section 4:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We considered the first three paragraphs of this section the other day and, as far as I am concerned, I have nothing further to add; but, the fourth paragraph requires some explanation:

Any man who is called out and who, without reasonable excuse, fails to report as aforesaid or to remain on active service where placed shall be guilty, according to the circumstances, of desertion, or of absenting himself without leave and shall be liable

(a) to be tried by court martial and convicted and punished by imprisonment, for a term not exceeding three years, or

(b) on summary conviction to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three years.

By this section concurrent jurisdiction is given to have a court-martial or to take proceedings in an ordinary magistrate's court. Is that correct?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is correct, but I do not think the word "concurrent" is quite right; it is alternative jurisdiction.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why should there be two recourses instead of one? It seems to me that trial before a magistrate ought to be quite enough. A man is called and he immediately becomes a soldier. Then, he claims his exemption; it is either admitted or not, and if his claim is rejected and he does not report, he is liable to be taken before the court. Would it not be better to have him taken before a magistrate rather than to have a court-martial?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are various circumstances and it is thought better to make the jurisdiction alternative for that reason. For example, if a man fails to leave his ordinary avocation and to report for duty, it would appear to me as much more convenient, and indeed more fitting, that his case should be tried before a magistrate. He has never physically come under military jurisdiction. On the other hand, a man might come within the military jurisdiction and fail to accept the assignment to such military duty as he might be allotted to. He has come physically under military jurisdiction and the more convenient method would be to prosecute him by court-martial. Subsection 4 provides for taking care of both contingencies and consequently alternative jurisdiction is established.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Very well; that is satisfactory. Who is to prosecute? If he is brought before a magistrate, as under the ordinary law, can anybody become an informer and prosecutor and lay a complaint against him?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a section later in the Bill under the head of "regulations," section 12:

(1) The Governor in Council may make regulations to secure the full, effective and expeditious operation and enforcement of this Act and in particular, but not to limit the generality of the foregoing, may

(a) define the duties of Registrars and fix their remuneration;

(b) authorize officers and tribunals to give directions not inconsistent with this Act;

(c) prescribe the conditions as to time or otherwise under which applications for certificates may be made, deferred applications received, appeals entered and heard and re-hearings had, and prescribe forms;

(d) prescribe for the keeping and transmission of records;

(e) appoint such peace officers or other officers and give them such powers and impose on them such duties as may be deemed necessary;

(f) make provision for expenses and the remuneration of officers;

(g) prescribe penalties for peace officers or other officers appointed under the authority of this Act, who are convicted or neglect or refusal to perform duty without reasonable excuse.

These regulations must be published forthwith in the Canada Gazette. It is the intention to provide officers for the purpose of carrying out the Act. They may be provincial officers, they may be municipal officers, or they may be neither, but full provision is contained in section 12 for taking care of prosecutions.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If a man is convicted and sentenced to the full term of three years, is it intended that he shall be confined in the county jail of the county in which the action is carried on? If so, it would seem to me to be a very improper place to imprison a man for such a long term. Most of the jails are insanitary, there is no way of giving the prisoner exercise, and no opportunity of putting him at work. Rather than put a man in jail for three years without an opportunity of getting fresh air, it would be better to put him against the wall at once and shoot him. There is another question in connection with this that I would like to submit to my hon. friend and that is the question of municipal expense. Will the board of the prisoner become a charge on the county where the trial is held? Under the present system of summary conviction, as you know, the expense falls on the county. It strikes me that there should be some provision by which the expenses would be borne by the Department of Militia and Defence in order that it should not fall on the county in a case where the prisoner is a military prisoner.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the first place, I need only call my hon. friend's attention to the law of the land which prevents imprisonment in any county jail for two years or upwards. I think my hon. friend will recall that two years less one day is the limit of confinement in any other institution than a penitentiary. If the full term, of two years or upwards, were given, the confinement would necessarily not be in the county jail. As to the municipality, the county or other party bearing the expense, I would like to hear the reason of my hon friend for feeling that there should be any different law applied here for violations of this Act from what would be applied for violations of any Act. My hon. friend will recall that in almost innumerable statutes, and in a great many Orders in Council passed under the authority of statutes, there appears the very same clause as appears here. Offences are created, offences are punishable on summary conviction and the penalty is there stated. Under the law of the land the expense falls where it falls. It would appear to me that there can be no good reason advanced why it should not fall here as in innumerable other cases.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any appeal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The summary conviction provisions of the Criminal Code would apply where there is an appeal.

Mr. MARCIL: I am not familiar with the Code. If a man is condemned to three years' imprisonment, is there an appeal to a higher court?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are the summary trial provisions of the Code, and there are the summary conviction provisions. My recollection is that there are cases under the summary conviction provisions in which there is an appeal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no appeal except in stated cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Whatever it is—I do not pretend to be able to give every portion of it to the House offhand, but I think there are cases in which appeals are allowed. The general law will apply.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This should be made very clear now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is very clear right now, and it has been long established in the Criminal Code.

Mr. MARCIL: I think appeals should be allowed in these cases, because it is a very serious matter to take a man out of his ordinary occupation and put him in jail for three years without the right of appeal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend will remember that under the summary convictions clauses of the Code three years is by no means the maximum penalty that may fall on a man who comes under those provisions. I have known cases under summary conviction of much longer imprisonment than that. So, whatever reasons for appeal there may be here, there would be as strong reasons in other cases. Thus the general law applies. I do not see what more could be asked for.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the hon. gentleman mean that in these cases there will be no appeal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not mean that at all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We ought to know distinctly.

Mr. MARCIL: The people are deeply interested in this clause, and all possible information that could be given should now be forthcoming in order to clear up this misunderstanding. The people are not very familiar with this kind of legislation, and any information that could be given would be of great advantage. We should know whether or not there is any appeal in these cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I shall make a statement, later, on the subject of appeals under the summary convictions clauses. I am not clear at the present time.

Mr. CARVELL: I think you will find that there is an appeal under the summary convictions clauses of the Code, straight to the county court judge.

Mr. MARCIL: An appeal from a court martial?

Mr. CARVELL: No, from summary conviction.

Mr. MARCIL: But these men are sent to jail by court martial.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know what would be done there, but on summary conviction there is an appeal to the county court judge, practically a re-trial.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In case of a court martial, the judgment of the court is always subject to revision by the military authorities, and that is really an appeal; and so, if what my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) says is right, there is always a re-trial.

Mr. MORPHY: Speaking, not on the details of the working out of the clause but on the clause itself, it strikes me that the punishment is too light. As I read subsection 4, it is dealing with two classes of cases, one where a man fails to report, and the other where he has been on active service and deserts. It seems to me that the punishment of three years in the latter case particularly, is utterly inadequate to the offence of desertion after being on active service. The punishment from all time for desertion has been much more severe, and I do not know why it should be reduced to three years in a critical time like this. If all is true that has been said about a certain class who have been denominated slackers, to send them to jail for three years would be like sending them to a picnic; they would rather welcome the safe incarceration in either a county jail or a penitentiary if they could be safe from going to war. My idea is to make the public understand that this law is a drastic measure, and so I think that this punishment should be ten years instead of three for the man who deserts and probably five for the man who fails to report. I feel that it is the sense of the loyal element of the country at large that whatever this Bill shall be it shall be drastic and intended to meet the case. Those who are unwilling to do their duty, or who fail to do it after undertaking it, should be met by a Bill that is drastic in every phase. This Bill should be held up to them now as something that will reach them and reach them hard. In that way many of them may come in before the terms of this Bill are passed into law.

4 p.m.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am not as anxious as the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Morphy) to have a drastic measure, but we ought to have a clear measure and to know exactly where we are. This very clause leads us into a good deal of confusion. By the first section of the Act, we have made the Army Act part of this Bill. The Army Act upon this point is far more severe than my hon. friend from Perth has suggested this Bill should be. Here is section 12 of the Army Act:

> Every person subject to military law who commits any of the following offences; that is to say,
>
> (a) Deserts or attempts to desert His Majesty's Service; or,
>
> (b) Persuades, endeavours to persuade, procures or attempts to procure any person subject to military law to desert from His Majesty's service, shall, on conviction by court-martial, if he committed such offence when on active service or under orders for active service, be liable to suffer death, or such less punishment as is in this Act mentioned.

If the Army Act is incorporated in this Bill, and it already is incorporated by the first section of this Bill, under the Army Act, a person charged with the offence of desertion is liable to suffer death. It must be remembered that under the chapter I have read the punishment of death is applicable when the man is called to active service. In former years the punishment for desertion was death in all cases, in peace time and in war time; but in later years it has been made applicable only during active service. Under the section we are now considering it is provided:

> The Governor in Council may from time to time by proclamation call out on active service—

The man who is called out under this Bill, if it becomes law, is held to be on active service, and therefore, if the Army Act is incorporated in this Bill, as it al-

ready is by the first section, the deserter is liable to the punishment of death. It is true that under this section he is liable only to imprisonment for three years. That is a provision of this Bill. But the Bill has already made the Army Act a part of the law which is to be, and I cannot see how we can escape the conclusion that desertion is punishable by death.

Mr. MORPHY: By section 13 it is clearly shown that this Act is by itself, although I believe there is a misprint in the word "therewith."

The Militia Act, the Army Act, and the King's Regulations and Orders for the Army shall so far as applicable and not inconsistent therewith—

I think that is a clerical error and means "not inconsistent herewith."

—apply to and form part of this Act.

That clearly takes the Army Act and the Militia Act and the King's Regulations and Orders out of this Act where they are inconsistent with its terms.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not say to the contrary, but at all events we should know where we are. Is the Army Act to apply or not to apply?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It seems to me very simple. The Army Act is to apply so far as applicable and where it is not inconsistent with this Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is so intended?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In respect to these particular offences it would be inconsistent, and therefore this Act would prevail.

Mr. MARCIL: Would it not be advisable to include as a schedule to the Bill the clauses of the Army Act that do apply, because the people generally are not like members of this House or of the legal profession or of the military profession; they are not familiar with all these things. Would it not be well to add the clauses to the Army Act, so as to know exactly what applies and what does not apply, so that every man to whom this Bill may be sent will know exactly what he was up against?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no possibility of doing that. It could be done better by a provision in the clause. There is a certain application of the Army Act, but it must not be applied so as to conflict with this clause. For example, when a man is tried by court martial, the principles that govern such tribunals apply, and the Army Act applies; but when it comes to the penalty, this Act applies. The tribunal cannot go beyond the limit fixed by this Act. If one were to extract clauses, he could not extract the clauses that apply to court martial, because that is governed by the provisions of this Bill. On the question of an appeal under summary conviction, I would refer to section 749 and section 146 of the Criminal Code. Those sections are in pretty full terms and set out the provisions for the appeal. Later on, in section 761, are to be found the provisions for stating a case. It will, therefore, appear that such provision for appeal is made here as has been considered in the general run of criminal convictions.

Mr. NESBITT: I have read clause 12, which my hon. friend referred to, but it does not give much information. It says that the regulations are to be made by the Governor in Council. That is one thing I do not like. I think the regulations should be set forth in the Act, and made part of the statute. The advertisement or notice which shall be given of that proclamation depends entirely on the view of the Governor in Council. You are going to punish a man who is called out under subsection 4 of section 4, who without reasonable excuse fails to report. Many people in the country do not read the papers. Nobody reads the Canada Gazette. Members of Parliament are the only gentlemen who receive it, and they throw it in the waste-paper basket.

Mr. BOYCE: That might be a reasonable excuse.

Mr. NESBITT: It might be. That would depend entirely on the view of the magistrate. All magistrates are very mortal—some more so than others—and I would not like the community at large to be subject to the whim of the magistrate, or to be subject always to the whim of the county judge. Therefore, I think it should be distinctly stated in this Bill what the advertisement for the proclamation should be. All I want to do is to have the Bill in reasonable shape, so that the public will be protected from prosecution. I do not imagine the intention of the Government is to persecute in any way, but still the tribunals might.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course, if regulations were embodied in the Bill, then they would not be regulations. They would be

sections of the Bill. Wherever regulations are referred to in any Act, they are to be afterwards promulgated by the authorities designated by the Act. That is the nature of regulations. As to publication, I may say that we embody as much in the Bill as can reasonably be done, and more than is done in England. In the Bill, we leave less to regulation than is done under the British Act. For example, under the British Act there is no division.

Mr. NESBITT: Pardon me, I do not care anything about the British Act. We are dealing with this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps other hon. gentlemen do.

Mr. NESBITT: I am not speaking for other hon. gentlemen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the British Act they leave these provisions to be afterwards worked out by regulation. Here we specify the division. As to publication, the reason it is put in the shape it is in Section 12 is that some notices and some regulations, which from time to time may be made necessary, will be of such very minor importance and such purely local consequence that it would be unwise to provide in the Bill that all of them should receive the same publicity, and that we should go to the same expense with regard to all. There may be regulations later on which will provide for the case of a tribunal whose head resides three or four miles from where hearings are held for the convenience of the public. It would not require the same publicity that other more general regulations would require. Consequently, it has to be left to the discretion of those who are most directly interested in the success of the Bill to see that such publicity is given as will bring the provisions of the Bill, and the provisions of the regulation, home to all to whom they should be brought home.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I suggest to the Solicitor General the desirability of providing a different tribunal for the case of a man who has actually been enrolled and gone into active service and becomes a deserter, from the tribunal which is to try the case of a young man who simply fails to report. That is along the line followed by the hon. gentleman from North Perth (Mr. Morphy), though, of course, he dealt more with the punishment. It seems to me very objectionable that a young man who is simply called out by the proclamation should be liable to be tried by court martial. If he is tried by court martial there is no appeal, and the question as to whether he had a reasonable excuse or not would be a question of fact in regard to which a young man should have the opportunity of appealing, if the decision was, in his opinion, contrary to the facts of the case. Therefore, I think that trial by court martial ought to be limited to the case of one who deserts after he has actually become attached to the army and engaged upon active service in Canada, of course, as well as abroad. A proclamation issues, we will say, calling upon young men between the ages of 20 and 23 to come forward and report. A young man may not come within that class. He may be, according to his own belief and the belief of his parents, 24 years of age. He may not be one who is liable to report under the first call. It would be a very great hardship if he should be brought before a court martial, tried and convicted as a deserter under this Act, when, according to his belief and the belief of his parents, he was not entitled to be called at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would come under "reasonable excuse."

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the court martial may decide he was under 24 years of age, and that he had no reasonable excuse for not coming forward. It would be a very great hardship that he should be convicted and sentenced to three years in the penitentiary by court martial, without having any right of appeal. There is no provision whatever in the statute for appeal from the decision of the court martial. It seems to me cases of that kind should be tried before the magistrate under the proceedings by way of summary conviction, and if the young man were found guilty, and it was thought he was wrongly prosecuted, he would then have an opportunity of filing his bond and appealing to the judge of the county court, in the ordinary way in which appeals from summary convictions are taken. For that reason I would suggest to my hon. friend whether the proceedings by court martial ought not to be limited to cases of desertion, after a man has actually become a part of the expeditionary force, and whether cases of mere neglect to report should not be tried under the Summary Convictions Act, in which case all the remedy ordinarily provided by law in case of summary conviction would be open to him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is not quite correct when he says there is no appeal in the case of court martials.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is none by this measure. Where is that provision to be found?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Similarly, there is none in the case of summary convictions. But the Code is still in effect and makes adequate provision. There is also provision in the King's Regulations and the Army Act for a reconsideration of the sentence of a court martial. I am not very familiar with military procedure, but I understand—indeed, if I caught rightly the words of the leader of the Opposition, he stated the nature of the appeal in cases of court martial.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The sentence is subject to revision by the military authorities.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a revision of the judgment of a court martial. That judgment always comes before the competent military authorities including the Minister of Militia, so that it is not correct to say there is no appeal in that case. On the main point raised by my hon. friend as to the wisdom of making a distinction in the tribunal in the case of a man who fails to report and in the case of a man who having reported and having come under the jurisdiction of the military authorities, then deserts, I have made a note and will give an answer later on.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the section stand in the meantime?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR: The evidence taken before a court martial is all taken down in writing. This evidence, with the finding of the court martial, is sent, before the finding is promulgated or goes into effect, to the officer who appointed the court martial, and the finding has to be reviewed and confirmed by him before it has any effect.

Mr. LEMIEUX: By him alone?

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes. Afterwards it is sent down to the Judge Advocate General at Ottawa, General Smith. That is a very long process, and unless the sentence is for a long period, any revision he made would not be effective. In the case of a long sentence, the Judge Advocate General is again charged with the duty of interfering if the sentence of the court martial does not appear to be in accord with the evidence presented. How far is it intended that this measure shall follow these soldiers? I presume it is not intended that there shall be one law for soldiers already enlisted or who enlist voluntarily, and another for soldiers coming in under this measure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The point directly raised by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor was in my mind when the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) was speaking and may be reserved for consideration with the matter already reserved at the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John.

Mr. GLASS: In reference to clauses (a) and (b), is it intended that the penalty imposed in one part of the country for an offence shall differ from that imposed in another part of the country for the same offence? There seems to be some ambiguity in this respect. One court, for instance, might impose a sentence of twelve months, while another might impose a sentence of two years or three years. The sentence imposed in one province might differ from that imposed in another. The offence of desertion is desertion wherever it is committed. If a deserter is tried by court martial, the military authorities provide what penalty there shall be, but if say, in Ontario, a man fails to respond to the appeal of his country, he may have the maximum penalty of three years imposed. Some judge, however, in Manitoba or any other province might take a more lenient view of a similar case and might impose a smaller penalty. There should be no room for variation in the penalty imposed for that offence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend will see at a glance that it would not be possible to fix a hard and fast punishment for every case of desertion. A limit must be fixed and the decision left to the tribunal according to the circumstances. What may be a crime in one case may not be a crime of the same extent in another. There may be desertion and desertion, but very different degrees depending upon the circumstances of each case, just as in every case of the commission of an offence.

Mr. GLASS: I was not speaking so much with reference to the matter of desertion; I was speaking with reference to the man who does not respond to the call of duty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is desertion.

Mr. GLASS: Then the men who will not respond to that call must, no matter where they may be, be treated in the same way. It might be possible for a magistrate, or

whoever tries the case, to impose a nominal penalty—

Mr. MORPHY: Three days instead of three years.

Mr. GLASS: —of three days, or thirty days or sixty days instead of three years. The offence of not responding to the call should make a man liable to a fine consistent with the seriousness of the offence. I am not a lawyer, but there seems to be a wide margin for making a farce of the whole matter if a minimum penalty is not imposed for an offence of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The offence, like every other offence, may from an abnormity go down in degree of guilt and infamy until it is nearly nothing at all. For instance, if a man is a deserter, he may have such an excuse that the judge might feel is not a reasonable excuse within the meaning of the law, but is very close to a reasonable excuse. That man might come before the judge, and, while failing to convince him that his excuse is reasonable, might say: I am ready to submit myself right now; I would have done so before had I understood things. Would my hon. friend have the judge say to the man: Although you may be ready to become a soldier, I am bound to send you to jail for three years? I think what is in my hon. friend's mind is this, that a man having served his time would have expiated his offence and therefore not be liable again. He would be liable still. Were he sent to jail for three days, he would have to report for duty immediately he was released. If he failed to do so, he would be again guilty of the offence.

Mr. GLASS: Supposing you found in any particular district the officer trying the case not in sympathy with the principle of conscription or of military service, he might make a farce of the whole matter by giving offenders only a few days' imprisonment. There should be a minimum penalty.

Mr. NESBITT: The military authorities would soon get rid of such an officer.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member (Mr. Glass) does not recall the fact that the difficulty to which he alludes is experienced in the general administration of the criminal law. There are comparisons made all the time in this country and in other countries between the sentence one judge may impose for a particular offence and the sentence another judge may impose for a like offence. You cannot regulate these matters in advance, if you are going to leave the degree of punishment to the judgment of the tribunal. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not appreciated the observation made by the Solicitor General, that the imposition of punishment under this section does not relieve the man from his obligation to military service. He is still liable to it, although he may have received and undergone a sentence.

Mr. MORPHY: Is that made quite clear in the Act, and where is it to be found?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is to be found in the fact that there is nothing in the Act against it. The man is made liable to military service. If he commits a certain offence he is to receive a certain punishment, within limits, but the imposition of that punishment does not relieve him from service to which he is liable under the provisions of the Act. It leaves his status in respect to the Act exactly as it was before.

Mr. MORPHY: I wish to support as strongly as I can the suggestion of the hon. member for Middlesex. If the Act is to be really effective the clause should make an offender liable to a punishment of not less than three years and not more than ten or six years, as the case may be; that would be making it definite. The hon. member for Guysborough made a suggestion as to the expenses of incarceration of prisoners convicted under this Act. Personally, I do not see why a sentence of imprisonment with hard labour should not be imposed on any one found guilty under the Act. If the clause stands as it is, I think the salutary effects of this enactment will be frittered away. As the clause stands, a magistrate strongly opposed to imprisonment for this sort of offence—and they are to be found in all provinces—might let his personal feelings come into play and disregard the interests of the country. He might say with a smile to the man brought before him charged with an offence: "You are guilty. Three days in the common jail." Or he might sentence him to jail for only 2 hours. Surely, the Government cannot afford to allow an Act with such a clause to go on the statute-book. To my mind it would bring the Act into absolute contempt in many portions of the Dominion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend suggest that the Government be directly represented at the court?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is referring to the tribunal. My hon. friend

from North Perth had reference to the magistrate who tries the case.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not think he is paying much of a compliment to the judiciary of this country when he suggests that a judge would make light of this Bill. However, I should not object to seconding my hon. friend's amendment if he would also bring war grafters under this drastic law.

Mr. MORPHY: I am informed that a session or so ago amendments were made to the Criminal Code dealing with that very class.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Have they been dealt with?

Mr. MORPHY: I have not heard of there being anything serious.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some hon. members have said the grafters should be shot.

Mr. BOYCE. I am in agreement with my hon. friend from North Perth, especially, in view of the statement that an hon. member of this House makes in this morning's newspaper, that rather than obey the provisions of this Act, 20,000 or 25,000 people would go to jail. That is certainly a serious statement to the public, coming from a member of this House. It makes one feel that we should be very certain with regard to the provisions in this Bill for punishment of any one disobeying the law in any part of Canada, irrespective of any province. Suppose that the threat of the hon. member—and his statement was made in public—were carried out and that 20,000 or 25,000 prosecutions had to take place, and that the magistrate who heard the cases saw fit to impose a penalty of only 24 hours, those men would be getting off pretty lightly.

I am also inclined to support my hon. friend's general suggestion that the provisions of the Bill with regard to punishment do not go far enough. This is a very important measure, certainly the most vital measure that could be placed before this House and the country. It calls on every man, and the punishment for an offence should be so drastic that any one wilfully disobeying the law should practically be made an outlaw. I would suggest—I will offer no amendment now, as I understand the clause is to stand—that any man who has been convicted should be deprived for a period of three years after his imprisonment of the rights of citizenship, of his right to vote, for instance, at either a provincial, municipal, or Dominion election because of his contumacious conduct in disobeying the law of his country which calls him out for active service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to the necessity for a minimum sentence I would ask hon. members very seriously to consider the purpose of the Bill. Its purpose is to make soldiers, not jail-birds. If a minimum term is to be fixed and the contingency that my hon. friend from Algoma suggests actually takes place, then the Bill will succeed in making jail-birds of these men, but it would be impossible under the Bill to make soldiers of them. We should bear in mind that immediately a man is apprehended for having deserted, by not reporting for duty, from that moment he is in the custody of the law, and whatever punishment he receives we have already made him an outlaw to the extent that he has disobeyed the law of the land. But as soon as he has served his term, be it only 24 hours, he is under the Army Act in that he has deserted, and under the provisions of the Army Act he may be apprehended and brought before a tribunal and the law enforced; that is, he may be made a soldier; he becomes a soldier after becoming an outlaw. Keeping in mind what we have in view, and not the mere question of punishment, it seems to me that the Bill in that regard is as it ought to be. As to the necessity of a higher maximum of punishment that can be taken into account with the other suggestions made by the hon. member for Perth and the hon. member for New Westminster.

Mr. TAYLOR: The answer of the Solicitor General has a bearing, of course, on the answer to the question I asked a short time ago as to how far this Bill follows the soldier. To my mind this Bill should not follow the soldier beyond his attestation. If we attempt to make it apply to him longer than that, I think we shall only be inviting trouble. We cannot have two classes of soldiers. We cannot have one law applying to men already in the army, and another law applying to those who are brought in under this Bill. If the Bill makes it quite clear that its purpose is to provide a force which is to be delivered over to the military authorities I think our trouble will be at an end. I would not for a moment group our citizen soldiers with the grafters to whom the hon. member for Rouville has referred.

I think it would be most unfortunate to stigmatize a man as a criminal because he has committed a purely military offence, such as failing to report. When I had the honour of commanding a battalion in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, I had to do with a great many offences against the military law. There was hardly a day a commanding officer's court was not held. In very few of those cases was there any vicious intent, and I found that the law of kindness was much more effective than the law of repression, with respect to those soldiers; and if you showed human sympathy with a soldier, and treated lightly an offence which was not repeated and recurring offence, explained to him his liability to punishment and the desirability that he should maintain the dignity of his own institution, you got along indeed very well with him.

I should be sorry to see any minimum punishment established under this Bill, as I think in a great many cases the purpose of the Bill would be served by apprehending the citizen and making him fully conversant with the liability to which he was subjected under the law.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would suggest to my hon. friend the Solicitor General that it might be well to have some method by which a prisoner can be pardoned, provided that after sentence he should be willing to obey the law and become a soldier. It strikes me that it would be well to have a provision of that kind, because no doubt there will be many cases of that nature, where men without very much intention of doing wrong fail to appear, and might be convicted and sentenced, and after spending a few days in jail might make up their minds that perhaps it would be better to join the boys in the fight, and be willing to go. I would suggest that some person should have authority in cases of that kind to pardon a prisoner and admit him into the forces.

In regard to the suggestion made by my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy) that a light sentence might be imposed upon an offender by a friendly magistrate, which would, in a way, make the Act a farce, I would ask would he not be liable for another sentence? Suppose a call comes to John Smith to turn out on a certain day, and he declines to go. His case is brought before a magistrate, and he is sentenced to, say, a week's imprisonment. He serves his sentence, and is discharged. Is he liable to be called on again, or does that settle the matter as far as he is concerned? Is he not liable for a second prosecution later on? I would like to know from the Solicitor General what the situation would be in a case of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is liable in case of any future desertion. I would apprehend, however, that inasmuch as he is in the custody of the law he would be physically under the military authorities, and it would be much more difficult for him to desert thereafter.

Mr. NESBITT: Would he not be liable to be tried by a court-martial, if the magistrate was too lenient?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He could not be tried by court-martial for the same offence, no matter how leniently the magistrate may have dealt with him.

Mr. NESBITT: I mean, could he not be tried by court-martial the next time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. In case a man repents and changes his mind after he has been convicted before the magistrate and sentenced, the full power of pardon rests with His Excellency, and may be exercised. An Order in Council is now in effect covering convictions or desertions, which provides that the convicting magistrate or judge may, of his own motion, release a prisoner if the prisoner is ready to take up again his military duties. That is to say, it has devolved upon the judge himself to provide more definitely for the pardon and release of men guilty of desertion, or guilty of absenting themselves without leave, which, of course, is another offence. In case of a conviction by court-martial, there is full power to pardon, not in His Excellency the Governor General, but, I think, in the commanding officer. In any event, the members of the House who have more knowledge of military matters may explain that it will be quite within the power of superior authority to release prisoners convicted by court-martial.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) has allowed members of the committee to ramble in the discussion of the Bill, I would suggest we take up the question of the exemption of the clergy. I would not mention the point if my hon. friend the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) had not raised it in his speech this afternoon.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend had better let the matter stand. It will come up in its proper place. If we

begin jumping from one section of the Act to another, we will never get through.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have no objection. I have some remarks to make on the subject, because my hon. friend from Victoria stated he was against any exemption in favour of the clergy. However, the question will come up later on.

Section stands.

On section 5:

5. (1) There shall be established in the manner hereinafter set out, the following tribunals:
(a) Local tribunals;
(b) Appeal tribunals;
(c) A central appeal judge.
(2) Any tribunal may hear evidence on oath or otherwise as it may deem expedient, and for the performance of its duties shall have all the powers vested in a Commissioner under Part I of the Inquiries Act.
(3) The Governor in Council may, upon the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge, make regulations with respect to the establishment, constitution, functions and procedure of the said tribunals and such regulations may contain provisions for securing uniformity in the application of this Act.
(4) In so far as provision is not otherwise made, the procedure of the tribunal shall be such as is determined by the tribunal.
(5) No member of any tribunal shall be responsible at law for anything done by him in good faith in the performance of his duties under this Act, and no action shall be taken against any member of a local tribunal or an appeal tribunal in respect of the performance or non-performance of his duties under this Act, except with the written consent of the Central Appeal Judge.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Might I call the attention of my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) to subsections 1 and 2 of this section. Does this wording mean that the appeal tribunals may also take evidence? I should imagine the intention is that only the local tribunal takes evidence. Or, is the court of appeal to take evidence also, upon the evidence already taken?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was thought wise to give the appeal tribunal power to take evidence if it saw fit.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: For what reason? It would simply be a re-trial.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We want the very simplest procedure possible before the local tribunals; and we want as few lawyers as possible, the idea being that the great bulk of the cases will be disposed of by the local tribunals. It might be that under such conditions as that a man might not adduce before the local tribunals evidence that he later could adduce. We do not want to debar the court of appeal judge from taking that evidence if he sees fit.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The appeal will not be an appeal in the ordinary sense of the word, but the appeal court gives to the prisoner a re-trial before a judge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, much in the way of an appeal from a magistrate under a summary conviction.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many members of the appeal court will there be?

Mr. MEIGHEN: One.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Paragraph 2 says:

Any tribunal may hear evidence on oath or otherwise as it may deem expedient, and for the performance of its duties, shall have all the powers vested in a Commissioner under part one of the Inquiries Act.

You establish a court, but a commissioner is not a court. Why this drafting? Why not say that the court shall have the power of a court of record?

Mr. MEIGHEN: A reference to the Inquiries Act will show that if the tribunal has the powers of that Act, it requires no more powers. I do not think it should be empowered further than a commissioner under the Inquiries Act. A general provision that it should have all the powers of a court of record would be more than would be necessary. It has hardly that status. It is more a board of inquiry than a court of record.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is a board of inquiry, but it has power to give judgment. It is a board of inquiry for the purpose of exempting a man.

Mr. MORPHY: Paragraph 2 of section 5 says:

Any tribunal may hear evidence on oath or otherwise as it may deem expedient.

Why "otherwise?" It seems to me that this tends towards looseness of administration in the working of the tribunal. I think it should be confined to evidence upon oath or to a statutory declaration having penalties attached to the violation or breaking of the oath.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It might be evidence of affirmation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My own idea was that it would be better that the tribunal should not be restrained in that regard. For instance, the cases might come very rapidly, there might be practically no question about a man's liability or about his right to exemption, and it seemed to me that it

would be better to leave it to the tribunal. If the tribunal thought the matter was sufficiently important, or the question sufficiently doubtful, to have an investigation, they could swear a man, but it might not be necessary to swear every man who wanted to make a statement before them.

Mr. MORPHY: What prompted me to make that remark was a story I heard about a certain regiment in a certain district where seven prospective recruits went before a medical board for examination. The officer who told me the story said that they were the finest looking body of men he had ever seen, apparently physically fit, all single, not one with a dependent, and every one was rejected.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A case like that would be taken care of by the presence of an official of the Department of Militia and Defence who could appeal immediately. I do not see that it will be taken care of any better by compelling swearing to the evidence.

Mr. MORPHY: My answer to that is that laxity in procedure would be bound to come from the lack of sanctity of the oath. If you establish the solemnity of the tribunal, you will get a better tribunal for investigating statements than by any other method or arrangement.

Mr. NESBITT: It will be left with the tribunal to make their own rules and regulations, and they can take evidence under oath if they want to. I agree with the Solicitor General.

Mr. KYTE: Is it intended that parties appearing before this tribunal shall be permitted to do so by counsel?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question of practice and procedure is left entirely to the regulations and to that class of the regulations which are framed initially by the central appeal judge. He will deal with the matter of procedure entirely, and it will be left ultimately to his decision as to what provision, if any, shall be made for counsel.

Mr. KYTE: I asked that question because subsection 2 says that:

> Any tribunal may hear evidence on oath or otherwise as it may deem expedient, and for the performance of its duties shall have all the powers vested in a Commissioner under part one of the Inquiries Act.

I recall that a few years ago when a commissioner was appointed under the Inquiries Act to investigate partisanship, he held that he could not permit parties accused of partisanship to appear by counsel and in many instances they suffered to a very considerable extent on that account. It should not be left to the decision of a tribunal but it should be specifically stated in the Act or in the regulations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the way it will be.

Mr. DEVLIN: Is it intended in the province of Quebec that a judge of the circuit court shall sit as a court of appeal over a judge of the Superior Court?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see how that would be possible under the Act.

Mr. DEVLIN: It is possible in this way. The local tribunal shall consist, in the province of Quebec, first, of a member appointed by the joint resolution of the two Houses, and secondly of a judge of the Superior Court.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What tribunal?

Mr. DEVLIN: The local tribunal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no. We are at section 5. We will discuss that when we come to section 6, but I do not think that is the case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Referring now to paragraph 3 of section 5 I find the following provision:

> The Governor in Council may, upon the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge make regulations with respect to the establishment, constitution, functions and procedure of the said tribunals and such regulations may contain provisions for securing uniformity in the application of this Act.

That word " uniformity " is a very broad and elastic term. I do not understand how it can be defined. What is contemplated by that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a similar provision in the British Military Service Act. The intention is this: A very wide discretion is left to the tribunal under a succeeding section as to exemptions. It is desired that the interpretation and application of those provisions shall be as nearly as possible uniform, and it was thought that the central appeal judge might draft such regulations as would look to the securing of the uniform application of these provisions throughout Canada. The very same provision exists in the English Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I asked that question because I thought that if there was a similar provision elsewhere we might know what it means and what regulations have been made. If there is a similar provision in the British Act, regula-

lations ought to have been made under it. What are they? I concede at once that it is desirable that there should be uniformity in the application of those clauses and that if possible the regulations should be made to secure that uniformity but unless there are precedents to which you can point, I am at a loss to imagine what regulations you could make which would be applicable to all cases beyond the commonsense, prudence and fairness of the judges themselves. If you have any direction to give them, I should like to know if possible, what it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I should be going beyond my rights here if I attempted to indicate what might be regulations; but I can easily imagine regulations that would look to uniformity. For instance it might be provided that the same rule in respect of the presence of counsel should prevail in Manitoba as in Nova Scotia, or that there should be uniformity in the application of the subsection relating to health and physical defects. It has been found necessary in other countries, and we have provided, that where a man is physically and manifestly unfit for military service he need not go through the nonsensical formality of going up for medical inspection. For instance, if a man had no legs the board could exempt him at once without his going before a medical officer.

Section agreed to on division.

On section 6, subsection 1:

The minister may from time to time by proclamation or otherwise establish local tribunals at such places as he deems necessary and give each an appropriate designation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will the regulations referred to in subsection 3 be published in the official Gazette a sufficient time before the law becomes effective to permit the public to become familiar with the regulations?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would be the duty of the Government to see that the people of the country had notice of those regulations.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Why is the word "otherwise" used, "proclamation or otherwise"? Is there any better way of making it known than by proclamation?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know that there is, but we thought that we would leave it to the discretion of the minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am afraid if he attempted to do it otherwise than by proclamation it would not be the best means of making it public.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That relates to the form of publication. There would probably be publication in the press and notices posted up.

Mr. MURPHY: Is this the subsection to which the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) referred this afternoon when he said that military districts would be designated rather than geographical districts?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Some place in the Act I found it spoke of a provincial jurisdiction; I think section 7.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can quite understand the point raised by the ex-Minister of Militia. Indeed, it was very frequently in our minds when these sections of the Bill were under review. The difficulty is that when it comes to the appointment of the Appeal Tribunal that is left to the Chief Justices of the provinces, and if it were done by military districts we should be under the necessity of having the Chief Justice of one province appoint the tribunal from another province.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Where will these tribunals be established? By counties? Where will they meet? It is important to know where the men will report themselves.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The tribunals will not necessarily be established by counties. They will be appointed and the places where they are to meet will be set out. There may be two or three tribunals in one county, one in another, and some counties may have none. The point at which the tribunal is first established will be selected so as to suit the convenience of the population. A tribunal may subsequently sit in another county, and its jurisdiction is ample all over the province. Any person may appear before a tribunal wherever he is; but he must abide by whatever tribunal he selects.

5 p.m.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who determines the action of these movable tribunals?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Justice. The intention is that if a tribunal finds it can do its work better in any other place it can wire for authority to move, and, having that authority, it may move to another place.

Mr. PARDEE: One tribunal might do the work for a whole province?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might do the work for a very large area. Later on there is provision for the consolidation of tribunals, if it is found that they are not all required.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What I had in mind was the convenience of those called. There may be in one township fifty young men, in another seventy-five, and in another one hundred, and so on. The object of the Government will be, no doubt, to cause the least inconvenience possible to young men and bring the tribunal as near to them as possible.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, that is the idea. That is why so much discretion was left to the minister, in order that he might study the requirements of population in the different parts of the country, and arrange the tribunals accordingly.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 3.—Local tribunals.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Judging from the remark just made by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) I understand that a man may select his own tribunal. Suppose, for instance, a resident in Ottawa is conscripted, and wishes to appear before one of the tribunals, would he be allowed to present his case before the tribunal, say in the city of London, or the tribunals in Toronto?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that not an anomaly?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think, as a matter of legal right, under this Bill, he would be enabled to go to London, and apply to the tribunal there, but the restraining circumstance is that he would have a lot more difficulty in presenting his evidence, and convincing the tribunal, than he would if he applied to a tribunal close at hand. But what was sought to be avoided was the raising of questions of jurisdiction. If geographical limitations were placed on the jurisdiction of the tribunal, the question of the domicile of every applicant would come up, and interminable questions of jurisdiction would arise. Those are avoided by allowing the young man to choose any tribunal he desires within his own province.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no provision made as to how many members will compose the Board of Selection?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, there is not, and I would be glad to have suggestions from hon. members. We had difficulty in framing the section, and we desired to have it present not only the appearance, but the reality of perfect fairness to every one. Therefore, we arrived at the conclusion that a board of selection, established by joint resolution of the Senate and House of Commons, would be the best body. If any other course is considered preferable by the committee, I should be very glad indeed to consider it. We have the idea in our minds that we might have a board consisting of two members from each province —18 in all.

Mr. NESBITT: Would that be two members from each province from the Commons, or from both Houses?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They will not necessarily be selected from the House of Commons. If they should be selected from the Parliament, of course it would be appropriate to nominate some members of the Upper House.

Mr. CARVELL: I have been thinking a great deal about this clause—a little more than any other clause of the Bill—and my right hon. friend must admit at once that a committee composed of, say, eighteen gentlemen from all over Canada would be a very unwieldy thing. There would be a very great deal of difficulty in getting them together, and I am afraid that many influences might be exerted upon them, and I would like to suggest, although I do not offer it as an amendment—that possibly there might be a smaller board appointed for each province in Canada, and see if that board, knowing the local conditions better than the larger board, could not work out a fairer method of choosing the members of these tribunals than could the general board that would be appointed under the suggestion of the hon. Premier. I simply throw out the suggestion. I think probably every member in the House has given this matter consideration. I know the people of the country have done so. I have received more letters along this line, and I have heard more criticism and discussion from people that I met and talked to on this phase of it, than on any other. I think this suggestion might be worked out fairly well.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have had the same experience as the hon. gentleman from Carleton (Mr. Carvell). I expected that perhaps the Government had a plan of their own, but if the only plan they have at the present time is the one suggested, of having two members from each

province, I am afraid it would be an unwieldy body and the observations of my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) appear to be unanswerable. Since the Government themselves are open to conviction upon this question, and ready to receive suggestions, perhaps the best thing to do is to reserve the subsection, and at the next sitting of the House hon. gentlemen can express their views on the question.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not so sure that it would not work out all right as it stands. As a matter of fact, it would probably work out in this way: The members from each province would examine the situation in that province and arrive at a conclusion. Then the board would meet and make their appointments without a great deal of difficulty, because the gentlemen nominated by the members from each province would most probably be accepted by their colleagues from the other provinces. Therefore, the matter would work out much in the way my hon. friend from Carleton suggested, except that the appointment would be made by the whole board of eighteen, instead of by the local provincial board for each province. I shall be very glad to accept my hon. friend's suggestion and let the section stand.

Mr. CARVELL: One of the difficulties would be that you could not find any two men in one province who are fairly familiar with every section of the province. My idea is that if you could have a board consisting of four or five members for each province, you would have a more representative board than one consisting of two members.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is well worth considering. I had it in my mind that I would ask my right hon. friend to name one man, and I would name another, and appoint the board in that way.

Section stands.

On subclause 1, of section 3:

1. In those provinces in which there are county courts or district courts, the county court judge or district court judge, or, if more than one, the senior judge for the county or district in which the local tribunal is established, or when the place at which a local tribunal is to be established is not within the territorial limits of any county court or district court, then by such judge as may be determined by the minister.

The judge making the appointment may appoint himself or any other judge having jurisdiction in the county or district.

For the purposes of this section, "county court judge" or "district court judge" includes any deputy judge authorised by law to act for the time being for any such judge, and also includes any acting judge so authorised.

In the province of Quebec:—

(a) In the judicial districts of Montreal and Quebec, any judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec who is authorized by the Chief Justice of the said court or authorized by the judge appointed to perform the duties of Chief Justice in the judicial district.

(b) In the other judicial districts the judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec assigned to the judicial district within which the local tribunal is established.

Mr. DEVLIN: According to part 2 of this section relating to the province of Quebec, a judge of the superior court shall appoint one of the members of the local tribunal. Is that member of the local tribunal to be appointed by that judge to be a judge of the same court?

Mr. DOHERTY: Not necessarily. It is not contemplated that he would necessarily appoint a judge.

Mr. DEVLIN: He may appoint any one?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: So that the provision that applies to all the other provinces will not apply to Quebec.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is just the same as in the other provinces. There is no obligation in the other provinces for the judge to appoint a judge. There is a provision that he may appoint himself or any other judge, but as I understand the matter, he is not limited to appointing a judge. The matter is permissive as regards the other judges.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that limited only to provinces other than Quebec? A judge in Quebec could not appoint himself.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is not provided that he might appoint himself, because I do not think it was contemplated that we would ask judges of the superior court to undertake the work of sitting on the tribunals. In the other provinces the county court or district judges are to do the work, and it was thought it might be quite proper that a county court judge should be appointed to do that work, but it did not occur to myself, nor, I believe, to the gentlemen drafting the Bill, that there was any need of our setting the judges of the superior court to do that work, because it is to be noticed that the appellate tribunal is to consist of a judge of the superior court, and it would be, from some points of view, undesirable that you should first have a judge of the superior court sitting on the local tribunal, and then an appeal from that judge of the superior court acting with

another member of the tribunal, to another judge of the superior court.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If I understand the Minister of Justice aright, the Chief Justice of the Quebec district will make the appointments there and Assistant Chief Justice Archibald of Montreal, will make the appointments in the district of Montreal.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And in each of the districts of the superior court in Quebec, the judge of that district will make the appointments.

Mr. DOHERTY: With this exception, that in the districts of Montreal and Quebec, I do not think the intention is that necessarily the Chief Justice shall appoint, but he will designate one of his judges to make the appointments.

Mr. DEVLIN: The judge of the superior court may appoint himself or any other judge of the superior court or any body else.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is not expressly so provided, and the inference might, from the provision, being expressly made for the county court judges in the other provinces, be that the superior court judge would not be expected to appoint himself or another judge of the superior court. I pointed out a moment ago a reason why it should seem desirable that he should not do so. From that local tribunal composed of the nominee of the judge and the nominee of the board of selection, there is an appeal to a judge of the superior court. The reason why we have to make a difference with regard to Quebec is, as the hon. gentleman knows, that in that province we have no county court judges; we have only superior court judges.

Mr. DEVLIN: We have judges of the circuit court.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, but only in the city of Montreal.

Mr. DEVLIN: It might be well to make a distinction there.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. member thinks it desirable to make a distinct provision for Montreal, that question might be considered, but it seems to us that we should make a system of general application throughout the province. The judge of the superior court designated to make the appointments in the district of Montreal might, very properly, if he thought fit, appoint one of the judges of the circuit court.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They are too busy.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. member suggests that our judges of the circuit court in Montreal have just about as much as they can do with their ordinary judicial work.

Mr. DEVLIN: Does it not appear ridiculous to the minister that if a judge of the superior court is going to sit upon the local tribunal, yet afterwards under section 7, the Chief Justice may appoint, in the city of Montreal, a judge of the circuit court in appeal over the judge of the superior court?

Mr. DOHERTY: I did point out the fact that the appellate tribunal was to consist of a judge of the superior court as a reason why you should not put a judge of the superior court on the local tribunal. I think that the words "any court" probably ought to be altered. There may be something in the suggestion of the hon. member, and perhaps the matter ought to be made clear. I had not observed that; I had in mind, as working the thing out in Quebec, that we have, save in the exception mentioned, only the superior court, and there the judge would be a judge of the superior court. I think in that province the intention was that it would be a judge of the high court or the superior court that should sit on the tribunal. While I would not like to admit that the matter appears to be ridiculous as it stands at present, probably when we come to it, it might be well to amend the provision as regards that province.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In the subsection with regard to the provinces other than Quebec, the county court judge may appoint himself to be a judge. This is a very proper suggestion, because if there is in any place a man who would sit on these tribunals that man is the judge who administers justice generally. If we have not the same provision with regard to Quebec we shall be excluding the very men who are best fitted to sit on these tribunals. Subsection (b) of section II says:

> In other judicial districts the judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec assigned to the judicial district within which the local tribunal is established.

If there is a man who ought to be a member of this court it is the judge in charge of the administration of justice

generally. If he is not allowed to appoint himself we shall be excluding the very best men we have.

Mr. DOHERTY: As I pointed out, the judge of the judicial district will in all probability be the appellate tribunal, and if he appoints himself to the local tribunal that will make it impossible for him to sit on the appellate tribunal. If he appoints himself to the local tribunal we should have a tribunal composed of one judge of the superior court and another gentleman named by the Board of Selection. They will sit and pronounce a decision, and that decision will be subject to an appeal to one judge of the superior court, and that one judge may reverse the decision of the district judge, assuming him to have a seat upon the local tribunal. What was in mind was that the judges of the superior cuort were to constitute the appellate tribunal. That presents no obstacle in the way of a county court judge appointing himself to the local tribunal, but it certainly is, I think, a serious obstacle to the judge of the superior court appointing himself to that tribunal, because in that case he would sit subject to an appeal such as I have indicated. There is no question that a judge of the superior court would be an excellent man to sit on a local tribunal, but on the other hand the general scheme does not contemplate the local tribunal being composed exclusively of judges. It does seem to me that we can repose in the judge of the district court just the same confidence to make a good selection as we would repose in him himself if he were acting on the local tribunal, and that leaves his services available for the appellate tribunal.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it intended that one member of each local tribunal shall be a judge, or may the judge appoint whom he likes?

Mr. DOHERTY: They can go outside the bench altogether.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When a judge has selected the members of a tribunal, are they compelled to act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, subsection 5 of section 6 provides for that. In order that there may be no misapprehension, I may say that to my mind section 7 was intended to read exactly as it is. The provision enabling the Chief Justice to appoint appeal judges was made as wide as it is for the reason that in some provinces, particularly in the West and in outlying districts of other provinces, the registrar might have very few appeals, and it would be very much more convenient to enable the county court judge residing in the district to hear the appeals than to send a King's Bench or supreme court or superior court judge from the capital of the province to hear those appeals. It was thought there would be no conflict of jurisdiction and no question of priority, at all events outside of the province of Quebec. A county court judge, even if he chooses to sit on one of the local tribunals, can only sit on one, and there would likely be several tribunals in his county. But, even if he sits on the local tribunal, we can trust the Chief Justice of the province not to appoint that particular judge to sit in appeal, and it is likely that no county court judge would sit in appeal over cases he had heard. I was not so familiar with the courts of the province of Quebec, and consequently no provision was made there enabling the superior court judges to appoint themselves. I remember that the point was raised, just as the Minister of Justice has raised it this afternoon, that the superior court judges would be those selected to sit in appeal, and the intention was that in each case they should make their own selection for the local tribunals and not appoint themselves.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will tribunals be composed of laymen entirely, or of military men as well?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Civilian tribunals purely.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there anything in the Bill preventing the appointment of a military man?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not forbidden. The county court judge could select a military man as his representative, but it appears to me very unlikely that he would do so or that the board of selection would choose a military man.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was under the impression that one member of the local tribunal was to be a judge, and the other member appointed by the board of selection.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: One member is appointed by a judge.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But apparently that is not the intention. I suppose that no judge would be appointed on the local tribunal?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He might or might not be. The local tribunals will have to be numerous, for the convenience of the population, and for that reason it would

be impracticable to have them composed of judges or even to have one member of each tribunal a judge.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There may be good reasons for not having judges on the local tribunals but I was under the impression, and I think the public was too, that one member of each tribunal would be a judge. With regard to Quebec, a judge may appoint himself or another judge, but in all probability he would not appoint himself or another judge when he could appoint a layman. So I look forward to having these local tribunals composed of people other than judges. There is nothing whatever in the Bill, so far as I can see, preventing a military man from being a member of a local tribunal, and I do not see what warrant the Solicitor General has for saying that a county court judge would not appoint a military man. The Bill does not prohibit it.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not see why military men should be debarred. It does not matter whether they are military men or not so long as they are not partisans; that is the main thing.

Mr. CARVELL: Has the minister considered the advisability of providing that there shall be a judge on each tribunal? It occurred to me, when I first read this section, that the county court judge would appoint either himself or another judge. That is perhaps a strained construction, and the Solicitor General says that that is not the intention. Have the Government considered the advisability of providing that one member of these tribunals shall be a judge?

Mr. NESBITT: That could not be done if there was only one judge in the county.

Mr. CARVELL: I realize that difficulty, but I should like to see the tribunals composed of men in whom the public have absolute confidence, and against whom there would be no suspicion whatever. In the great majority of cases, I am sure, the men appointed by the county court judge would be the very best selection he could make, but sometimes the county court judge might have great difficulty in finding men of the proper standing in the community who were willing to act.

I have looked over my own constituency, and I have wondered where in the world I could find a man who would be willing to accept that responsibility. I am afraid we will have some difficulty. Of course, I realize it would be imposing a very great burden upon county court judges, because in our province one judge has charge of three or four counties, and he would have some difficulty in moving around all over the country. In any event, I wish the Government would consider that phase of it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Does that refer to the local tribunals?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: It seems to me there would be difficulty in working it out in the West. In all southern Manitoba from Saskatchewan to Winnipeg there is one county judge only. In the constituency of Souris there is no judge.

Mr. CARVELL: In all probability the territory would be too large to have it work satisfactorily.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it the intention that there should be one local tribunal for each county? Clause 1 of section 6 says the minister may, from time to time, by proclamation or otherwise, establish local tribunals at such places as he deems necessary. I would like to know if it is the policy of the Government to appoint one local tribunal for each county, or if it is proposed to establish more than one, where the county is large? If more than one were appointed it would avoid inconvenience.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be impossible to define exactly how many would be appointed to so many miles, but I have not in mind at the present moment any county where one tribunal would be sufficient. The county most familiar to me, of course, is Portage la Prairie, and I know it would be utterly impossible for one tribunal to take care of that county. Men would have to travel seventy miles to reach the tribunal. Such a thing would be absurd in a well-populated county. Consequently, it might be fair to state that there will likely be a local tribunal appointed in every substantial village, unless it happens to be very near some larger place. The aim is to meet the convenience of the people, and to avoid, as much as possible, imposing expense and loss of time upon them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Might I suggest to my hon. friend that, as it will be rather difficult to find the proper man to act on those tribunals—and I do not suppose there will be any great enthusiasm to go on the boards—that the selection of the judges be made from the justices of the peace of the county. These gentlemen have a fair knowledge of the law, and enjoy the confidence of the community. They are per-

fectly acquainted with the districts in which they live, and it seems to me they are the men best fitted to come in contact with the public and to give the Act a fair trial.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no doubt at all the justices of the peace will be called upon. They have a great deal of experience in the matter of hearing evidence. At the same time, I think it would be very unwise to confine the selection to them.

I might take this opportunity of saying that since the outbreak of the war members of the Government, and members of Parliament as well, I have no doubt, have been in receipt of very many communications from prominent citizens all over Canada offering their services free. Those gentlemen are actuated by patriotic motives, and nothing else. They are anxious to do something in the war. I am in hopes that from the best of that class of people we will be able to get the men who will carry out the work of those local tribunals, and carry it out well. To all those who have made such offers, and their number is thousands, I extend an invitation now to make it known that, if chosen by the authorities, their services will be available for this work. If they do, we will obtain very excellent results indeed, and I hope there will be no shirkers from the duty of performing the work of the local tribunals any more than there will be shirkers from those who should enlist for the war itself.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not make the fact that a man was a magistrate a disqualification, but I would not like to make it a supreme qualification either.

Mr. NESBITT: Well, I should think not.

Mr. GRAHAM: These men must have other things to recommend them besides being accustomed to taking evidence. They would have to be fairly good students of human nature, men with very level heads, men who are unswerving in their views and who are absolutely fair.

I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he has had any communication from the Motherland as to the success of their tribunals, or the satisfaction they are giving in their methods of operation. The reason I ask this: two gentlemen who have been in England told me within the last ten days that the work there in this respect was very unsatisfactory. I would not state the particulars, but they assured me that if the same method was followed here, and the same lack of wisdom, I would say, in the performance of those duties, the whole thing would be quite unsatisfactory.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have various reports as to the working of the tribunals in England. What my hon. friend says is something similar to the reports we have received; subject to this modifying fact, while at first their local tribunals were unsatisfactory mainly because they seemed to think that in certain districts it was their duty to accept everybody, or to reject everybody, still they profited by their experience. They have had no less than five Service Acts introduced in the British House, three of which are now law. Each of these Acts took advantage of the experience they had gained under the preceding one. Now, we think we have taken advantage of all their Acts and all the experience they have had under them. One of the difficulties they had was that their tribunals were too large. We have profited by their experience in this connection. They also realized that the fullest opportunity for appeal had to be given to the military authorities. We think we have covered that also. Then, again, they have not a full control of their procedure as they moved along. We are in a position to enable the tribunal to have full control of their procedure, and there is a provision in our very first Act for uniform procedure. Consequently, if they have met with very many difficulties, we have no reason to believe we will meet with the same.

Mr. MARCIL: How many exemptions were there in England?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot tell, but I know that while the number of exemptions was very great, they proceeded to recomb them and they kept recalling men over and over again until now they have succeeded pretty well in securing all that are available.

Mr. SINCLAIR: With reference to what my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has said, I have been looking over the British Hansard on this question and I have discovered there were some severe criticisms made in regard to the local tribunals in Great Britain. I find in one case that Sir Roland Adkins, M.P., speaking in the British House of Commons on May 15, 1916, said that in one case the appeal tribunal reversed no less than 16 out of 18 decisions of the local

tribunal, and in every case they treated the original applicants more generously than the local court had treated them. There was a certain amount of dissatisfaction with, and some severe criticism in the House of Commons of, the decisions given by local tribunals. They bore rather hard on certain applicants who appeared before them.

Mr. McCRANEY: I wish to endorse what my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) has said as to the desirability, if possible, of appointing a judge on the local tribunal. There must be authority connected with the carrying on of the work of these tribunals and such authority will be given by the presence of a judge where it would not otherwise be found. It will give a finality to the proceedings which will tend greatly to lessen the number of appeals.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) is wrong in the belief that judges will not themselves act. I know that there are cases where perhaps they could not even act on one tribunal but it is hoped that wherever a judge himself is able to act, or wherever the judge junior to him is able to act, such judge will be appointed on the tribunal most important in the county. I do not know of any reason to apprehend that if judges had the time they would decline to perform this public service.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I meant was that where it was not in any way obligatory upon a judge to act, but where the power of appointment is simply vested in the judge, it is not likely that he will assume the duties himself. No judge would like to appoint himself where he was simply given power to make an appointment and, if the opinion of the Government is that it is desirable they should act, the Bill should provide that they should act in all cases were it is feasible to do so and the feasibility or otherwise should be determined by the Governor in Council. Unless you throw upon the judge the duty of acting he is not at all likely to appoint himself and I am not quite sure that he is likely either to appoint some other judge.

Mr. KYTE: I would like to add a word to what has been said by my hon. friend from St. John. I should think it would be extremely doubtful if, from a feeling of delicacy, a judge would like to name himself as a member of this tribunal unless the obligation fell upon him by virtue of this Act. I cannot conceive that in the province from which I come there could be any difficulty whatever in the judges of the county courts finding sufficient time to discharge any duties imposed upon them in connection with this legislation. The jurisdiction of the county court judge in the district in which I live extends over three counties, he holds court in different localities in that district, and I am quite sure that he could find it convenient to hold sittings of the tribunal in various sections of his district for the accommodation of persons who desire to come before him without putting them to too much inconvenience in the matter of travel. If there is no insurmountable reason why the Solicitor General should not change the wording of the section so as to make it perfectly clear that the judge of the county court shall be a member of the tribunal, it is very desirable that such provision should be made. With reference to what has been stated by my hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), the decision of a tribunal presided over by a county court judge would have very much greater weight than a tribunal presided over by a layman, and, as he points out, it would result in the lessening of a number of appeals which would otherwise be taken from the local tribunal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am sure that I voice the sentiment of my own province when I say that, if it is possible to get them, judges are the fit and proper persons to preside over such tribunals.

Sir EDWARD KEMP: There are not enough.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When I suggested a moment ago justices of the peace, I detected a smile on my hon. friend's face. But we have judges of the superior court of Quebec, judges of the circuit court, and district magistrates. For the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure we have a judge of the superior court, and we have in the Magdalen Islands, in Bonaventure and Gaspé, two district magistrates. They have a civil jurisdiction extending to $100, and they have quite a wide jurisdiction in criminal matters. Perhaps my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) could see to it that their services could be availed of. I really believe you will have difficulty in finding people who will accept the duty of applying this law, which means compulsion after all. Although the Solicitor General stated that thousands of people had offered their services, I would point out

that it was not for such service as this; it is for such service as every true and loyal citizen would be ready to give to his country at this time—the Red Cross, hospital work, the Patriotic Fund, but when you come to a law of compulsion, that is quite a different matter. Suppose the appointee of the judge refuses to act. I understand that these officers are to secure their appointments from the Minister of Justice. The Government and myself are agreed that the application of this law should be fair and above board. You want to allay all suspicion in the public mind. Although I have the utmost confidence in my hon. friend's fairness and unbiased mind in such matters, he will be bitterly criticised upon the appointments he will make. Liberals will say: Our political opponents have been appointed, we have to appear before them and we will not receive justice. On the other hand, a judge has the respect of the whole people whether he was appointed by a Tory or a Grit Government. I would like my hon. friend to take my suggestions into consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that statement of universal application with reference to judges?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have argued cases before my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) when he was a judge of the superior court, and I have the most gratifying recollection of his high character as a judge.

Mr. DOHERTY: Did you always win your cases?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Of course as a politician my hon. friend may be quite a different man.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not yet got the habits of a politician.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am afraid my hon. friend has fallen from grace. I think my hon. friend might well consider the suggestions which are being made.

Mr. MACDONELL: This is a very important provision of the Bill. It is essential, not only that justice should be done, but that the people should be satisfied that justice has been done. We all know that the courts in all parts of Canada command the respect of the people unimpaired. The county judge is naturally the man in a district to whom the people look for justice and fair dealing. In Ontario we have one or two county judges in each county, so that there is ample provisional machinery to which these matters could be referred.

Mr. GRAHAM: And they have ample time, most of them.

Mr. MACDONELL: There is no doubt about that. I think the Minister of Justice has nearly one hundred county court judges under his authority in Ontario. It would seem highly desirable that the county court judge in a district should be definitely named as one member of the tribunal. The people would respect his findings, feeling that they were unbiased and that if he made errors they would be made unintentionally. Owing to the great diversity in population between the different counties, it must be difficult to lay down any general practice. In the county of York, including Toronto, there are perhaps 700,000 people, so that quite a number of tribunals would be required there; other counties have not more than 20,000 inhabitants. There is provision for these perambulatory tribunals, and the county court judge could move about and hold courts in different centres in his district.

Mr. GRAHAM: He now holds division courts all over the county.

Mr. MACDONELL: If the Government could see their way clear to make the county court judge one member of the tribunal, to appoint him definitely, I am sure it would work out not only with justice but to the satisfaction of the people.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Rainville in the chair.

Mr. CARVELL: I understand that subclauses 1 and 2 of clause 6 have been carried.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Subclauses 1 and 2 have been carried. All of subclause 3 of clause 6 stands.

Mr. MARCIL: Referring to subclause 2 of clause 6, I did not understand whether an answer had been given to the suggestion that district magistrates in the province of Quebec might be employed. They are appointed by the provincial government, and their powers are extensive in civil and municipal matters. They correspond, in some respects, to the county court judges in the other provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They may be named for local tribunals. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) that the selection should not be confined to them, but they may be named.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose I might say, in the presence of lawyers, that the successful operation of the law depends fully as much on the methods adopted in its enforcement, and the men employed in using those methods, as on the words of the statute. A good law may have very poor results, if enforced by men who do not appreciate the conditions under which the law was made, and realize the full intent of it. Sometimes the letter of the law is more successful in the breach than in the observance, if the breach is not too large. There never was a law placed on the statute books of this country to which this observation is as applicable as to the present one. In reference to the form of the tribunals, it strikes me that there is a great deal in the remarks of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), as to the county court judges, particularly in the province of Ontario. We have, in a great many of our counties, a senior and a junior judge. Two judges were appointed originally where the business was too heavy, or supposed to be too heavy for one, but of recent years, while the business has decreased very much, the number of judges has not decreased. We have some appointments of recent date of a second judge in counties where there is not sufficient work for one. I realize that that is largely in the hands of the provincial rather than the Dominion authorities, the appointment of the judge being by the latter, and the necessity for his appointment being decreed by the former. In Ontario the senior and junior judges are in sufficient number, and with insufficient work, to my mind, to enable them to carry on their duties under this statute without imposing any hardship upon them, and so long as we are under a party form of Government, and men have their likes and dislikes politically, very strong in every locality, it will be difficult to select men whom the public will think are giving the greatest satisfaction. I would not say the men themselves would not be doing their best, but they might as well make a mistake as to have the public think they are making a mistake. If the statute provided that these judges should do the work, I think no serious objection could be taken. I do not know what the condition is in other provinces, but speaking of Ontario, knowing the various counties, and feeling confident that none of the judges has too much work, I am heartily in accord with what the hon. member for South Toronto says. I think that the Government should take that into consideration fully, and I will be disappointed if they do not arrive at the conclusion that these judges ought to do the work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thoroughly agree with the wisdom of having the judges do the work. If they have the time to act on, at least, one of the tribunals in the county, I think it is to the interest of all concerned, and very much in the interest of the enforcement of the Act, that they should be nominated. But there are two points in connection with that phase of it. I do not see any other way of wording the section, because, if we make it compulsory on the judge, there are cases where he cannot comply and do justice to his work. I know of such cases. Furthermore, it would not seem wise, because you would only get him on one tribunal, and there would be other tribunals in some counties on which he could not act. Then there is this further consideration: there is nothing in the Bill to prevent the Board of Selection naming a judge. If the members of the board know that a judge could be spared, and a judge had not named himself or the junior judge, it would be within their competence to name him. In that way, we would have a tribunal that would judge each case on its merits.

Mr. GRAHAM: This man is selected by a body who are not judges, and not named by statute. If he is named by statute, there could be no semblance of partisanship. There will be all kinds of suggestions made to the body that has the selection from all quarters as to who the men ought to be. I am subject to correction about the other provinces, but I am speaking advisedly about Ontario.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did the hon. gentleman understand me when I stated that the board of selection could select a judge themselves, as a member of the tribunals?

Mr. GRAHAM: They could, but they need not. It is open to that criticism, and, above all things, with the feelings in the country, we must avoid every loophole, or opportunity for criticism, or suggestion that these tribunals might not be properly selected. I may be wrong about this suggestion, but the Minister of Justice will know; I believe it will be proper, in Ontario at all events, for the Bill to provide, after consultation with the Provincial Government of course, that one of the judges in each county where there are two judges should be assigned to this work. Let this be his work for the time being, and let him be relieved of the other

work; there might be some provision made whereby he could attend to some other work when he was not busy on this, but let him make this his primary business. I believe it would not interfere with the administration of justice, throughout Ontario at least, and it would relieve the selection from all semblance of criticism, because, in placing that provision in the statute, you would not be selecting any particular judge; you would be selecting a judge in every county in the province. I would go that far in my view, that it ought to be done by statute, and that it should be made the duty of one of the judges in each county where there are two.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member think it would be worth while to put in that compulsory clause, just for the sake of the counties where there are two judges? It would seem an anomalous thing to insist on it where there are two judges, and leave it optional where there is only one.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not go that far. The Government might make it obligatory on all the judges so far as possible. Where there are two judges, I would suggest that one judge be nominated for the board of selection.

Mr. CARVELL: What is true of Ontario is also true of the Maritime Provinces. In those provinces we have no senior and junior judges, but each judge has from two to four or five counties to look after, and every hon. member from the Maritime Provinces will admit that those gentlemen have hardly enough to do to keep them—

Mr. GRAHAM: Warm.

Mr. CARVELL: —in working order. In the Maritime Provinces there is hardly an instance where a county court judge could not find plenty of time to do this work. That brings us back to what has been stated by many hon. members, namely, that the very fact that a judge is appointed to this position makes the appointment acceptable to the great majority of the people. It does not matter whether he was a Liberal or a Conservative before he went on to the bench, the fact that he is a judge makes the people feel that his decisions will be based upon the actual facts. As I read this Bill, the appeals really do not amount to very much after all. When I first read the Bill and from the way in which the newspapers took it up, I imagined that there was going to be an enormous number of appeals, but the appeal tribunal, as I find from section 7, refers practically only to the case where the two members of the local tribunal fail to agree. If the two members of the local tribunal agree, their decision is almost final, with the exception possibly that a man might go on from there to the central appeal judge, and I do not see how he can. We shall discuss that matter, I suppose, when we come to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That comes in section 10.

Mr. CARVELL: I have read sections 7 and 10, and they amount to this, that the decision of the local tribunal is, for all practical purposes, final. I think, therefore, there cannot be too much attention paid to these tribunals to make sure that they shall be composed of gentlemen in whose decisions every person will have absolute confidence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This section, of course, stands, so I will not further discuss the matter of having judges act on local tribunals. That subject we shall consider along with the section when we come into committee again. I do not understand my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) in regard to appeals. There is the freest possible appeal from the local tribunal to the appeal tribunal. Any person at all who goes before a local tribunal may, if he is dissatisfied with the finding of that tribunal, go to the appeal tribunal. All he has to do is to send his notice of appeal to the registrar, and then the registrar allocates the appeal. If the person is quite satisfied, but the representative of the military authorities is not, the latter may freely appeal. Those are two classes of appeals. The third class is where the tribunal itself fails to agree and states the facts for the decision of the appeal tribunal. All those classes of appeal come before the appeal tribunal, so that the importance is not so great as if there were not an appeal tribunal composed of no one but a judge. We have a final judicial determination of every case where there is dispute, no matter whether we have laymen on the first local tribunal or not.

Mr. NESBITT: If a judge is inclined to be fair, would not his fair-mindedness guide him to a certain extent in appointing his tribunal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think a judge who travels a county is in the best position of any person to name a proper man.

Mr. NESBITT: What I meant to say was: If he was fair in his decisions, would not he

then think it incumbent upon him to be fair in his appointments?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

On section 6, subsections 4 and 5—Appointments by minister if local tribunals not formed, and filling of vacancies—penalty for not acting:

(4) (a) The names and addresses of all persons appointed on a local tribunal shall, as may be provided by regulations, be communicated to the minister.

(b) The minister may by telegraph or otherwise appoint one or both members, as the case may be, of any local tribunal, if he has not received, within such period before the tribunal is to sit as may be fixed by regulation, the names and addresses of members duly appointed.

(c) A vacancy occurring shall be filled by the authority who appointed the member vacating, and if not so filled or if communication of same as aforesaid has not been received by the minister within such period as may be fixed by regulation, the minister may fill such vacancy.

(5) Any person duly appointed a member of a local tribunal shall, unless relieved in writing by the authority appointing him, perform his duties as such member, and any person who without reasonable excuse fails so to do shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding five hundred dollars.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the remuneration of those appointed to serve on these tribunals, or is there any remuneration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The men are appointed until their work is done. As for remuneration, it is not contemplated to give them any. It is believed, in that way, a better class of men will be secured.

Mr. MARCIL: Their work will be done when 100,000 men have been raised?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister explain what is to be construed legally as "reasonable excuse?" Suppose a man had a conscientious objection; suppose he was convinced that it was not the duty of his country to send men abroad to fight, would that be considered a "reasonable excuse?" A man who does not believe in capital punishment may be relieved from serving on a jury trying a murder case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not like to circumscribe, or to attempt to circumscribe, a judge in the discharge of his duty. The matter will be for each judge to decide; but I may say that if I were judge, I would not consider such a plea a reasonable excuse.

Mr. GRAHAM: The word "regulation" is mentioned in section 6 several times.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

Does not that make it clear to the Government that the enforcement of this measure depends almost as largely on the regulations as on the Act itself, and that therefore, we ought to have the regulations? Under present conditions, we are not in a position to know what this measure means. The Government provides a regulation for a certain thing. It depends upon what that regulation is, what we ought to do with this section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not intended that anything substantial, that is, in the way of principle, should be left for regulation, but the reason this is left for regulation is this. The success of the working out of the measure is to depend in some important degree on the central appeal judge. The matter of how many days should be allowed between the date of the sitting of the tribunals and the date of the appointment is a mere detail. That, and many other details that must be fixed, will be all set out in the proclamation. It may be two days, three days, or four days; something of that kind is what I have in mind myself. But that is a mere detail which would be worked out along with the other details by the person who is himself the final authority—who is, as it were, the apex of the pyramid on whom rests to a great extent the duty of making the Act work successfully. It seems to me a good principle to leave the fixting of these details to him.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend practically says that each judge will decide what constitutes a legitimate excuse.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A judge acting in his judicial capacity, and not under this Bill at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: Unless there be some statute on which a judge can base his decision will there be uniformity of decision? A judge in one county may decide that such and such a thing is a sufficient excuse, and a judge in the neighbouring county may decide that it is not. There may be many excuses from the men who do not want to go to the front.

There is another point. It surely is as obligatory for the men who ought to serve on these boards to do so, as it is for the eligible men to go to the front, but you are letting them off with the payment of a fine, and sending the other chap to jail. I would make the penalty just as severe for the man who would not act on a board as for the man who would not go to the front when called up. In the one case the man is de-

fending his life, and in the other he is simply defending his case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: At all events, I will go so far as to say that we will reserve consideration of sub-clause 5. I did think that a penalty of a $500 fine was somewhat appropriate for failure to act in such a case as this. Still, we are at a crisis, and this is a national duty which these men are called upon to perform, and, speaking for myself, I am disposed to agree with the hon. member (Mr. Graham).

Mr. GRAHAM: He could buy himself off.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But he becomes a breaker of the law; he is guilty of an offence.

Mr. GRAHAM: But he can settle with money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Serious consideration will be given to that suggestion. With regard to my hon. friend's other suggestion as to uniformity of decision on the part of the judges sitting in their ordinary capacity, as to what would constitute a reasonable excuse, there is no doubt much in what the hon. member has said; but there is no more difficulty in getting uniformity of decision here than there is in any other case. In all applications of law under the criminal code, and in applications of law with regard to offences committed under other statutes, a reasonable excuse will release a man from his liability, and it is for the judge to say what, under all the circumstances, constitutes a reasonable excuse.

Mr. GRAHAM: In those cases precedents have been established, but there are none here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is very true; precedents have been established, and I think in the main they would be applicable to this case.

Mr. LEMIEUX: For instance, the jurors.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For example, the reasonable excuse that constitutes ground for failure to act as juryman would be of very reasonable excuse in this case.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend give a concrete case of what constitutes a reasonable excuse? I cited the case of a juror who might be summoned to act on the panel during the whole term of the criminal assize. I acted for the Crown many years ago, and I know the court used to accept illness in the family of the juror as a reasonable excuse. Does my hon. friend contemplate any class of excuse other than what is known as a reasonable excuse in the administration of justice?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) is quite to the point. A reasonable excuse in this case would be such as would apply in the case of a juror for failure to perform that public service.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Except that the fine is a little higher.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And it may go higher still. The class of excuses would be about the same, and I think the decisions on the point would be very applicable.

On subsection 6—local tribunal to decide on exemptions:

(6) Each local tribunal shall hear and decide applications for certificates of exemption made to such tribunal as provided in section eleven.

Mr. NESBITT: Would the minister take into consideration the expediency of putting in the Bill some of the regulations that are mentioned so very frequently? I dislike seeing everything left open.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can assure my hon. friend that, so far as I was concerned, I did my best to leave as little as possible to regulation. I am afraid that if we placed in the Bill the fixed period that must intervene between the date of the sitting of a tribunal and the receipt of the name of the nominee we might run into great difficulties in the working out of the Act. These matters are best regulated as we get down to practice and see what the necessities of the case impose. They can also be best attended to when all the other details as to time and so forth are considered together. It might be that the time we fixed might not be workable, and that it should be lengthened or shortened, but if we should fix it in the Bill it would be laid down hard and fast and the Bill might be made unworkable. It is only a detail anyway; there is no difference in principle whether it is one day or five.

Mr. PARDEE: Does it not appear to the Solicitor General that certain rules and regulations ought to be laid down covering specific cases? Each tribunal might make rules of its own. If that were so there might be different rules with different tribunals in the same province. I cannot help thinking that in a section of this kind there ought

to be something which is absolutely specific and absolutely directory, so that each tribunal may work according to the same ruling.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member will look at subsection 3 of section 5 he will see the following:

> The Governor in Council may, upon the recommendation of the central appeal judge, make regulations with respect to the establishment, constitution, functions and procedure of the said tribunals, and such regulations may contain provisions for securing uniformity in the application of this Act.

Mr. PARDEE: Let me ask the Solicitor General to look at clause 4:

> In so far as provision is not otherwise made the procedure of the tribunal shall be such as is determined by the tribunal.

So that, again you leave it, not mandatory or directory, as it should be, but in the hands of the tribunal. There may be one tribunal for a whole province. The Solicitor General said he would make them cover as much territory as possible, which is quite right. On the other hand, there may be two or three tribunals in the province, and each tribunal may have an entirely different set of rules or regulations to work by.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there is any possibility of a central appeal judge, who has so much at stake in the matter, on his own responsibility, not providing rules and regulations to cover everything he thinks of any importance. But, in the event of something not being covered, it is better that the tribunal be able to decide its own procedure. It is only procedure the tribunal can decide.

Mr. PARDEE: I am not arguing so much on that point. As the Solicitor General says I can quite understand that if something is left out something may be added. The only thing I am arguing is that different men may have different sets of rules or regulations for different tribunals. Would they be absolutely uniform?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. That is the object of section 3.

Mr. PARDEE: But, reading that in conjunction with section 4, does it not take you back to the same point?

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me we are in a large measure allowing the judge of the central appeal court, or the central appeal judge, to legislate in respect of matters in regard to which this Parliament ought to legislate. It is proposed to give to the central appeal judge the power to make regulations with respect to the establishment, constitution, functions, and procedure of the said tribunals, and such regulations may contain provisions for securing uniformity in the application of this Act. That is giving very wide powers to the central appeal judge. He may make regulations covering the establishment, constitution, and functions of those tribunals. It seems to me that is a power which ought to be exercised by this Parliament, and ought not to be left to any single individual.

Something has been said by the Solicitor General with regard to the rules and regulations under the Judicature Acts. If I remember rightly those regulations are enacted by statute. I know that is the case in New Brunswick, where the regulations in the Judicature Act are enacted by the provincial legislature and form a part of the law. It has not been left to a single judge to make rules and regulations of so vital a character as are these regulations which may be made by the central appeal judge.

I quite agree with my hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) that this Bill ought to cover a great deal of the ground which it is proposed to leave to the central appeal judge. The objection is this is accentuated by some of the provisions in the section now under consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With all deference to the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) I do not think he agrees with the hon. member (Mr. Pardee) at all. He does not bring forward the same point as was brought forward by the hon. member for West Lambton.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought he did; practically the same principle.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for West Lambton fears the regulations may not be so general and uniform so as to avoid lack of uniformity of procedure in the tribunals. The hon. member for St. John fears that the regulations not being made directly by Parliament might not be what they should be. I do not want to plead precedent. I only plead on the merits, but the Militia Act of this country is full of just such provisions, in fact it is more replete with them than is this Military Service Act. I can read them here by the dozen, where the Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying the Act into effect, for the organization, discipline, efficiency and good government generally of the militia and for anything requiring to be done generally.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be done on the recommendation of the minister in

charge of the militia. It would be really a militia regulation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In this case, in addition to the responsibility of the members of the Government, we have the initial responsibility of the member of the Supreme Court of Canada who himself is the judicial head of this whole structure, so that Parliament is not asked to leave entirely to the Governor in Council the framing of regulations so important as those. Parliament is asked only to trust to the Governor in Council to bring in such regulations as may be framed by the member of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. PARDEE: Clause 8 says:

> The Governor in Council may appoint one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada to be the Central Appeal Judge.

That is merely permissible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act would be meaningless, unless the Governor in Council acted.

Mr. PARDEE: But, it is merely permissible.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not the minister draw the distinction between the regulations of the Militia Act and the regulations under this Act? This Act is constituting a court, or constituting tribunals all over the country, which are to determine questions of the most vital importance in connection with the enforcement of the provisions for military service. It seems to me it is entirely contrary to good practice and good legislation to allow any judge to provide regulations so far-reaching as these —regulations as to the establishment and as to the constitution of those tribunals, and as to the functions which those tribunals are to perform. There are features which Parliament ought to determine for itself. Parliament should determine what are to be the functions of these tribunals, yet we, the representatives of the people, are entrusting to one man the determination as to what the functions of those tribunals shall be. It seems to me it is entirely contrary to what should prevail, in respect of a measure of this importance.

The regulations in the Militia Act are of the most simple character. There is provision in the statute as to balloting for those who are to be compelled to serve. There is provision as to who shall be exempt. There is no provision for the creation of courts to decide as to who shall serve and who shall not serve.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend must be guilty of not having read the Militia Act very carefully. The power conferred upon the Governor in Council by the Militia Act is infinitely greater than that proposed to be conferred by this Bill. The idea of naming a judge was to remove the exercise of power from the Government and thus to avoid any suspicion of partisanship and to restrict the Government to such regulations in the respect mentioned as would be recommended by the central appeal judge. It could not be said that the Government were enacting regulations on their own initiative, but solely on the recommendation of an absolutely independent and impartial authority. Look at section 144 of the Militia Act and see the power that is conferred by that section:

> The Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying this Act into effect, for the organization, discipline, efficiency and good government generally of the militia, and for anything requiring to be done in connection with the military defence of Canada.

You cannot imagine anything wider than the powers that are vested in the Governor in Council under this section. Anything that is proposed in this Bill is infinitely short of that and moreover we have restricted the power of the Government in so far as this particular matter is concerned by requiring that the Governor in Council shall act only upon the recommendation of an independent judge, a man of whose impartiality and good faith there could not be the slightest possible suspicion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do I understand that the recommendation of the central appeal judge will be accepted by the Government as recommended? Do they reserve to themselves the power of supervision?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We do reserve the power of supervision but it comes to us as a recommendation from the judge and we cannot pass it unless he has recommended it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The judge makes the recommendation and that recommendation may be accepted or not accepted by the Government. The regulations may be amended. I do not know how it is in the other provinces but in Quebec the rules of practice made by the judges are not subject to revision; they are a law unto themselves. If the central appeal judge were empowered to make rules that were binding, that could not be revised, then, I could understand the argument of my right hon. friend; but that is not the Bill. The Bill says that the judge can make recommenda-

tions to the Governor in Council but the Bill does not say that he must accept those regulations.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does my right hon. friend think it will be better to vest the power in the judge alone?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Certainly; in so far as politics are eliminated, there is no reason why the judge should not have the power. I cannot see why the rules should not be made by the judge rather than by action of the Governor in Council.

Mr. CARVELL: The difficulty is that the Governor in Council is not bound to take the suggestions of the central appeal judge except in one case, and that is only in fixing the conditions of the appeal from the appeal tribunal to the central appeal judge. There are many other cases in which the Governor in Council may make rules and regulations without reference to the judge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: See paragraph 3 of section 5.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, that does give him further power:

> The Governor in Council may, upon the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge, make regulations with respect to the establishment, constitution, functions and procedure of the said tribunals and such regulations may contain provisions for securing uniformity in the application of this Act.

Then, by section 10, the Governor in Council may make regulations on the recommendation of the central appeal judge as to the method of appeal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think there are other paragraphs.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not attempt to claim that it was only upon the recommendation of the central appeal judge that the Governor in Council may make regulations. I was speaking of the matter immediately under discussion.

Mr. CARVELL: Then, there are many cases in which the Governor in Council may make regulations entirely without reference to the central appeal judge?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Reverting to paragraph (b) of section 6:

> The minister may by telegraph or otherwise appoint one or both members, as the case may be, of any local tribunal.

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Would it not be better for the minister, before making the appointment, to get the advice of that board?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of the central appeal judge?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, the board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would not be any board until the appointments were made.

Mr. NESBITT: The board appointed by the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The board. I wish to ask my hon. friend, before the clause is carried, if he will further consider the question of appointing judges of the high or low courts to these local tribunals?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is reserved.

Mr. MARCIL: I do not see any provision in this Bill for the use of the French and English languages in these local tribunals. Is there any provision of that kind?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would follow as a matter of course. Subclause 2 of section 12 provides for the publication of all regulations and proclamations. It would seem that there possibly could not be any doubt about that because the object is to have them read.

Mr. MARCIL: I mean the procedure before the court. I saw a newspaper paragraph last year stating that the Manitoba judges had denied the use of French in the courts of that province. I would like to have it made certain in this case that French could be used. Of course, it is an official language in federal courts such as the Supreme and Exchequer Courts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no question that the language can be used before these tribunals.

Mr. MARCIL: I want to make sure that it can be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know why it should be stated because it would seem to be clearly permissible without stating it. In the first place the tribunal can take evidence in any way it desires. Certainly, the tribunal, where there is a French population, ought to be able to use French because otherwise they could not do their work.

Mr. MARCIL: I think there should be no hesitation about making it plain that French can be used before these tribunals.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no hesitation.

Mr. MARCIL: Then why not put it in?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It can be covered later on by regulations if there is any reason why it should be. It is the object of the tribunals to get the evidence and they could not get it otherwise.

Mr. MARCIL: Would it not be possible to put in two lines and say that the proceedings under this Act may be conducted either in French or English?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In any of the courts of Canada a man can only give evidence in the language he speaks. Evidence may be given in other languages besides French and English.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think section 133 of the British North America Act makes it quite clear. These certainly are tribunals or courts of Canada and in this section it is said that:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the House of the Parliament of Canada and of the House of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec.

We are establishing a court for the application of a Dominion Act, and I think that would very clearly apply.

Mr. MARCIL: These local tribunals may not be as well versed in the law as is the minister.

Mr. DOHERTY: It will require the same knowledge of the law to understand it in the British North America Act as in this Act. It would be a matter of knowing that under the law they had to do it, and there ought not to be any great difficulty in conveying that information to them.

Mr. GRAHAM: It should be made clear that any one wishing to be heard in French before this tribunal should be enabled to do so.

Mr. MORPHY: That would be under section 133 of the British North America Act. If these courts are federal courts they will come under the exact wording of section 133, and therefore the use of the French language must follow as a matter of course.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In the United States they have provided that military officers shall be disqualified from acting on the local tribunals. The theory is that they sometimes have so much zeal in regard to military affairs that they may not take an unbiased view of the cases before them.

Subsection agreed to.

On section 7.

> 7. The Chief Justice of the court of last resort in each province, or in case of his absence, or failure to act, then, a judge of that court designated by the minister, shall establish for such province a sufficient number of Appeal Tribunals, and shall assign to each such tribunal one judge of any court of such province, and shall distribute among such tribunals all appeals from, and cases stated under subsection two of section ten, by local tribunals of which the registrar has notice and such appeal tribunals shall severally hear and decide the same.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am in favour of the coordination of all the strength of the nation to win this war, and I would not have any clause in this Bill saying that even a Chief Justice could fail to act, even if he did not want to. If he was in good health I would see that he was not absent, and if he was present I would see that he acted. We are passing a compulsory measure, compulsory for the men who have to risk their lives, and I would not leave it optional to any man, even as high as a Chief Justice, to say whether he would act or not. I would make it part of his duty and make it compulsory for him to act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Section 7 is a very vague statement. Are these appeals to be established by the Chief Justices and not by this Parliament? Are the tribunals to be composed of one, two, or three men? The Solicitor General this afternoon intimated that he supposed these appeal tribunals could really hold new trials, that they were not simply courts of appeal. From reading the Bill, I understand that the court of appeal was to revise the decision of the local tribunal. I do not object to the view of the Solicitor General that new witnesses could be heard. But it seems to me that this section should define clearly the character, composition, and jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It defines its jurisdiction and its composition. It does not say how many tribunals shall be established in any province. It says that the Chief Justice shall assign to each tribunal one judge of any court, and shall distribute among such tribunals all appeals, etc. That establishes the jurisdiction and the power. The only thing that is not definitely fixed is the number of tribunals, and that could not be fixed until we knew the number of appeals. We assign to each tribunal one judge of any

court; the number of members of the tribunal is fixed, and the jurisdiction and powers are fixed. As soon as the registrar gets all of the appeals collected and the data for the appeals, he allocates those appeals geographically for the province,

9 p.m. and then the Chief Justice of the province, who will have all of that information, will assign a judge of any court to try these appeals. The judge so appointed can not only try appeals in the strict sense of the word, but can also hear new evidence. It would be unwise to prevent him from hearing new evidence for the reason, among others, that it may not be found necessary to take down all of the evidence verbatim at summary trials.

As to the point raised by the hon. gentleman from Renfrew, I have absolute confidence that there is no possibility of any chief justice in Canada failing to perform his duty, unless some disability prevents his acting. It is impossible to conceive of the chief justice of a province of Canada failing to perform his duty, and it is a duty of the same character as those he is performing weekly in the discharge of the duties of his office. In the province of Manitoba, the number of sittings of assize is fixed by the judges themselves, according to public necessity. The same character of duty is assigned to the chief justice here. I cannot conceive that any one would fail to discharge his duty. If I thought that were possible I see no reason why provision should not be made for it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not want to say anything about the members of the Bench, because I have the greatest respect for them, but there are times when they consider their convenience is almost superior to the convenience of the public. I have seen this feature in cases in which I have been interested. The fishing might be particularly good at a certain time of the year when this Act ought to be put into operation, and they might delegate this work to some person else as an ordinary duty, so as not to interfere with other arrangements. I am not saying it disparagingly, but if there is a loophole left for that, we might have the chief justice doing the work of some other judge, who might do this work just as well. My viewpoint is that this, being a compulsory measure, should not be left to the option of any judge, whether he is chief justice or not. The law should say that he should act, and that it was part of his duty to act. It is a time for sacrifice for all of us, and, as the Solicitor General says, the chief justice would not shrink from the duty, except under some circumstances, where he might think the duties to be performed would be performed just as well if relegated to some other member of the bench. I should say that the chief justice ought to act. Some of our chief justices have been very pronounced in saying that a conscription measure ought to be passed, to make men go to the front. I would make it apply to all these men in favour of conscription.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is imperative.

Mr. GRAHAM: Except in cases of "failure to act."

Mr. DOHERTY: This does not say that failure to act is the end of his responsibility. He will be responsible for not having done his duty, but suppose there is a failure to act, though he will have the responsibility of having failed to obey the statute, we must find some remedy for the consequence of his failure. We might go on punishing, but we could not get any appeal tribunal, unless we enabled somebody else to act in the meantime. This is just as much an obligation as any other which rests upon a chief justice in any other capacity, and he is liable for whatever consequences would be entailed by his failure to perform any other official duty. The purpose of this provision is not to deal with him from that point of view, and give him an option, but it is to provide for the case where he fails to act, and he may fail to act for very many legitimate reasons. This does not necessarily imply refusal to act. It is failure to act. The chief justice may be ill, and quite unable to act for other reasons, and the purpose is not to give him permission to do as he sees fit, but to provide for what would happen if for any reason he fails to act. It is not in contemplation to give him any liberty in the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: Nothing happens, if he does not act under this statute, and something will happen to every person else named, in case of failure to perform duties. It looks to the ordinary laymen as if you were affording an invitation to the chief justice, because he is the chief justice, not to perform his duty. I am not saying he will not, but you say, in the terms of this Act, "or failure to act." If he fails to act no provision is made for any penalty. I am not saying that there should be. If the meaning suggested by the Minister of Justice is the one intended by this provision, I should say the clause

should read "failure to act through illness," or something of that kind. I would not relieve him from acting, in order that he might go fishing.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is all that can be said of any of the judges or chief justices. Of course, in case of failure of a judge to perform his duty he may be impeached. In addition to that, there is a provision in the Criminal Code under which a man who refuses to perform an obligation imposed upon him by statute is liable to be prosecuted before the courts, if necessary.

Mr. GRAHAM: But he will not be.

Mr. DOHERTY: If we inserted such a provision here, would it be more likely that he would be?

Mr. GRAHAM: In regard to the other tribunals, if a man fails to act, unless for some good reason, he can be fined a sum not exceeding $500, and the Solicitor General is considering the advisability of making the penalty more severe. But with respect to the chief justice we hesitate to say anything, except that we provide a remedy if he does not act. He is relieved, and the minister appoints another judge to take his place. I cannot get away from the fact—and I think none of us can—that this is not the ordinary Criminal Code or Judicature Act, or whatever you wish to call it; it is a compulsory measure.

Mr. MORPHY: Conscription of men.

Mr. GRAHAM: Every man who is asked to perform any duty under this Act ought to be compelled to perform that duty. I would make no distinction between the case of the chief justice and men assigned to any other tribunal. I would make it read "in case of failure to act from illness," or something of that kind, but not broader than that. The ordinary person reading the Act will say, "Well, when it came to the chief justice, they did not apply the rule to him that they have to all other men supposed to be engaged in this great struggle." Nobody ought to be excused, according to my judgment.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is a difference between the members of the ordinary tribunals under this Act and the chief justice. The obligation on the others would only be created by this statute. That office is created and the obligation is created to accept it, and then you make a penalty for this new state of affairs that never existed before, but your chief justice is an officer bound to perform all the duties imposed upon him in his quality of chief justice, and liable to certain consequences for failure. You are imposing an additional duty on him, and all the consequences of failure to perform any duty attaches to him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You would impeach him?

Mr. DOHERTY: I would not say what we would do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With reference to the provision about the court of appeal. I understand the court of appeal is to be composed of only one judge, to be appointed by the chief justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And he is to have jurisdiction to try the case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: One feature which might defeat the object of the Bill is the multiplicity of appeals. We have first, if I understand well, the local tribunal, then the appeal tribunal, then the central judge. I stated the other day, repeating what my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said in his address to the House, that there was, in that multiplicity of appeals, a chance for a rich man who wished to escape as much as possible the obligation, which the poor man had not. I do not raise the issue for the pleasure of raising it, or to create a prejudice in the minds of the public.

But I say that unless it is made very clear that the deposit which is ordinarily required for the lodging of an appeal will not be exacted in either case and that the cost of those proceedings will be reduced to a minimum, there will exist that prejudice in the minds of the people. If the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General would make those two points very clear the people would be impressed with the idea that rich and poor alike can, if they have a just case, not only appear before the local tribunal, but go to the appeal court and the Central Appeal Judge. There is a subsection in the Bill which enacts that the regulation for the setting in motion of those appeals will be prepared by the Governor in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will be approved by the Governor in Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Clause (b) of subsection 3 of section 10 says:

> The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge, may make regulations governing the right to and fixing the conditions of appeal from an appeal tribunal to the Central Appeal Judge, provided

any person authorized by the Minister of Militia and Defence may as of right enter and prosecute such appeal.

Before this Bill is passed the Governor in Council, that is to say, the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General, ought to provide the tribunals referred to in that clause, so that the public may know that there will be no undue favouritism on behalf of a certain class of the community as against another, so that the people of this country, rich and poor alike, will be on a footing of equality. The Minister of Justice, who has had long experience as a judge, knows that it is very easy to create an injustice by exacting from a poor litigant a large deposit to bring his case to appeal. In Montreal, where my hon. friend has practised law, and where he has administered law for so many years, there are classical cases of rank injustice where the litigants had not the means to go to the appeal court. I do not suppose the cost will be high, but we live in a time when the cost of living is high, and when the people have not too much ready money. This is not an ordinary piece of legislation.

The usual administration of justice has to look after only a few litigants, but here you have the whole nation which is liable to be called out, brought, so to speak, automatically before those courts. In the name of common sense and justice, I appeal to the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General to frame, before this Bill is passed, regulations which will show clearly to the people that there will be no high cost for the setting of the machinery in motion, and that the deposit to lodge the appeal will be practically nil.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can set my hon. friend's mind at rest on both points immediately before any regulations are made. There will be no deposit at all required for appeals, and such regulations as provide days, times, procedure, etc., will be such as to reduce to the very minimum, if not entirely to eliminate, the necessity of costs. The object of the regulations will be to make the appeal just as acceptable and just as applicable to the poor as to the rich.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the appellant have to forward his case and the evidence to Ottawa, or will he have to go there himself?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The first appeal is to the appeal judge, and the appellant can take new evidence to that judge or he can give his evidence over again. There are no strict rules as to that, and that judge will be almost as convenient to him as the local tribunal. It is hoped, at least, that there will be no necessity of a man going very far to an appeal judge. No fewer appeal tribunals could possibly be established than three. He who objects to three tribunals has not thought the matter out or does not weigh his words at all. It is hoped that the first court of appeal will weed out the number of appeals to a relatively small number. It is inconceivable that any one central tribunal at one time could hear all the appeals that will be made inasmuch as there is the utmost freedom of appeals. One court would never get through all the work. Consequently, there has to be an intermediary court, and no one could suggest anything else that would properly handle the appeals and at the same time that would be practicable in its working. There are two appeals in England and two in New Zealand.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many are there in the United States?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know. The regulations on this point have not yet been received. The appeals could not be simpler than they are here, and all that is left to the regulations is as to the right to appeal and the conditions of appeal. We had not in mind financial conditions, but simply the rules to be followed which will be of a very general and simple character to enable each appeal to be prosecuted with the least possible expense and to be disposed of as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. ROSS: Does not section 7 lay itself open to this criticism? It says:

> The Chief Justice of the court of last resort in each province . . . shall assign to each such tribunal one judge of any court of such province.

That might be a county court judge. Might not this situation arise? The local tribunal might consist of a county court judge and a layman, who would give their decision in regard to a man's exemption. There would be an appeal from their decision. Under section 7, might not the Chief Justice appoint a county court judge of another county to hear an appeal from a judge of the court of the same jurisdiction and a layman? That would be a rather ridiculous situation. Should not there be in the section something to state that in case of an appeal from a local tribunal consisting of a county court judge and a layman, the appeal should be

to a judge of a higher court? There is no provision except that the Chief Justice shall distribute the appeals. A county court judge of Oxford county might set aside the decision made by a county court judge of Middlesex and a layman. We do not think the Oxford county court judges are more capable than those of Middlesex.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member (Mr. Ross) has the same understanding of the section as I have. I know of no way to avert the possibility, if you call it a possibility, of that occurring, except by eliminating the county court judge as a judge of appeal.

You cannot eliminate him unless you are ready to impose very great inconvenience on judges of the higher courts. In the province of Manitoba the judges of the higher courts all reside in the city of Winnipeg, and similar conditions obtain in the other provinces. There may be half a dozen appeals to be heard at the town of Swan River, 400 or 500 miles from the city of Winnipeg. It is surely not wisdom to compel the Chief Justice to send a judge of the Court of King's Bench 400 or 500 miles to hear half a dozen appeals. Consequently we are allowing him to appoint a resident county court judge in the district to hear the appeals. It may be that a county court judge in that district has already passed upon those very cases, in which event the situation that presents itself to the mind of the hon. member for Middlesex would doubtless present itself to the mind of the Chief Justice, and he might be called upon to send a judge of the King's Bench to hear the cases, and he would likely do so.

Mr. ROSS: Why not say in the Act that he shall do that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we had provided in the Bill that wherever a county court judge sits, even if on only one case, a judge of the King's Bench must be sent to review it, we should be imposing very great inconvenience for very small cause. It seems to me that the way in which the Chief Justice will naturally get over the difficulty will be by assigning these cases to be tried by a judge in a near-by place. He knows the amenities of the Bench; he understands the feelings of judges as to being tried by their equals, and he, of all men, can be trusted to have regard to those considerations in the disposition of judges in courts of appeal. I do not think such cases are likely to arise at all, although they are possible under a strict reading of the Bill, I do not think in the first place that the Act need be worked to avoid that condition, because I think the judge will avoid it, and in the second place, I do not see how we could very well word the Bill so as to avoid it.

Mr. NESBITT: Did I understand the Solicitor General to say that the appeal court will consist of only one judge?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: That would be an argument against appointing judges on the local tribunal. It would be much cheaper to appoint a county court judge to hear the appeals.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is an argument, I think, against compelling judges to act on the local tribunal.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot understand why the Solicitor General does not even want to inconvenience a judge of the King's Bench. This Act is to compel men to risk their lives, but the Solicitor General will not use compulsion on a chief justice. He hesitates even to compel a county court judge, and he does not want to inconvenience—that is the word he used—a member of the King's Bench. I would not look at it in that light. I would make this a compulsory measure, and if it was necessary I would send a member of the higher courts anywhere, however much it inconvenienced him. I would make this measure compulsory on every person it affects.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not regard for the judges so much as regard for the public that governs. Judges are fairly busy, or are supposed to be. In the province of Saskatchewan, for instance, they are not merely busy but actually congested for reasons that I need not expatiate upon here. Litigation is very much in arrears; there has been a congestion there for two years. It is not in the public interest that for an insufficient cause one of these judges should be compelled to lose days and perhaps weeks doing something that could very conviently be done by a county court judge on the spot. The judges are, of course, compelled to act when they are needed, but we are not compelling the chief justice of a province to appoint one judge instead of another, when the other might be much more convenient to the locality; that is all. The compulsion is on the chief justice just as it is on every one else, and the compulsion is on the appeal judge when

he is appointed by the chief justice. The penalty lies in the law as it stands to-day, and a judge who refuses to act is liable to a much more severe penalty than any one is liable to who is nominated and fails to act on a local tribunal. The penalty of $500 is very small compared with what a judge of the court is liable to if he fails to do his duty according to the statute.

Mr. NESBITT: You would force the appeal judge to go to the district to hear these cases, and not make the applicants go to him?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He would go wherever he was sent. The appointment will be fixed conveniently to the residence of the appellants.

Mr. NESBITT: You will see that that is carried out?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. ROSS: I cannot follow the argument of the Solicitor General. He is considering the convenience of the public entirely, he says, but his whole argument tends to convince me that he is serving the convenience of the judges. The judges in this country are paid well in proportion to the amount of work they have to do, and I do not think they are overworked. They may do their duties well; I am not saying anything about that, but here we are dealing with the liberty of the subject, the thing most dear to all men. The Solicitor General should provide in the Bill that in case a county court judge is a member of a local tribunal, appeals from that tribunal shall be heard either by two county court judges or by a Superior Court judge, no matter how much it inconveniences them. This is a very important measure; we are at war; we are calling out men and sending them to fight and die in foreign lands, and at a time like this the convenience of a chief justice or two county court judges should not be considered. The Solicitor General must admit that we have a great many more county court judges in the province of Ontario than are necessary to do the work. I think other provinces are in the same position. I repeat that if the Solicitor General is unwilling to inconvenience a Superior Court judge, the appeals should be heard by two county court judges.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The suggestion of having two judges looks to me as possibly being practical. I will see if it can be arranged for.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. J. A. DESCARRIES (Jacques-Cartier) (translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point clearer which, in my opinion, is of the greatest importance: I refer to the appeal taken to the appeal tribunal and then to the central appeal judge from the judgment which will be given by the first tribunal. In the province of Quebec, when an appeal is taken from a lower court to a higher court, I do not know that new witnesses have to be heard. Now I think it is the desire of this honourable House that in such appeals new evidence should be heard. Therefore, if it is not specifically stated in this Act that new evidence may be heard, the presiding appeal judge will practically make rules of practice under which it would no longer be possible to adduce new witnesses.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY (translation): My answer to the hon. gentleman is that it is not the general rule, on an appeal, to hear new evidence. In criminal matters, the judge who sits in appeal over a case, holds a new trial and the appeals will be conducted in that manner. It will be within the power of the judge to frame regulations as to appeals under this legislation. The matter will be left to the initiative of the central appeal judge and the regulations concerning that tribunal shall emanate from the Governor General in Council.

Mr. DESCARRIES (translation): Should this not be put in the Act? When the law is sanctioned and enforced and difficulties arise, it will be too late to provide a remedy, whereas such difficulties could easily be obviated now. Why do you not say in this legislation that, in those appeals to the first appeal judge or to the central appeal judge, the appellant will have the right of producing new evidence?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY (translation): I do not see any objection to that, but neither do I see the necessity for it, as that point is governed by the regulations which are to be made by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the central appeal judge, and it seems to me that the hon. gentleman could accept our assurance that those regulations will provide for such cases as he refers to; the more so as it would not be practicable to apply to such appeals, under that Act, rules of procedure applying to civil cases, in which a record is made and prepared before the judge of the lower court. The fact must not be lost sight of that proceedings before tribunals of first resort are summary proceedings, and I have but little doubt that were it left to the

decision of the appeal judge,—seeing the great similarity of the proceedings with the proceedings in appeals in criminal matters —the judge would decide that it is absolutely necessary for him to hear new evidence, as no docket is prepared in writing which could be handed over to him. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman could accept the assurance that this will be made absolutely clear by the regulations and that he will have in those regulations which most control the procedure, exactly what he desires.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (translation): My hon. friend was not here this afternoon, when this matter came under review, and if he looks at section 5, he will find that not only the appeal tribunal has the right to hear the evidence, but the three tribunals.

Here is the English version:

5. (1) There shall be established in the manner hereinafter set out the following tribunals:—

(a) Local Tribunals;
(b) Appeal Tribunals;
(c) A Central Appeal Judge.

(2) Any tribunal may hear evidence on oath or otherwise as it may deem expedient, and for the performance of its duties shall have all the powers vested in a Commissioner under Part I of the Inquiries Act.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would like to leave with the Solicitor General for later consideration the suggestion of empowering appeal tribunals to appoint counsel to represent appellants, these counsels to be paid, of course, by the Government. I make this suggestion largely for the purpose of eliminating any excessive costs, or any costs at all, on the part of appellants.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why would my hon. friend limit it to appellants? After a case had been decided by a local tribunal, or by the appeal tribunal, the Minister of Militia might carry it to the central court of appeal at Ottawa, and put the subject to any amount of expense in defending the judgment he has obtained. I think there is a great deal to be said in favour of the suggestion of my hon. friend, but I would not limit to appellants. In every case I would give the subject the right to counsel. Of course, this comes up a little more prominently in section 10, which contains a most extraordinary provision, giving to the Minister of Militia the right to appeal. He may carry a case from the local tribunal up to the central appeal judge. He has the right to appeal, as a matter of course, and he need not give any bond or furnish any security for costs. If the subject has obtained a judgment in the lower court, the minister may practically ruin a poor man, carrying him from court to court without any possible redress.

I think the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) is a very excellent one. If there is a provision for the benefit of the subject, whether he is an appellant or a respondent—

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Of course, I mean that.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would like to get some information from the Solicitor General as to when this right of appeal begins, and what the appeal is from. It is not very clear from what the first appeal is taken. As I understand subsection 2 of section 4, after a certain proclamation is promulgated everybody in a certain class becomes subject to military law. There is no selection in the body of men called out by that proclamation. There may be hundreds among them who will not pass the medical examination, but they are subject to military law the moment they are called out. Of necessity, there must be some of them who will not find it necessary to appeal, because the medical examiner will turn them down. There must be a certain stage in their condition when they do not know whether the medical examiner will reject them or not. Are they supposed to appeal then to this central tribunal, before the doctor passes judgment upon them, or are they to wait until they are declared medically unfit? I have not been able to understand that very clearly. Perhaps the Solicitor General will make it definite as to when the right to appeal begins in the case of a man who is called out under the proclamation

Mr. MEIGHEN: The right to appeal begins immediately the decision of the local tribunal is obtained.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Whether exemption has been granted, or refused?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Whether exemption has been granted or refused. As to medical examinations, the local tribunal may itself grant exemption on the ground of ill health, or infirmity, under subsection E of clause 11. The regulations governing when the local tribunal may do so will be fixed, and the cases contemplated are cases of manifest infirmity or ill health. If the applicant comes before the tribunal and is refused exemption, or if he does not apply for exemption, upon the day fixed in the proclamation he must report, and from then on he is subject to mili-

tary discipline. Immediately on reporting he goes before the medical examiner, in the usual way, and if he is found unfit for service that ends it. His duties, under that call, have been answered. He may obtain from the local tribunal a conditional exemption, conditional as to time or otherwise, or as to re-examination locally or otherwise. That is the way all those medical difficulties are taken care of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Clause 7 stands. We do not ask that the clause shall be passed.

Section 7 allowed to stand.

On section 8—Central Appeal Judge.

The Governor in Council may appoint one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada to be the Central Appeal Judge.

Mr. CARVELL: Would it not be just as well if the word "may" were changed to "shall?"

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just as well .

Mr. CARVELL: I would like to see it that way, although I presume there would be no change and that a judge of the Supreme Court would be appointed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It means the same thing, but there is no objection to changing it to "shall." I move that the word "may" be changed to "shall." The rule is that where power is conferred upon executive authority, and presumed to be in the public interest, the word "may" is obligatory.

Motion agreed to.

On section 9—Registrars:

A Registrar for each province may be appointed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Might it not be desirable to have the right to appoint more than one registrar in some of the larger provinces such as British Columbia or Ontario?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there is need for more than one registrar in a province, and I do not think it is advisable, having regard to uniformity. We want to have every man who appeals send his appeal to the same registrar in each province. The duties would be much heavier in some provinces than in others, but there is provision later on for the appointment of any other officers necessary.

Mr. MARCIL: Have you provided for clerks for these local tribunals?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is covered by the "regulations" clause, 12, and it is provided that they may be appointed on the recommendation of the central appeal judge. It is intended to have a representative of the Militia Department and it may be possible that he would act as clerk.

Mr. MARCIL: Who supervises the expenses of the court?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Justice.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The suggestion to change the word "may" to "shall" in section 8 was acted upon very quickly, but I would suggest to the Prime Minister whether it is ever customary in a statute to use the word "shall" with respect to the Governor in Council or the representative of His Majesty. The word "shall" is entirely inconsistent with all the other sections in which the word "may" is used.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is true.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In section 4 it is said:

The Governor in Council may from time to time by proclamation—

Mr. CARVELL: This is different. They may never issue a proclamation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have never known the word "shall" to be used in that connection. It may be all right but I do not think it is customary.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think probably my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) is right. It is in effect what I suggest to my hon. friend from Carleton, but we will let it stand for the present and perhaps we can consider it again.

Section 8 allowed to stand.

Mr. MARCIL: Regarding the appointment of a registrar in the province of Quebec, there are two important and well defined judicial districts in that province, those of Montreal and Quebec. The chief justice of the Montreal district visits the Quebec district and the chief justice of the Quebec district visits the Montreal district. Perhaps two registrars will be necessary in that province, one at Quebec and one at Montreal.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I suppose it would be possible to appoint a deputy to the registrar for one of these districts if it should be found necessary.

Mr. McKENZIE: What are the duties of these registrars?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The principal duties of these registrars are to receive and to allocate appeals geographically throughout the province in order that the chief justice may appoint judges to try those appeals with convenience.

On section 10—Appeals:

10. (1) Any person aggrieved by the decision of a local tribunal, and any person authorized by the Minister of Militia and Defence, may appeal against any such decision.

(2) If the two members of a local tribunal cannot agree as to any decision to be made by them, they shall forthwith state in writing the case to be decided and cause the statement to be sent to the Registrar for the province in which the tribunal is established.

(3.) (a) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (b) of this subsection there shall be an appeal from any appeal tribunal to the Central Appeal Judge.

(b) The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge may make regulations governing the right to and fixing the conditions of appeal from an appeal tribunal to the Central Appeal Judge, provided any person authorized by the Minister of Militia and Defence may as of right enter and prosecute such appeal.

(4) The Central Appeal Judge shall be the tribunal of last resort, and the Governor in Council may, on his recommendation, appoint one or more other judges of any superior court to assist the said Central Appeal Judge in the discharge of his duties, and define their powers.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The first subsection gives to the Minister of Militia the right of appeal. It does seem to me that when a man has applied for exemption on the ground of sickness, infirmity or any of the other grounds which are set forth in the statute, if the Minister of Militia desires to appeal from the decision in the case, it should only be upon terms prescribed by the appeal tribunal. It is hardly right that the Minister of Militia, having authority to employ counsel and having the money of the country behind him, should put the subject, who might be very poor—perhaps utterly unable to employ counsel, and who might be affected very grievously by the cost of the proceedings that he would have to take to defend the judgment which he has obtained from the local tribunal—to the trouble and expense of defending a proceeding of this kind. It would be unfair that as a matter of right the Minister of Militia, without any conditions, any obligation as to cost if he fails, should have the right to enter an appeal. This right is still more objectionable when we come to paragraph (b) because (b) provides that the central appeal judge may make regulations governing the right of the subject to appeal. The Solicitor General stated that it was only intended to fix the conditions of appeal, but it is his duty to make regulations limiting the right of appeal as well as fixing the conditions. It is his duty to

—make regulations governing the right to and fixing the conditions of appeal from an appeal tribunal to the central appeal judge, provided any person authorized by the Minister of Milita and Defence may as of right enter and prosecute such appeal.

Why should there be a greater privilege extended to the Minister of Militia to carry the appeals from one court to another than is extended to the subjects who have obtained judgments in the first instance from the local tribunal? It does seem to me that it ought to be entirely the other way. The subject ought to have the right of appeal but if the Minister of Militia is not satisfied with the judgment of the local tribunal he ought to be compelled to enter into a certain obligation; at all events, to save the subject harmless of the costs incurred by reason of his being compelled to go from court to court until finally the Minister of Militia might carry him before a judge of the Supreme Court in Ottawa and might involve a young man in expense and hardship that would be almost ruinous to him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On this subclause 1 which we are at present discussing, the right of appeal is a free right of appeal on the part of both from the local tribunal. There is no restraint. But, under subclause (c) of section 12 it is provided that:

The Governor in Council may make regulation.. .. .. under which application for certificates may be made, deferred applications received, appeals entered and heard and rehearings had.

That is to say, conditions might be fixed, not conditions that would become a restraint, not conditions that could not be filled by either the individual applicant or the Militia Department. There might be conditions that could be easily complied with. It was felt that the central appeal judge might well make such regulations as would, in some way, limit appeals from that appeal tribunal to the central appeal judge. But it would be impossible to limit the appeals from the Militia Department, because in no other way could we secure that uniformity of application throughout the Dominion that is so desirable. My hon. friend says there should be even a freer right of appeal from that tribunal to the central appeal judge on the part of the individual than on the part of the department. At the opening of the discussion this afternoon, my hon. friend from

Renfrew (Mr. Graham) made some reference to our taking advantage of the experience of Great Britain in this regard. It is the experience in Great Britain that we have had regard to here. The experience there of the permission to appeal equally on the part of both to the central tribunal in London proved very disadvantageous in the obtaining of the necessary men under the Act. It caused great delay in many cases. So we have deemed it wise to enable the central appeal judge to make such regulations as, while they are quite fair and will cover all necessary and proper cases, will not allow an unrestricted right of appeal to every one, which would practically suggest and would perhaps break the whole machinery. There is no hardship involved. Every man has the right to appeal to the judge of a court of his own province, and he must be aggrieved by a judge of that court before he can complain.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Solicitor General states that the regulations governing appeals are to be made by the central appeal judge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Governing the right to appeal from the appeal tribunal.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That would be so if it depended entirely upon section 10. But by subsection (c) of section 12, the Governor in Council is allowed to make regulations. The two provisions seem to be inconsistent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is contemplated in section 12 is the entering of appeals, meaning the initiation of the appeal in the first place. It may be well to consider, when we are dealing with section 12, whether that should not also be among the regulations to be first initiated and recommended by the central appeal judge.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Solicitor General says that it is desirable to discourage appeals.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not quite.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well the experience in England has been that appeals have caused delay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is from the appeal judges.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me that unless we know the nature of the conditions of appeal that would be fixed by the Governor in Council, we can hardly tell whether it is going to remedy the evil or not. It may be that the condition of giving a bond as security for costs would operate very advantageously to the wealthy man, who could easily furnish

10 p.m. his bond or security for costs, and very disadvantageously to the poor boy who wished to carry his case to appeal. We have no intimation what those conditions are to be. The Solicitor General has not answered the argument that the Minister of Militia should have no more right to carry the subject from court to court without any obligation to give security for costs, or making any provision for giving the subject the advantage of counsel, than the subject would have to carry his appeal from court to court. Take the case of a young man who has made application for exemption. He gets a judgment from the local tribunal in his favour. The Minister of Militia, without giving any security, without any condition whatever being fixed, may appeal from that judgment to the appeal tribunal. If he gets a judgment from the appeal tribunal overturning the judgment of the local tribunal, then you are making provision under which the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the central appeal judge, can prevent that young man from appealing to have the judgment of the local tribunal restored. You are going to take away from him that right, while on the other hand, after the subject has got judgment of two courts in his favour, you allow the Minister of Militia to carry him off to the central appeal court without providing any security for costs, and without any conditions in respect to the appeal. It seems to me that is imposing an unreasonable hardship upon the subject. If there are to be any conditions attached to the appeal, those conditions ought to apply equally to the Minister of Militia and to the subject; indeed, I think they ought to apply much more strictly to the minister than to the subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would be no object in having security for costs put up by the Minister of Militia.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Make him liable for costs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is quite within the power of the central appeal judge to provide by regulation that in appropriate cases, looking to the means of the applicant, compensation can be granted to any one who, in his judgment, is unnecessarily brought before the central appeal judge.

It is quite within his power, under clause (b), subsection 3, section 10. I think that is quite adequate. At all events, the experience of Great Britain shows that unless the right of appeal is given the Militia Department to the central appeal judge, this measure will be in great danger of failing of its primary object.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I submit there is no fairness at all in that clause. There are two parties to the suit, the conscript and the Minister of Militia. Each has the right of appeal. If the minister is given the right of appeal he should be on a parity with the conscript, and should be subject to all the rules. If the minister is exempt from furnishing bonds, or giving security of any kind, the conscript should not be placed in a worse position. The rule should apply to both; there should be no exception. An appeal is given from the local tribunal to the appeal tribunal and the party has simply to say: "I appeal." When you come to an appeal from the appeal tribunal to the central judge, conditions are imposed upon the conscript, but not upon the Militia Department. I do not know what the conditions will be. It is provided in subsection 3 of section 10 that regulations can be made limiting the right to appeal. One condition may be the furnishing of a bond or making a deposit, or there may be a limit of time. But the conditions, whatever they are, will have to be performed by the conscript, whereas the Minister of Militia will be free from all those formalities, and can simply walk into court and say: "I appeal." That is not fair at all. They should be on an absolute parity in both cases, and I do not see how my hon. friend can justify the greater restriction upon one than upon the other.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is not quite correct in saying that there can be no conditions placed upon the Minister of Militia in reference to an appeal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The section says so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How do you construe the regulations?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The regulations may provide conditions, but they must not be such as to prevent the absolute right of appeal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Paragraph (b) of subsection 3 of section 10 reads:

> The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge may make regulations governing the right to and fixing the conditions of appeal from an appeal tribunal to the Central Appeal Judge, provided any person authorized by the Minister of Militia and Defence may as of right enter and prosecute such appeal.

That gives the Minister of Militia the right to enter and prosecute an appeal, without conditions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can only give my interpretation. I cannot say it is worth any more than the interpretation of any one else. My interpretation is that conditions may be imposed in reference to carrying on an appeal. Those conditions may even be applicable to the Militia Department, but there must not be such conditions that will put it in the power of any one to prevent the Militia Department prosecuting the appeal. They may compel the Militia Department to fulfil certain conditions, or they may compel them to provide for the witness fees of the other side, but they cannot prevent them from prosecuting the appeal, whereas these regulations may provide a condition, applicable to the individual, that he shall be prevented from prosecuting an appeal, except with the consent of the appeal judge. Such a condition, under this clause, could not be applicable to the Militia Department. Condition might be made which should be performed by the Department of Militia, but not a condition which would prevent the Minister of Militia, in any case, going to the Central Appeal Judge. They cannot do anything that puts it in the power of any one to prevent him appealing, but any other condition would be quite a fitting obligation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They can take away the right of the public to appeal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They can.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is putting him in a difficult position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not contend they are in the same position, and I only say, in defence of that, that if we are to have regard to the working out of the British Act at all, and if we are sincere in our desire to get these men, the working out of the British Act has shown that it will not do to have the parties on a parity with regard to appeals to the final court—that there must be as much freedom of appeal on the part of the Militia Department as there was in Great Britain, which will enable them to go to the final court, thus

assuring the uniformity of application everywhere, and securing the men. I do not contend that they are on a parity, but I say it is necessary that the free right of appeal should exist on the one hand, and I do not think it is necessary on the other.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is where we disagree. I do not know what the regulations may be, but I imagine that perhaps it might not be contemplated that the right of appeal from the appeal judge should exist as a matter of right. That is the party may be compelled to present a petition to a judge, making a prima facie case, giving some reasons why the appeal should be allowed. I can conceive of such regulations being made, but no further than that. In the case of the conscript, when he comes into court, they say to him, "You want to appeal? On what ground?" He may say, "I want to have a new witness," and he may be allowed to appeal upon certain conditions. But, on the other hand, the Minister of Justice walks in, without giving any reason at all, and says to the court, "I appeal this case, I have no reason to give;" —simply "I appeal." Notwithstanding what my hon. friend may say as to the necessity and advisability of administering this Act so as to get recruits, it is repulsive to one's sense of justice that one side should have more privileges than the other. All classes should be on a parity, and if one side has to fulfil conditions in order that he may be allowed to appeal, the other side should be placed in the same position. It seems to me, as the provision stands, it is against the rules of fairness, equity and justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The two are not on a parity, in the first place. The country is acting for everybody. The individual is acting for himself; and, in the next place, conditions might be imposed which would compensate the individual for the harassment of an unnecessary appeal, such as the provision that the conscript's expenses should be paid by the Crown. You could not, on the other hand, impose similar conditions on the public, because it would be immediately said, "You are making it possible for the rich man to appeal to the central judge, but you are making it impossible for the poor man." In a word, it is impossible to impose the same conditions on the individual as you may impose on the Militia Department. Consequently, as the conditions cannot be the same, the rights cannot be the same, because the individual is acting purely for himself. On the other hand, the Militia Department is acting for the whole country, and they do not start out on a parity.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: They do not start on a parity because the Minister of Militia has the whole Government behind him. It shows how necessary it is to protect the conscript. I am sorry I cannot convince my hon. friend. The argument is a strong one, and I shall have to press it again.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend will see that great difficulty might arise by reason of different views being entertained by different appeal judges in different parts of the country, and I think he will agree that it would be desirable to have some regulating authority by which uniformity of decision would be secured. That is the only purpose of this provision. So far as all these appeals are concerned, and indeed so far as the procedure before the tribunal of first instance is concerned, I hope the matter will so work out that there will not be all the formality of procedure that obtains in the disposition of civil trials in the courts. I would hope that the proceedings in the first instance and the appeals as well may be of the informal character that we see, for example, before the Board of Railway Commissioners. It is said that on one occasion some years ago a former chairman of the board saw certain men who had arrived to advocate the rights of some community in the country, and who had no lawyer with them. He said to them: "Come forward, gentlemen, and state your case. This is a catch-as-catch-can court.' These tribunals and appeal courts ought not to be impeded with legal quibbles or legal procedure. I hope they will be carried on in a very different manner. It would not be my disposition to surround any of these proceedings with strict legal formalities. I hope every man who may have a reasonable right of appeal will get his appeal and have it heard as quickly and expeditiously, and with as little technical procedure, as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have no objection to that. On the contrary, I am quite disposed to agree with my right hon. friend that these appeals should be as simple as possible, devoid of formality, going direct to the question to be decided and dispensing with law if possible. But in the Bill as it stands, the first appeal is without any formality at all; it is of the character represented by my right hon. friend. The conscript walks in before the judge and says:

"I appeal." He may say to the judge: "I have a witness whom I had not at a former trial, and I want to have him heard." But when you come to the second appeal, here is the condition which I read in the Bill:

> The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge, may make regulations governing the right to and fixing the conditions of appeal.

The very fact that the judge may make regulations governing the right of appeal nullifies the object my right hon. friend has just stated. At once there must be formalities. The judge makes regulations to limit the conscript's right to have his appeal. What are those regulations? I wish we knew them, but they are left to the judge. They may be of one character or of another character, but whatever they may be, I submit as a matter of equity, justice and fairness, that the rules which are imposed upon the conscript for the exercise of his right should also be imposed upon the Minister of Militia, and vice versa; otherwise, there is no equity in the matter at all.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Subsection 2 of section 10 provides for a stated case in the event of a disagrement between the two members of the local tribunal. Is that subsection complete in drafting, or is there some other section in the Bill, which I do not know of at the moment, which deals further with this matter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, section 7 says that the cases so stated shall be heard.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is complete, yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Subsection 2 of section 10 provides that if there is a disagreement between the two members of the local tribunal, they shall state a case which they shall transmit to the registrar of the province in which the case arises. It is the duty of the registrar to turn that over to the appeal court, but there is no provision made for transmitting the evidence taken by the local tribunal along with the stated case. The evidence should go forward with the stated case, so that the court of appeal would have an opportunity of seeing what evidence was taken before the local tribunal in order to arrive at a decision.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In stated cases, you do not require evidence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A stated case would embrace such a summary of the evidence as would make the appeal intelligible to the appeal tribunal. We could not impose upon the local tribunal the necessity of including all the evidence in a stated case, because that would involve the necessity of all the evidence in every case being taken down in writing.

Mr. SINCLAIR: But nothing is said about the evidence going forward?

Mr. MEIGHEN: A stated case cannot be anything other than a statement of the evidence in the case, a short statement, signed by the two members of the tribunal of the facts as brought out in the evidence.

Mr. CARVELL: According to clause (b) of subsection 3, the central appeal judge makes regulations, and there is nothing in the clause as to who shall pay costs or what bonds shall be given, and so on; but the Minister of Militia has the absolute right in any case to appeal, and, of course, he has the whole consolidated revenue fund of Canada behind him, so that on his part there is no question of money. Has the minister ever considered the advisability of providing that if a man be in indigent circumstances and not able to defend the appeal, he may be alloted counsel or have his expenses paid? If the first appeal is decided in favour of the conscript, then as the laws stands, he is right. The Crown, with all of its power and money behind it says: We will not stand by this decision and we are going to appeal from it. It may be absolutely impossible for the poor man to follow that appeal and protect what may be his legal right, because up to that time we have to consider that he is right, as the court which this Bill creates says that he is right. While my hon friend may say: We shall leave it to the central appeal judge by regulation to say what the conditions shall be, it seems to me there ought to be in the Bill some direction to state the lines along which these regulations shall be framed, and that some protection should be thrown around the conscript by which, if he is not able himself to defend the appeal, the country should stand by him and see that he receives a fair trial on appeal.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We want, of course, to give every man full opportunity to assert his rights; but on the other hand, it is not a desirable thing to have inserted in this Bill any such provision as would encourage frivolous appeals merely for the purpose of taking up time and preventing a man, if he is really liable for military service, from entering upon his duties as a soldier.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not objecting to the central appeal judge having the right to make the regulations governing the right of appeal, because that is where your frivolous objection comes in. But assuming that the Crown exercises the right of appeal, and the man has received a decision in his favour before the first tribunal, unless some means is provided he will be unable to follow up that appeal. He might have a perfectly just case, but, having no means to defend himself, the case would go against him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had that very case in contemplation, namely, an appeal by the Militia Department from the decision of the appeal tribunal. I can conceive that there would be cases where the central appeal judge would decide that equity demanded compensation to the individual who was brought before the central appeal judge or some other judge named by him.

Mr. CARVELL: Are you referring to the taxation of costs to the conscript after the appeal is heard?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I referred to.

Mr. CARVELL: I was referring to what might happen before the appeal was heard. If a conscript has no means he would never be able to get before the central appeal judge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was just proceeding to that. There might be a case where, owing to the capricious action of the official of the department, a man who was appealing a case might be put to an expense that he should not have been put to. That might very well be covered by regulation. I do not see how it could be covered by the Bill, because a great deal would have to be left to the central appeal judge himself. There might be cases where the individual might not be able to get to the central appeal judge or some other judge named by him, but those cases would likely be very few, because the central appeal judge has power to name some judge in British Columbia, Nova Scotia, and so on, to do the work for him, and consequently the expense could not be so great. It would appear to me best to leave to the central appeal judge the framing of the regulations under which indigent cases, so to call them, might be provided for. If we inserted in the Act a provision that a certain sum shall be lodged in the event of an appeal by the Militia Department we should be putting a very high premium on appeals beyond the tribunals. We want to discourage such appeals as much as possible. I do not see why the central appeal judge could not be trusted to work out some regulations for payment for the service of subpœnas and such other necessary costs as he might feel ought to be provided for, on the production of evidence of inability to pay on the part of the applicant.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think my hon. friend is following me. I am not pleading for the applicant, but for the man who has received a decision in his favour from the tribunal, and against which decision the Crown has appealed. If this man has no means he is unable to carry on the case. My hon. friend does not live in a part of the country where they have a divorce court, and so he does not know what real justice is, but down in the Maritime Provinces we have a divorce court and the wife has a right to demand that the husband who is suing for divorce shall pay her costs day by day, or the case cannot go on. I think that might be done in this case where the Crown is appealing against the decision from a court below.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is not done in divorce cases alone. Sometimes an appeal is granted, by special leave, to the Privy Council upon condition that the appellant in any case shall pay the costs of the respondent. There might be regulations which would restrict the Minister of Militia in that way, and it may be very desirable that there should be such regulations to cover some cases; that is to say, if a case is decided against the Department of Militia by the tribunal, and it is desirable for the purpose of securing uniformity of decision in all the provinces that there shall be an appeal against that decision, it might be possible to provide that in any event the Minister of Militia shall pay the costs of that appeal.

Mr. CARVELL: That is what I am contending for.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It does not seem possible to provide for that in this Bill. It had better be left to regulation.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not care whether it is done by Bill or regulation, so long as I am assured that it will be done. But if it is not in the Bill it is possible that the central appeal judge might not consider it necessary to put it in the regulations, and in that case, although we all have the best

intentions, the poor man would be without redress.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That clearly should be done by regulation. The appeal judge would consider the wisdom of such a course and what the costs should be.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand that a man will be allowed to appeal from the decision of any army doctor? A doctor might pronounce him physically fit, but the man himself, guided by his own feelings or the advice of some other doctor, might declare that he was physically unfit. Could he appeal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no appeal from the opinion of the army doctor as to physical fitness. The man would be in just the same position after the decision of the army doctor as he would be in to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have listened to the discussion and am unable to come to any conclusion whether or not the Government intends to give to the conscript the right of appeal to the Central Appeal Judge. I should have thought that the real object of having this appeal judge was to enable the Minister of Militia to get uniformity of decision throughout Canada. The Solicitor General has rather admitted that the regulations may take away the right of appeal altogether from the subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Except in certain cases.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would those cases be appeals on question of fact or on questions of law? Reading the whole section one must be struck by the anomaly of it. Section 3 (a) says:

> Subject to the provisions of paragraph (b) of this subsection there shall be an appeal from any appeal tribunal to the Central Appeal Judge.

That clearly limits the right of appeal. It does not give what one would think was being given to the subject, namely, the right of appeal. Section 3 (b) says:

> The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Central Appeal Judge, may make regulations governing the right . . . . of appeal.

Under that, it seems to me that the judge can make such regulations as will actually deprive the subject of the right of appeal, either on a question of fact or on a question of law. It goes on:

> —provided any person authorized by the Minister of Militia and Defence may as of right enter and prosecute such appeal.

The effect of that is the regulations may absolutely deprive the subject of the right of appeal to the central judge. The Minister of Militia has an absolute right of appeal, which cannot be taken away from him under those regulations. I only wish to repeat what I said before, in the hope that some weight may be given to the suggestion. It is only adding to what has been said by my right hon. friend who sits on my left (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that if a conscript has had a judgment of the local appeal tribunal in his favour, he ought not to be carried to the central appeal judge by the Minister of Militia, without some provision being made to reimburse him for his costs, in case the judgment appealed from should be sustained. My hon. friend says the desire is to discourage appeals, but, as has already been pointed out, it is not the case of the conscript appealing, but of the Minister of Militia not being satisfied with what might have been the judgment of two tribunals in favour of the subject and he still wants to carry the case to a higher court where the conscript may be absolutely unable to meet him by reason of his poverty—and where on account of the case being undefended, the Minister of Militia may get a judgment reversing the judgments of the inferior courts. This is contrary to the principles of natural justice, and should not be permitted. If the subject has a judgment of either one or two of these courts—appointed in the very careful way in which the Prime Minister says the tribunal is to be appointed—I say it is grossly unfair that the Minister of Militia should be permitted, as of right, to carry the case to a higher court without making any provision which would enable the poor boy—who possibly, is absolutely without means—to meet him in this higher court. There should be either an equal condition of affairs as between the subject and the Minister of Militia, or there should be, in the case of the minister appealing from the judgment of one or two of the inferior courts, some provision which would do justice to the conscript in the way of guarding him against the loss which he must necessarily sustain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not disagree altogether with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that there will be cases of unfairness if entirely unrestrained by any condition the Minister of Militia were to have the free right of appeal against the judgment of the two courts below, but there is nothing in the Bill which says that he must have such right of appeal unre-

strained. All I argue is that the central appeal judge can better frame the provisions which seem fair in his judgment—the conditions that must be lived up to by the Minister of Militia—before he allows an appeal of the Minister of Militia from the judgment of the lower courts.

Mr. CARVELL: According to subsection (b) the right of the minister to appeal is without condition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The central appeal judge may make regulations governing the conditions upon which that right may be exercised. He cannot prevent the Minister of Militia from exercising it, but he can hedge it around with conditions which the minister must fulfil, such as, for instance, a provision for witness fees.

Mr. CARVELL: Or, depositing a sum of money for the costs?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Exactly. So that he is quite at liberty to protect the subject against embarrassment, so far as money can protect him.

Mr. CARVELL: Then, why not say so?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend can frame a clause which will take care of cases of that kind, I will be quite open to receive it.

Mr. CARVELL: I have it framed already.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never claimed that exactly the same right of appeal rests on the one side as on the other. The Militia Department represents the whole people of Canada, and the individual represents himself. It is not a principle of law that the same right of appeal rests on both sides. Rights are presumed, and rights are granted under the common law of the land, in favour of the Crown, which the individual does not enjoy.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In what case? Will the minister give an instance?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the collection of debts claimed by the Crown, the Crown has a right which the individual does not enjoy.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is very different.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Crown has the rights in this country and in Great Britain which the individual does not enjoy at all; and why? Because it is in the public interest. The Crown represents the people, whereas the individual represents himself. In a trial between two individuals there must be an absolute parity, but it cannot be in the interests of the State that in a contest between the State and the individual there should be a parity in all things. I contend those very principles should be embodied here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There was a time when the Crown had more rights than it has to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very true. It might be that, under this, regulations may be adopted whereby the consent of the appeal judge must be secured before an individual can take a case to the court of appeal. It might be, that consent would be called for where it was a question of law, but not of necessity, where it was a question of fact. Such restraints would be fair, reasonable and right, but you could not get uniformity if the same restraint were applied to the Militia Department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The reason given by my hon. friend is that it is essential to have uniformity. That is not the reason at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not the only one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is the principal reason, as I have understood.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) wished to know how we could provide for what we are seeking. It seems to me that I would like to make this proposal.

Paragraph 3 (a) says:

> Subject to the provisions of paragraph (b) of this subjection there shall be an appeal from any appeal tribunal to the Central Appeal Judge.

I would suggest that at the end of that clause you put these words:

> Provided that if such appeal is prosecuted by the Minister of Militia the latter shall be required to deposit with the court such sum as the judge may direct to pay the costs of the respondent to such appeal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would not meet the very case that the hon. member has in mind. Where would the respondent get his money in the meantime to carry on his fight?

Mr. CARVELL: He knows that the Government is putting up the money and he will probably find some enterprising barrister who will help him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will he not be just as well off if the regulations provide that if

the cost of the appeal is harassing he will be recompensed?

Mr. CARVELL: If the minister will say that the regulations will contain that provision I am satisfied.

Mr. McKENZIE: If his right depends on his being successful, I do not know that there will be very much protection for him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If he wins there is no provision by which he will get his costs. He may win in every court but the statute gives him no costs. I cannot see where, under the statute, the central appeal judge can make regulations which will give him his costs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the intention.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then there should be an express provision to that effect. It does seem that the minister is carrying it too far when he says that the spirit of the statute is in the interest of the public and against the subject. Every statute passed for the protection of the subject is said to be in the interest of the public. Every criminal law is, and we know that the criminal law is always administered with the most tender regard for the subject. The subject is at an enormous disadvantage as against the Crown.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why then is the subject not given the same rights to challenge before the jury as the Crown is giving to stand aside jurors?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Because under the law of Canada there must be a unanimous verdict of the jury of twelve before a prisoner can be found guilty. That is an enormous advantage. That advantage has been taken away from the prisoner in many countries, amongst others in the United States, because in some of the states nine jurors can find a prisoner guilty. In this country there must be a unanimous verdict.

Mr. DOHERTY: The verdict has to be unanimous here either for conviction or acquittal.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is absurd; if the jury do not find a unanimous verdict against the prisoner they are discharged after a reasonable time and the man goes free.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about a disagreement? They might bring in a disagreement. It is just as fair for one as the other. But as to the right of challenge, the advantage is given to the Crown in every trial.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has the right to stand aside jurors.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In a capital case, a case of murder, the prisoner can challenge twelve jurymen and the Crown can only challenge three. Is that not so, Mr. Minister?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think those figures are correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Crown can stand aside a hundred if it likes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Crown simply stands aside so many until the panel has been gone over, but when the clerk begins again to call the panel the Crown has a limited right of challenge. I think it has only one-third or one-fourth the right of the prisoner.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The right of the Crown to stand aside jurors is practically an unlimited right in Manitoba and other provices and it gives an enormous advantage to the Crown. That principle pervades our civil as well as our criminal law. How could it be contended that the two stand on a parity before the court?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Any man who has had anything to do with the administration of the criminal law will recognize that the law is always tender and merciful to the accused. He is deemed to be innocent until proved guilty. He is given the right to challenge twenty jurors while the Crown has only the right to challenge three. There must be a unanimous verdict of guilty before the prisoner can be found guilty and condemned to punishment. The Crown has a most tender regard for the rights of the subject and the reason is that the subject is at an enormous disadvantage. In this case, here is the Minister of Militia with all the power and authority of the Crown, and with all the money of the treasury at his back, with power to employ counsel and to call witnesses from all over the country, while the subject, the conscript, who may be without money, notwithstanding that he may have got judgment in two courts, may be dragged to Ottawa, before the central appeal judge without any provision for the payment of his witness or counsel, or even his travelling expenses. That is placing the subject at an enormous disadvantage and it is contrary to the spirit which hitherto has animated Parliament in connection with any Bill that I have ever known to be passed.

Mr. CARVELL: I did not intend, as was suggested by my hon. friend from Cape

Breton (Mr. McKenzie), that this sum of money would only go to the respondent in case he won. The amendment was drafted very hurriedly but my intention was to so draft the clause that this would be a sum of money set aside to pay his costs, win or lose. If he loses the Crown gets his body. It is only to put an indigent person in a position to defend himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It applies to every case whether he is rich or poor.

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly. I take the ground that if the Crown appeals a second time and the respondent has the decision below, the Crown should pay the costs of the appeal.

Mr. J. A. DESCARRIES (translation): Mr. Chairman, I approve the suggestion made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). Since the Minister of Militia who, in the main, is the Government, is not obliged to make a deposit in order to proceed with his appeal, it seems to me there is no reason to compel the appellant, who believes himself wronged by conscription, to make a deposit as a security for his appeal costs. Otherwise, it would be debarring from their right to appeal a large number of people who might think they had been wronged by the local tribunal's decision. There will certainly be appellants among those who will be in the first class and there will also be in that class young men twenty years old. Now, I wish to point out that, in the province of Quebec, a youth of twenty is a minor, that consequently, he has no rights, or responsibilities, in order to obtain money. He cannot legally contract a bond or a security in order to make a cash deposit to allow him to appeal. I will go further and say that the greater part of these young men are absolutely resourceless. Then, do I ask, how could these young men appeal when they feel they are wronged, if they are deprived of all means to do so?

Would there not be some way of protecting these young people, who are at the start of life, who have no earthly possessions and not even the legal capacity to contract, would there not be some means of giving them at least the right of appeal of course without any expensive procedure, of paying only their witness costs, in fine, that they be only liable for those things which they would absolutely be obliged to do for themselves? I make this suggestion in order to protect this most interesting class of young men, the first youth of the country who are to be called upon to fight for the protection of our rights. Therefore, at least, let those who would believe they are injured by conscription have a chance to appeal to the highest tribunal and to do so in a practical manner, that is to say, let us afford them the means of doing it without compelling them to fill certain conditions which they are unable to fulfil.

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: I may say, in reply to the hon. gentleman that it has already been stated that there is no intention whatever to exact deposits as conditions for appealing. In the next place, the terms to be laid down must be couched in the form of regulations which will be prepared by or at the suggestion of the court itself (Central Appeal judge). I believe we may depend upon the court and that they will not attempt to lay down conditions which the appellants would be unable to comply with. If we can trust the court as regards the settlement of the main issue, it seems to me we should be thoroughly satisfied that they would not impose conditions which the appellants could not possibly meet.

At all events, hon. members have suggested the imposing of conditions upon the Minister of Militia, as to the costs and expense, but there is in the Act nothing to suggest that pecuniary conditions would be imposed upon the appellants.

Mr. DESCARRIES: I have perfect confidence in the decision to be rendered by the tribunals as to the merits of the appeal, but as to the conditions we do not know what they may be. It is perfectly possible that the appeal judges impose as a preliminary condition of such an appeal, a deposit, a security of some sort, or such other conditions which would be so burdensome that those parties of whom I was just speaking, those twenty year old minors, would not be able to meet them, it would be like shutting the door upon them. It seems to me that Parliament, that the members have the right to know whether the conditions to be imposed by the judges and ratified by the Governor General in Council, shall be burdensome to such parties or shall give them the opportunity to appeal.

Mr. McKENZIE: This Parliament and all parliaments have been in the habit of enacting substantive law by the Act itself and not leaving it to regulations to be dealt with in regulations. In subsection (b) of section 3 the Solicitor General is departing from the ordinary rule and leaving the enacting of substantive law to regulation.

The right of appeal is substantive law. How we shall get to the court of appeal, etc., is a matter of regulation, but the right of appeal is substantive and should be enacted by this Parliament. While I am very anxious that everyone should have all proper rights of appeal, my criticism of this Act is that it provides for too many courts, and none of them strong. It would be better to have a court of first resort stronger than any courts I have heard mentioned yet, and let that be the end of it. The matters that go to that court are covered by subsections (a) (b) and (c) of section 11. The county court judge and another man sitting with him will not be a strong court to deal with the subjects that must necessarily come under those sub-sections, and it would be better to have a strong court of first instance composed of men capable of dealing with this broad subject. I would say, let that strong court deal with it once for all, and do not let us have this irritating condition of going from one weak court to another. I am not reflecting in any way upon the capacity of judges; but these are not matters of law; they are matters of the common utilities of the country, and a judge is no better able to deal with them than anybody else. If the plan I have suggested were adopted, there would be less irritation, less trouble and a better administration of justice.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Reverting to the question of challenge, I find that a person charged with an offence punishable with death is entitled to challenge peremptorily twenty jurors and the Crown only four, not three as I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite agree that in regard to challenge more liberty is given to the accused, because the right of telling jurors to stand aside is practically unlimited on the part of the Crown, and is a very powerful weapon. It must be remembered that those provisions are modified by provincial legislation, at least on the point of standing aside.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The right to stand aside continues only until the panel is exhausted. The provincial legislature in the constitution of the court may increase the number of jurors; perhaps that is what my hon. friend refers to, as that increases the number who may be stood aside. But that is only until the panel is exhausted, whereas the prisoner's right is to challenge peremptorily, and, in addition, he can challenge for cause.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understood from the Minister of Justice that the appellant would not be obliged to make a deposit in order to make his appeal good. Am I right?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not the individual.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 11.12 p.m.

INDEX

SEVENTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1917

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abbotsford postmaster, 608

Achim, Mr. Honoré (Labelle)
Military Service Bill, 2873

Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 9, 47, 83, 119, 160, 195, 249

Address to His Majesty the King. *See* Parliament: Extension of term of

Adjournment moved to discuss matter of urgent public importance
Mr. Pardee, returned soldiers, 459
Mr. Lemieux, liquor in military camps, 806
Mr. Kyte, price of flour, 1039
Mr. Devlin, conservation of grain, 1176
Mr. Macdonald, German submarines, 1320
Mr. Oliver, removal of rails, 1820
Mr. Turriff, farm labour, 3504
Mr. Macdonald, munitions, 5517

Adulteration of food. *See* Food

Advertising, government
Department of the Secretary of State, 656
Recruiting, 986, 3136

Aeroplane. *See* Air service *and* Aviation

Aetna Explosives Company, 4508

Agriculture
Animals
Health of, 2271
Loaning of to farmers, 4152
Pure bred, purchase of, 2276
See, under this head, Live stock.
Apples, embargo on export of, 5776
Associations, 2276
Beans for seed, 671, 1473
Bulletins, 2062, 2274
Butter
Imports and exports of, 1573
Purchases by British Government, 899
Cattle. *See, under this head,* Live stock
Cheese
Imports and exports of, 1573
Manufacturing and curing of, 2265
Purchase of by British Government, 1774, 1863, 1971, 2197, 2257, 2265, 2267, 2557
See also Food

Agriculture—*Con.*
Dairy industry, 953, 2075, 2256
Department
Estimates, 654, 2062, 2255, 2924, 3744, 4677
French-speaking employees of, 2262, 2265
Publications 2062, 2274
Staff and salaries, 4924
Development of, 2578
Exhibitions, 2260, 2270
Experimental farms, 2055, 2063, 4682
Hay
Embargo on, 1222
Imports and exports of, 1574
Inspection and grading of, 3402
Purchases of by British Government, 5086
Hogs
Inspection of, 2271
Cholera, 2273
Insect pests, 2066, 2075
Labourers. *See* Labour
Horses, compensation for destruction of, 2056
Live stock
British embargo on, 918, 987, 1535
Pure bred, purchase of, 2276
Shipments, inspection of, 1841
See also Live stock and Produce Bill
Noxious weeds, 2068
Parcel post shipments, 2072
Plant diseases
Rust in wheat, 2063, 2067
Powdery scab in potatoes, 2269, 5991
Potatoes
Accumulation of on railways, 607
Duty, proposed removal, 703, 5274, 5777, 5982
Exports and imports of, 2267, 5982
Powdery scab, 2269, 5991
Prices and supply of, 936, 1087, 1189, 1437, 2095
Seed, 1473
Straw, utilization of, 4683
Veterinary Director General, 987
See also Cold storage, *and* Food

Agricultural Instruction Act
Administration of, 3755
Payments to Prince Edward Island under, 455

Aiken, Mr. G. O., employment of, 4151, 4508

Air Service, 805, 1039, 1127, 1331. *See* Aviation

Alase, Motor boat, 5360

Alberta, enlistments in, 3373, 3375

Alcohol
Distillation of, 3742
Public institutions, for, 5103

Alcoholic liquors
Revenue from sale and manufacture of, 304
Sale of to soldiers. *See* Army: camps
See also Intoxicating liquors, Prohibition *and* Grain

Aldershot camp. *See* Army

Aliens
Armenians and Assyrians, franchise rights of under War-time Elections Act, 5421
Disfranchisement of, 1862, 5416
Enlistment of, 4413, 4415
Homestead rights of, 3808
Naturalization of, 3810

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (Montreal, St Antoine)
Budget, 742
The tariff, 742
Government expenditure, 743
Building of highways, 744
Taxation of business profits, 745
Debt of Canada, 745
Military Service, 2738
Contravention of Act, 3346
Enforcement, 2744
Exemptions, 3220
Petitions for and against, 2738
Recruiting, progress of, 2742
Patriotic Fund
Disbursements, 378, 382
Pensions, 382
Pensions, military, 1615
Soldier Settlement Board, 3785
Soldiers
Assigned pay of, 384
Pay of, 3215
Returned, provision for, 756
Voting of, 4781, 4912
Taxation of incomes, 4084, 4095, 4099, 4641, 4647
Unclaimed bank balances, 1008
War charities, 6064

American Turf Association, 47

Amqui-St. Leonard mail contract, 3903

Anderson, Mr. David, employment of, 1265

Angers, Captain, dismissal of, 758

Anglo-French delegates, visit of to Canada, 669

Apples, embargo on export of, 5776

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 20 (for 1916-17, $9,127,777.42; for 1917-18, $32,195,144). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 584
2. Bill No. 108 (for 1917-18, $24,054,845.38). Res., 1r., 2947; 2r., com., 3r., 3086
3. Bill No. 128 (for 1916-17, $4,821,217.80). Res., 1r., 5242; 2r., com., 3r., 5275
4. Bill No. 135 (for 1917-18, $51,096,767.05). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 6061; 3r., 6062

Archives, Public
Expenses, 5791
Records, 3742

Armstrong, Mr. J. A. M. (North York)
Military service, 2546
Railway mail service, 2244

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4496, 5160
Fuel, 1405
Government Railways Act amendment, 4350
Intoxicating liquor, prohibition of, 4399
Railway Act, the, 3422-3453, 3511-3553, 3592-3609, 3717

Armstrong, S. A., position of, 802

Army
Allowances
Dependents of men joining British Army, to, 385
London offices, to soldiers employed in, 5915
Separation, 336, 382, 383, 387, 1191, 3075, 4001
Subsistence, 4001
Assigned pay, 383
Badges of identification, 5953
Bands, regimental, 4044
Battalions
Forestry
List of, 4509
Recruiting for, 5703
Wages paid in, 3950, 3509
60th, 525
105th. Supply Officer Lieut. R. J. Moffat, 5361
122nd, 5083
156th, 523
167th, 5272
Camps
Aldershot, 3295, 3419
Borden, 96, 100, 101

Army—*Con.*
Intoxicating liquor in, 535, 806, 1226, 1266, 1561, 1567
Petewawa land claims, 5241
Training, in Canada, 899
Canteen system in England, 718
Casualties
June 30, 1916, to June 5, 1917, 2201
June, 1917, 3719
July, 1917, 4151
August 16-31, 1917, 5901
Civil servants, in, pay and allowance to, 663, 713
Classifications, 2185
Commissions, granting of, 203, 207
Conscription. *See* Military service
Demobilization plans, 3118
Dental Service, 31
Officers, 1574, 4009
Desertions, 338, 3111
Discharge
Purchase of, 3111
Regulations governing, 3096, 3098
Table of, 3096
Total to June 30, 1917, 4152
Work pay, on, 457
Divisions, 459; 2186
Enlistment
Aliens, of, 4413, 4415. *See below* Persons of foreign birth
British army, in, 385
Civil Service, from. *See* Civil Service
Different units, in, 29, 245
Farmers, of, 4685
Figures
April 30, 1917, to, 1572
June 30, 1917, to, 4152
July, 1917, 4151
Generally, 2411, 2442, 2446-2451, 2454, 2463-2478, 2573, 2583, 2600, 2624, 2631, 2647, 2855, 2884, 2904
Moosejaw, at, 5122
Non-residents, of, 1476
Persons of foreign birth, 3656, 3759. *See above,* Aliens
Provinces, by, 216, 221
Unfit men, of, 697, 3099, 3107, 4003
Urban and rural, 3135
Western provinces, from, 4685
Equipment, 23. *See also* War supplies
Expeditionary force
Command of, 28, 268
Conditions governing in respect of British Government, 1576
Control of by Canada, 20, 39
Disposition of, 268, 1816, 2356
Holiday for, proposed, 5902, 6065
Status of, 259
Terms respecting enlistment in, 1576
Fifth Canadian Division, command of, 459
Highland Brigade, 458, 552, 556
Hospitals. *See that title*
Irish-Canadian Rangers, 458
Medical service. *See* Canadian Army Medical Service
Non-commisisoned officers, 1608
Officers
Alleged surplus of, 3102
Appointments, charges regarding, 98
Mentioned in despatches, 4062
Pay of, 1628, 1673, 5773
Reversion in ranks, 3997, 5773
Retention of on leave, 5902
Salutes to, 5424
Unemployed, 560, 3102
Wives of, passports for, 3996
For individual officers see their names
Overseas Department
Officers employed by, 6069
See also under this head Expeditionary force
Pay and Records office, staff of, 3104
Pensions. *See that title*
Recruiting
Advertising in connection with, 986, 3136
Civil Service, from. *See that title*
Correspondence between Prime Minister and ex-minister of Militia, 2446, 3086
Expenses, 1959
Folkstone Director of, 1226
Forestry battalions, for, 5703
Generally, 51, 69, 86, 98, 101, 269, 559, 2395, 3371
Irish, Mr. Mark, statements of, 2707
Medical examination of recruits, 3098, 3963, 3967
National service proposals, 360
Officers
Bonaventure county, 1675
Cape Breton, 5361
Quebec, 3135
Rimouski, 456
Orders in Council respecting, 2482
Provinces, by, 2511. *See also under titles of Provinces*
Retarding of, alleged, 3086, 3110
Statement by Prime Minister, 194
System of, 360, 372
United States
British subjects in, 2482
Canadians in, 3758, 3759, 3904, 4466
Regiments
104th, 1570
165th, 1725
Reinforcements. *See* Military Service

Army—*Con.*
Rejected men
Certificates to, 5423
Disposition of, 3099
Rum, issues of, 535, 536
Soldiers
Age of on enlisting, 3577, 3993, 4001
Attendance of at political meetings, 4338, 5231
Deceased, estates of, 3805
See also Soldier Settlement Board
Employment of on farms, 1677
Former occupation of, 4685
Graves of, 1534
Leave of absence, 4005, 4055
Life insurance of, 3557, 3589
Mail matter for, 1263, 3644
Pay
Assigned, 383
Increases in, proposed, 2603, 5223
Promotion, in cases of, 5423, 5773
Working, 457
Personal requests concerning, 4203
Public meetings, attendance of at, 4338, 5231
Returned
Badges for, 5953
Care of, 10, 67, 587, 1586, 1594
Committee on, 459, 524, 756
Employment of, 3846
Camp Kapuskasing at, 5422
Government service in, 491, 1127, 1850, 1858, 1884, 6054
Pensions, scale of, 1594
See also Soldier Settlement Board *and* Pensions
Reversions in rank; pay in such cases, 5423
Voting of, 87, 223, 452, 1383, 2403, 2557, 2651, 2850, 3727, 4406, 4688, 4693, 4740, 4792, 4874, 5195. *See also* Military Voters Bill *and* War-time Elections Bill
Widows of, 3805
Working pay, cessation of, 457
For individual soldiers see their names
Soldier Settlement Board. *See that title*
Substitutes, buying of, 3113
Troops
Alleged stoning of, 803, 2756
Despatch of to the front, 574
Local, supplies for
Pictou, N.S., contracts, 303
Trenton, N.S., contracts, 303
Maintenance of at the front, 536
United States, training of in Canada, 2482

Army—*Con.*
Unfit men
Certificates to, 5423
Utilization of, 3099
Veterans. *See* Army and Navy Veterans Incorporation Bill
Work pay, cessation of, 457
See also Military Service *and* War
Army Act. *See* Military Service Bill
Army and Navy Veterans of Canada Incorporation Bill, 1r., 5421. 2r., 5541. 3r., 5910
Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Army
Officers, surplus of, 3103
Pensions, 3218
Rejected men, 3101
Soldiers, voting of, 4716, 4761, 4777, 4813, 4825, 4895
Immigration from the United States, 1750
Military Service Bill, 2654
Soldiers, attendance of at political meetings, 4338, 5231
Arthurs, Lieut.-Col. James, position and pay of, 5914
Ashcroft-Fort George mail service, 668
Assyrians, franchise rights under War-time Elections Bill, 5421
Astronomical Surveys, 4917
Athletic Associations, incorporation of, 5922
Atholstan, Lord, dynamite plot against, 5360
Atlantic mail service, 452
Atlantic Patrol Service. *See* Naval Service
Auditor General
Office of, 1791
Report of, 1469
Austro-Germans in western provinces, 1265
Aviation
Canadian fund, 5362
Corps, enlistment in, 1886
See Air Service
Babtie, Dr., report of. *See* Canadian Army Medical Service
Baddeck mail contract, 1819
Bags, duty on. *See* Customs
Balfour, Rt. Hon. Arthur J.
Announcement of visit of, 613, 1724
Reception to, 1766
Speech of, 1767
Bank Act Amendment Bills
1. Bill No. 46, Mr. L. A. Lapointe, 1r., 1037
2. Bill No. 56, Sir Thomas White, 1r., 1773; withdrawn, 2008

Bank Act Amendment Bills—*Con.*
3 Bill No. 65, Sir Thomas White,—loans on farmers' live stock. Res., 1960; 1r., 1971; 2r., (referred to Banking and Commerce Committee), 2149

Bank of Commerce, Canadian, 4686

Banks and banking
Savings deposits, 4685
Unclaimed bank balances, 1001

Barnard, Mr. Geo. H. (Victoria, B.C.)
Judges' salaries, 1976
Railway Act, The, 3529

Barrette, Mr. Joseph A. (Berthier)
Gauthier, Mr. L. J., denial of statements of, 2570
Halifax Chronicle, statement in, 3352
Military Service Bill, 2521
Amendment proposed, 2524
Opposition to compulsory service, 2522
Referendum proposals, 2523

Bartlett, Major, position of, 4292, 4416, 5422

Bathurst harbour improvements, 3872

Baugh, Edward Levi
Defalcations of, 1470
Release of, 2481

Baxter, Leslie E., employment of, 3418

Bawdy houses. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Bay State Fish Company, 2321

Beans. *See* Agriculture.

Bear River, N.S.
Indian agents, 1569
Post office site, 1378, 1569

Béland, Hon. H. S., M.P., detention of in Germany, 311, 341, 524

Belford, Major J. F., position of, 5703

Bell, Mr. Graham, pay of, 1129

Bell, steamer, 1377.

Bell Telephone Company, 3548

Bell Telephone Memorial Association, 5780

Bellemare, Mr. A. (Maskinongé)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 294
Military service, 294, 2823, 3573

Bennett, Mr. R. B. (Calgary)
Bishop of Mackenzie River, 868
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4566, 4627-4638, 5149
Civil Service salaries, 2248
Companies, incorporation of, 5924-5942
Government railways, rolling stock, 4931
Gwatkin, General, 4428

Bennett, Mr. R. B.—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway
Operation of, 786
Reply to Mr. Graham's statement, 805
Intoxicating liquors, prohibition of, 4402
Legislators, free transportation for, 4936
Live stock exchanges, 5506, 5509
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5252, 5259
Military Service Bill, 4664
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4669, 4672
Overseas Military Forces, minister of, 4428
Pensions, 6023
Railways
Material for France, 1830
Private cars, 4937
Transportation for legislators, 4936
Soldiers, voting of, 1403, 4902
War-time Elections Bill, 5614
Woman suffrage, 1510

Bennett, Mr. W. H. (East Simcoe)
Flour, price of, 1048
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5499, 5904
Insurance Act amendment, 1037, 1157, 1524, 1568
National Transcontinental Railway—solicitor's fees, 454
War-time Elections Bill, 5681, 5870

Berlinguet, Thomas F. X., employment of, 1381

Bernard, Lieut.-Col. E. S., position of, 5703

Best, Mr. John A. (Dufferin)
Rankin, Captain Ramsay, 987
Troops, alleged stoning of, 803

Bickerdike, Mr. Robert (Montreal, St. Lawrence)
Capital punishment
Abolition of, 46, 325, 617, 1028
Proposed plebiscite, 1016
Russia, in, 1012
Spain case, the, 1018
Women and children, 1017, 1150
Cattle, British embargo on, 920
Dubreuil, Mr., dismissal of, 3635
Prisoners, proposed enlistment of, 1012, 1015
War-time Elections Bill, 5600

Bigamy. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Bigras, Gedéon, dynamite plot against, 5360

Bills. *See their titles*

Binder twine, 3233.

Blain, Lieut. Roswell, position of, 4245

Blain, Mr. Richard (Peel)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 824
Recruiting, 3377

Blain, Mr. Richard—*Con.*
Parliament, extension of term of, 3483
Pensions, 1606
Technical education, 1240
Blondin, Hon. P. E. (Postmaster General)
Alleged statements of on conscription, 250, 339
Recruiting by in Montreal, 4415
Board of Grain Supervisors
Appointment of, 2236, 3692
Powers of, 3696, 5206
Boards of Trade Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 3609. 2r., 3657. Com., 3657. 3r., 3905
Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Alliance Nationale, 1547
Emigration restrictions, 1726
House of Commons, payment of sessional indemnity to members, 6045
Inland Revenue Department officials, 3819
Intoxicating liquor, trade in, 3818
Military Service Bill, 2833
Extension of the term of Parliament, 2834
Vacancies in Parliament, 2836
Petitions against conscription, 2837
Recruiting in Quebec, 2841
Amendement of Mr. Barrette, 2844
Contraventions of Act, 3349
Parliamentary procedure, amendment of Mr. Barrette, 2844
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2374
Soldiers, voting of, 4906
War-time Elections Bill, 5626
Bolduc, Hon. Joseph, address to Mr. Balfour, 1767
Bonaventure county
Breakwater, 988
Mail service, 1126
Recruiting officer, 1675
Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 25
Appreciation of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, 25
The New Governor General, 26
Newfoundland and Canada, 26
Great Britain's part in the war, 26
Progress of the war, 27, 44
Canadian overseas forces, 28
Military Hospitals Commission, 31
Canadian Dental Service, 31
Production of munitions, 31, 36
War Purchasing Commission, 32
Transportation of war supplies, 33, 36
Financial, industrial and trade conditions, 33
Extension of term of Parliament, 37
Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 38
The record of the present government, 38
Control of Canadian military forces, 39
Military equipment, 40
Imperial War Conference, 42
Peace proposals, 43
Army
Act, regulations of, 3114
Available men, 2390
Canteens, open, 537
Classifications, 2185
Demobilization plans 3120
Dental Service, 31
Enlistment of persons of foreign birth, 3759
Equipment, 40, 556
Expeditionary force, suggested holiday for, 6065
Highland Brigade, 556
Medical Service, 464, 531, 601, 1864, 3970, 4954
Overseas forces
Control of, 39
Maintenance of, 357
Pay and Records Office, 3105
Pensions, 332, 1613
Rejected men, 3099
Separation allowances, 386
Soldiers
Graves, 1534
Returned, care of, 462, 524, 587
Voting of, 4805, 4819, 4880-4887, 4890
Troops, maintenance of at the front, 356
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., address to, 1771
Béland, Hon. Dr., M.P., efforts for release of, 311
Bruce, Dr., report of. *See* Medical service
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of 4027, 4216, 4240, 4478, 4867, 4873, 5015, 5112
Canadian Patriotic Fund, 3078
Civil Service, promotions, 4666
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 195, 334
Western mining of, 341, 523, 2570, 2609
Coalition government. *See under this title,* Union Government
Confederation, fiftieth anniversary of, 38, 524
Conscription. *See* Military Service
Customs duty on Crown's goods, 1981
Defence of Canada, 359
Farm labour, 3506
"Fiddlers, The," forbidden circulation of, 3503, 3654, 3718, 3955, 4059

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Galt, Mr. Justice, investigation into report of, 2056
Gauthier, Mr. L. J., denial of statements of, 2570
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5903
High Commissioner, Canadian, office of, 4177
Hospitals, military, 464
House of Commons
Business of the House
Morning sittings, 2619, 2775, 2833
Saturday sittings, 324. 2569
Wednesday sittings, 324
Mace, new, 1468
Members, tributes to deceased, 3
Officials
Appointments, 586
Clerk of the House, retirement of, 6069
Sergeant-at-arms, death of, 6069
Imperial Munitions Board, labour, 1986
Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference
Adjournment of House for, 117, 597, 603
Announcement *re* meeting of, 42
Correspondence respecting, 5, 24
Proceedings, 1525
Cattle embargo, 1535
Dominions overseas, constitutional relations of, 1528, 1531
Development and control of natural resources, 1532
France, visit to, 1536
Imperial preference, 1532
India, representation of, 1534
Minutes of, 2354
Soldiers' graves, 1534
Statements by British Prime Minister, 2354
Judges' salaries, 5955
Labour bureaus, establishment of, 118
Lake of the Woods water level, 2775
Landry, Mr. Justice, finding of, 3110, 3615
Lessard, General, 364
Mace, vote of thanks to donors of, 1468
Members of Parliament, tributes to deceased, 3
Military Service Bill
Introduction, 1542, 2184
Amendment of Mr. Copp, 3078
Appeals, 2191, 3178
Army Act, regulations of, 3114
Available men, 2390
Board of Selection, 5083
Canada's position in the war, 2184
Contraventions of Act, 3342-3351, 3361, 3588
Exemptions, 3208, 3363, 6068
Exceptions, 3559

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
General provisions, 3239, 3259
Militia Act, provisions of, 2187
Necessity for reinforcements, 2187
Persons liable for service, 3116
Registrars, 5900
Senate amendments, 4663
Tribunals, 2190, 3152
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4174, 4667
National Service Commission, 309, 370
Nationalist Party, 4564
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3745, 3747, 3749
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4196, 4417, 4436
Parliament, extension of term of, 37, 3419, 3504
Parliament, printing of, 5950
Parliamentary procedure
Order of the day, reinstatement of, 2877
Question of privilege, discussion on, 600
Votes and proceedings, correctness of entry in, 2880
Parliamentary Secretaryships, 4196, 4417, 4438
Peace terms, consultation with Dominions on, 300
Pensions, 6018
Pension Commissioners, 4958
Political deadlock, rumoured, 1971
Press censorship, 3654, 3718, 3955, 4059
Racing meets, limitation of, 323
Railway Act, The, 603
Railways
Employees, payment of salaries of, 5956
Material, removal of to France, 310
Traffic, congestion of, 587
Recruiting
Alleged statement regarding, 194
Correspondence with ex-Minister of Militia, 2446, 3086, 3371
Figures for 1916, 379
Retarding of, alleged, 3371
Systems explained, 360-382, 2482
Rogers, Hon. Robert, resignation of, 4736
Ross rifle, 392, 408-434, 477-522
Speaker, election of, 1
Taxation of incomes, 4655
Union Government
Correspondence with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2690
Rumoured political deadlock, 1971
Votes and proceedings, correctness of entry in, 2880
War
Expenditure, 354, 476
Requirements. *See* Military Service

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Supplies—clothing, motor trucks, Oliver equipment, wagons, 556-558
Trophies, exhibit of, 6003
War Purchasing Commission, 32
War-time Elections Bill, 5576, 5648-5702,
War vote ($500,000,000), 354, 586 5706, 5805, 5834, 6071
Woman suffrage, 1504
Yukon price advances, 2199

Boulay, Mr. Herménégilde (Rimouski)
Agriculture Department, French-speaking employes of, 2262, 2265
Army Medical Service, 3989
Bright, the late John, 987
Budget, 1085
Free wheat, 1085
Behaviour of soldiers passing through Quebec, 1086
Necessity for co-operation with the Government, 1087
Civil Service
Employment of men in higher offices, 1256
French-speaking employees, 2262, 2265, 2340, 2759
Salaries, 2239, 2251
Government railways
Accidents, 1376
Operation and management of, 3389
Removal of obstructions, 595
Rolling stock, 594
St. Fabien crossing, 2226, 3389
Government Railways Act amendment, 4373, 4382
Interior Department, French-speaking employees, 2340
Mail service, 3640
McWilliams, Mr., dismissal of, 2167
Military Service Bill
Authority of Parliament, 2761
Classes, 3353
Exceptions, 3571
Exemptions, 3190, 3306
Quebec, position of, 2754
National Transcontinental Railway
Express service, 595
Fitzpatrick yard and engineer's residence, 455, 456
Telegraph line, 456
Ottawa Citizen, statement of, 2776
Parliament buildings, destruction of—indemnities for losses, 4413
Pension Commissioner's staff, 608
Quebec
Recruiting in, 2754
Troops passing through, insults to, 2756
Railway Act, The, 3435, 3511

Boulay, Mr. Hermenegilde—*Con.*
Rimouski
Government employees, 2165
Recruiting officers, 456
St. Lawrence signal and telegraph service, 1471
Scientific and industrial research, 3957
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1145
South African war, 2200
Steamship services, 2323
Technical education, 1249
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5384
Troops, alleged insults to, 2756
Veterinary Director General, 987

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Gravel, Lieut. Gedéon, 1674
Gravelle, Oscar, 1226
Levis railway station, 1129
Military Service Bill, 3069, 3147
St. Romuald public works, 1129

Boy Scouts Association, 2062, 3740

Boyce, Mr. Arthur C. (West Algoma)
Military Service, 3147

Boyce, George H., position of, 1472

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil)
Butter and cheese purchases, 899
Maple sugar—adulteration, 1958
Military service, 2931

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 90
Patriotism of Canadian women, 90
Simcoe county and the war, 90
Loyal Orange Order, 91
The Dorchester election, 92
National service, 93
Recruiting in Quebec, 94

Bradbury, Mr. George H. (Selkirk)
Army canteens, 811
Army and navy veterans, 5910
Capital punishment, 634
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3799
Military service, 3190
United Grain Growers, Limited, 893
War affairs, Government administration of, 3383

Brampton-Palestine mail route, 590

Bran. *See* Grain

Brantford moulders' strike, 2322

Breadner, Mr. R. W., position of, 3676

Bright, the late John, 987

Brindle, Mr. William, dismissal of, 3758

British Admiralty, recruiting in Canada for, 4159, 4163

British Cattle Supply Company, 1817

British Columbia Indian Commission, 653, 1896

British Government and Canadian Pacific Railway Financial Arrangements Bill, 1r., 1369. 2r., 2059. Com., 2059. Rep., 2061, 3r., 2139

British Government, war supplies, purchases of in Canada, 4953, 5517, 5541

Bromptonville postmaster, 1129.

Brouillard, Mr. Ovide (Drummond and Arthabaska)
- Ætna Explosives Company, 4508
- Military service, 3072

Bruce, Dr., investigations of. *See* Canadian Army Medical Service

Buchanan, Mr. W. A. (Medicine Hat)
- Army allowances, subsistence, 5915
- Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5178
- Coal mining, western, 119, 458, 523, 1266, 1372, 1616, 1723, 1725, 2526, 2570, 2653
- Coutts quarantine reserve, 590
- Economic and Development Commission, 1125
- Farm labour, 3507
- Fuel, 1414
- Grain
  - Commission, 3711
  - Elevators, 986
  - Seed, advances for, 303, 305
- Home guard duty, 336
- Hudson's Bay Company lands, taxation of, 986
- Hyde, Mr. J. W., 301
- Indian reserves, 989, 2389
- Judgments, uniform interest on, 900
- Letter carriers' salaries, 1474
- Medicine Hat military reserve, 301
- Military service, 2600
  - Exemptions, 2607
  - Referendum proposals, 2607
  - Taxation of wealth, 2608
- Mounted Police pensions, 5701
- Oil-boring machinery, 301
- Proportional representation, 913
- School lands, western, 1378
- Shaw, Mr. F. D., dismissal of, 1847
- Soldier Settlement Board, 1163
- Soldiers, former occupations of, 4685
- Taxation
  - Farm implements, 1686
  - Hudson's Bay Co. Lands, 986
  - Income, 1687, 4122
  - Wealth, 2608
- Unclaimed bank balances, 1009
- War-time Elections Bill, 5580
- Woman suffrage, 1515

Budget debate, 718. Amdts. proposed: Mr. Turriff, 750, 845, 870, 937, 1085, 1089, 1194, 1201, 1267; Mr. Robb, 1317, 1319, 1423; Mr. Oliver, 1424. Mr. Loggie, 1424. *See also* Taxation.

Bull, Mr. Perkins, position of, 1130

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
- Berlinguet, Thos. F. X., 1381
- Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5016, 5168
- Industrial requirements, 2696
- Inland Revenue Department estimates, 3835
- Military service, 2693, 5882
- Montreal Gazette, statement of, 2709, 4739
- Public Works Department architect, 5104
- Quebec judges' salaries, 5798, 5800
- St. Maurice river improvements, 1381
- Taxation of incomes, 5886
- Three Rivers
  - Harbour improvements, 3879
  - Public building, 668
- War-time Elections Bill, 5667, 5695, 5712-5771

Burford, recruiting in, 601

Burgess, defalcations of, 1127

Burke, Col. Rev. A. E., position of, 5704

Burnham, Mr. John H. (West Peterborough)
- Aliens, enlistment of, 4415
- Army
  - Camps, sale of liquor in, 817
  - Enlisted men, age of, 3577
  - Pensions, 1594
  - Unfit men, 699
- Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 6911
- Capital punishment, 623
- Civil Service, appointments, 2019
- Government Railways Act amendment, 4355
- Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
- Intoxicating liquors, prohibition of, 4403
- Judges' salaries, 1977
- Labour—Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1112
- Military Service Bill, 2555, 3365
- Parliamentary secretaryships, 4204
- Patent medicines, war tax on, 363
- Shipbuilding, 1932
- Soldiers, voting of, 2557
- Soldier Settlement Board, 3630
- Technical education, 1238
- Trent canal wharves, 759
- Venereal diseases, 817, 869

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Agriculture)
Agriculture Department
Estimates, 654, 2062, 2255, 3744, 4677
French-speaking employees in, 2263
Publications, 2274
Animals
Health of, 2271
Pure bred, purchase of, 2276
Cattle, British embargo on, 921
Cheese
Purchases by British Government, 1971, 2197, 2257, 2267
Regulations regarding manufacture of, 2267
Cold storage plants, 2076, 2256
Exhibitions, 2261, 2270
Experimental farms, 4682
Flax industry, 4683
Food supplies for Great Britain, 2260
Grain
Diseases—rust, 2064
Seed, 1188, 4677
Hogs
Inspection of, 2271
Cholera, 2273
Live Stock and Produce Bill, 4287, 5503
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5970
Potatoes
Powdery scab, 2269
Supply of, 936, 1088, 1189, 2095
Public health, 999
Seed grain purchases, 1188, 4677
Technical education, 1246
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5397
Western farmers, relief for, 3478, 4677
White pine blister rust, 4677

Business Profits War Tax Act, administration of, 3655, 3676, 5290
See also Taxation

Business Profits War Tax Act Amendment Bill. Res., 1436, 1445. 1r., 1774. 2r., 2107. Com., 2107. Rep., 2108. 3r., 2139
See also Taxation

Butter. *See* Agriculture

Cables. *See* Telegraphs

Campbell, Mr. Duncan J., position of, 758

Campbell, Capt. G. H., employment of, 4508

Campbellton-Gaspe steamship service, 1126, 1228, 1959

Canada Evidence Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 4291. 2r., 4463. Com., 4463. 3r., 4466

Canada Gazette, publication of, 3737

Canada Grain Act, expenses under, 5205

Canada Grain Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 386

Canada Temperance Act
Expenses under, 5243
New Brunswick, proposed repeal, 1263, 3739

Canada Year Book, 2337.

Canadian Army Medical Service
Babtie, Dr.
Inquiry and report, 201, 227, 522, 559, 669, 4195
Reply to by Dr. Bruce, 4954
Bruce, Dr.
Report, 201, 227, 527, 559, 601, 669, 1343, 1720, 1864, 3962, 4194.
Publication of, 3845
Reply to Dr. Babtie report, 4954
Carleton-Jones, Surgeon General, report of, 1866
Changes in, 4466
Treatment of soldiers, 3963
See also Hospitals

Canadian Associated Press, 5290

Canadian Association of Returned Soldiers, 4951

Canadian Aviation Fund, 5362

Canadian Bank of Commerce, shareholders and investments of, 4686

Canadian General Council of the Boy Scouts Association, grant to, 3740

Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, 2223, 2228
Cars
Freight, 2205
Intercolonial, on, 1378, 2226, 3395
Private, 4933
Purchase of, 758, 1376, 1866, 4298
Refrigerator, 4933
Coal for, 3388
Purchase of, 592, 664, 667
Construction and betterment, 3385
Employees
Pay of enlisted, 595
Promotion of, 759
Freight handlers at Pictou, 303
Employees' magazine, 452
Halifax terminals, 2204
Hudson Bay railway, 3396, 5086
Ice, tenders for, 301
Intercolonial
Accidents, 1376
Boisdale, contracts for work at, 4415
Cars, 2226
Shortage of, 1378
Purchases, 3395
Coal, freight rates on, 3511, 4292
Construction and betterment—details of items, 2224
Crossings, 2222
Damage claims, 2707, 3416
Earnings, 2202
Grades, improvement of, 456
Grand Narrows bridge, 2321

Canadian Government Railways—*Con.*
Levis station, 2208
Maritime Express service, 8
Milford ballast pit, 2320
Obstructions, removal of, 1376
Operation of, 759
Passenger service, 2203
Peniac bridge, 2320
Pension fund, 1476
Rails, 1575
Rates, coal, on, 4292
Station accommodation, 2227
Stations, naming of, 3386
Tracadie siding, 2618
See also Government Railways Act Amendment Bill.
Intoxicating liquors, shipment on, 591
Level crossing, Pictou harbour branch, 304
Line improvements, 2204
Military and hospital trains, 2205
National Transcontinental
Earnings, 2203
Engineers' residence at Fitzpatrick, 455, 456
Express service, 595
Fitzpatrick yard, 455
Freight rates, 2210, 3394
Operation, 657, 1573, 3411.
Expenses of, 2203
Portneuf claims, 1571
Rails, removal of to France, 1229, 1266, 2225
St. Malo shops, 1128
Salmon river viaduct, 2212
Solicitor's fees, 454
Telegraph line, 456
Ties, purchases of, 455
Traffic, 2209, 2218
Obstructions, removal of, 595
Officials, 657, 3390
Operation of, 2203, 3386
Passenger service, 2207
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry and terminals, 2205
Widening of, 3902, 3945
Quebec railways, 4948, 5452
Rails, 2224
Rolling stock, 594, 4928. *See, under this title,* Cars
Safety-first inspectors, 337
Ships, building of, for, 4939, 5429
Valley railway, 1380
Working expenses, 3410
See also Government Railways Act Amendment Bill

Canadian Northern Railway.
British Columbia, lines and works aided by province of, 4987
Capital stock of affiliated companies held by, 4626
Payments on interest account, 4338
Removal of rails from, 301, 3398

Canadian Northern Railway Company.
Financial statements respecting, 4058
Report of Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4011

Canadian Northern Railway Acquisition Bill.
Res., 4022, 4215, 4217, 4247. 1r., 4293. 2r., 4467, 4512, 4566. Com., 4590, 4622, 4835, 4960, 5015. 3r., 5108, 5123-5194
Amendment proposed: Mr. Graham, 4477; lost on div., 4590
Closure applied, 5002, 5015, 5121, 5123

Canadian Pacific Railway. *See* British Government

Canadian Patriotic Fund, 595, 3078
Allowances from, 203, 207, 383, 3951
See also War Charities

Canadian Press Limited, 3740

Canals, 3402, 3417
For individual canals, see their titles

Canteen. *See* Army

Cape Bold breakwater, 3873

Cape Breton
Recruiting officers, 5361
Senate representation, 89

Cape Cove pier, 3879

Capital Punishment,
Plebiscite proposed, 1016
Russia's abolition of; proposed congratulations, 1012
Spain case, 1018
Women and children, in cases of, 1017, 1150
See Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Caraquet and South Shore Railway, 2223, 3387

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5175
Military Service Bill, 3058
St. Lawrence Flour Mills Company, 4509

Carleton beach protection works, 1128

Caron, Mr. Hector, employment of, 4151

Carrier, Emile, allowance to, 581

Carroll, Mr. William F. (South Cape Breton)
Aeroplane service, 1331
Army Recruiting Officers, Cape Breton, 5361
Budget, 1424
Taxation of incomes, 1424
Government expenditure, 1425
So-called prosperity, 1426
Control of food prices, 1427

Carroll, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Reply to statements of Mr. Edwards, 1430
Canada Temperance Act, 5244
Canadian Government Railways, private cars, 4933
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5140
Censors and decoders, 576
Customs Department, motor boats, 3759
Dental officers, 1574
East Bay wharves, 5315, 5317
Flour, price of, 1044
Food products, prices and control of, 1427
Indians—Sydney reserve, 1888
Insurance, 5203
Macdonald, Miss Jessie, 5361
McNeil, Lt. John D., 5272
Military Service, 2854
Nova Scotia steamship service, 2291
Shipbuilding, 1331
Submarine situation, 1329
Taxation
Incomes, 1424
Wealth, 2859
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway, 2613
Carroll, Lieut. W. F., M.P., position and pay of, 6066
Carson, Major General, position of, 986
Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)
Agricultural instruction, 3755
Army, soldiers
Pay of, on promotion, 5423
Voting of, 4795-4834, 4874-4887, 4889-4914
Bear river, N.S.
Indian agents, 1569
Wharfinger, 1378
British preference, 1711
Canada Gazette, 3738
Canada Temperance Act, 1263, 3739, 5243
Canadian Government Railways
Branch lines, 2230
National Transcontinental, Salmon river viaduct, 2212
Promotion of employees, 766
Quebec railways, 5464
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4253, 4266, 5146
Companies, incorporation of, 5928-5942
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4301, 4318
Daylight saving, 3682
Desjardins, Lt. Col., 1818
Farm implements, duty on, 1708
Flour, price of, 1051
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 989
Gordon divorce case, 5903
Carvell, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Government Railways Act amendment, 4340, 4356, 4366, 4863
Grain, fixing of price of, 3688
Hollocody, Captain, 897
House of Commons
Members, sessional indemnity of, 5790
Stenographers, 5789
Hudson Bay railway, 2230
Immigration agents, 1737, 1756
Indians,
New Brunswick, 1889
Reserves, cutting timber on, 1889
Insurance, 4388, 5202
Maritime Provinces, military affairs, 5226
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5247, 5254
McNeil, F. C., payments to, 1380
Military district No. 6, 5226
Military service, 2709
Appeals, 3179
Referendum, 2711
Tribunals, 3152, 3161
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3746, 3753
Parliament, railway transportation for members of, 3519
Potatoes, duty on, 5777
Proposed removal, 5274, 5982
Public works expenditure, 5348
Quarantine service, 3756
Quebec harbourmaster, 897
Railway employees, payment of salaries of, 5957, 5997
Railway Act, The, 3422-3453, 3516-3553, 3593, 3717
Ross rifle, 388, 412-434
Rural mail service, 3647
St. John harbour improvements, 5347
Soldiers, votes for, 1404
Sugar, colouring of, 1957
Surveys, 1346
Tariff revision, 1699
Taxation
Business profits, 1452, 4245
Income, 1452, 1701, 3768, 5884
Telegraph and telephone lines, 3543, 5363-5404, 5410
Unclaimed bank balances, 1007
Victoria breakwater, 1381
Valley railway, 1380
War Purchasing Commission inquiry *re* purchases, 340
War-time Elections Bill, 5660, 5676-5699, 5713
West Edmonton forest rangers and homestead inspectors, 1476
104th Regiment, 1570
Cattle. *See* Agriculture

Censorship, 3503, 3654, 3718, 2881, 3995, 4059, 5492
Censors and decoders, 576, 3718
Louisburg, at, 4008, 4048
See "The Fiddlers"

Census
Male population of Canada, 2283
Western, 2336

C. E. Tanner, steamer, 5362

Chabot, Mr. John L. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Appointments, 2020
Salaries, 2251
Military service, 2781
Enlistment in Quebec, 2784

Chabot, Lt.-Col. J. L., M.P., position and pay of, 988

Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker

Charitable and patriotic enterprises, organization and control of, 378, 462

Charlton, Mr. William A. (Norfolk)
Budget, 1304
Pulp and paper industry, 1304

Chicago drainage canal, 302

Chicoutimi, pure bred animals at, 4152

Chinese Immigration Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 843. 2r., com., 2139. Rep., 2149. 3r., 2285

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Economic and Development Commission, 2200
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2151
Dogfish, 2177
Inverness harbour, improvements, 5326
Margaree harbour improvements, 3867, 5330
National Service, provincial directors of, 2200
Nova Scotia public works, 5319, 5337
Scotch Hill post office, 3649
Steamship service, 2301, 2306
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5371

Cheese. *See* Agriculture: Dairy

Civil Service
Act, administration of, 1791
Appointments
Order in Council, Jan. 1917, under, 3003
Regulations governing, 643
Returned soldiers, 643
See also Army: Soldiers: Returned
Section 21, under, 607, 650, 693, 1023, 1351, 1937
Compulsory retirement from, alleged, 2059

Civil Service—*Con.*
Disfranchisement of civil servants, proposed, 2018
Dismissals, proposed, 3633
Employees, French-speaking, 2262, 2759
Employment of men in higher offices, 1256
Enlistments from, 192, 2014
Pay and separation allowances, 213, 663
Insurance, 3503
Mail carriers. See Post office
Promotions, 2010, 2011, 2238, 4666
Salaries, 1791, 2008, 2238, 2946
Enlisted men, of, 1353, 2014, 2252
Proposed increases, 583
See Civil Service Act Amendment Bill.
For departments see their titles

Civil Service Act Amendment Bill. Res., 2008. 1r., 2024. 2r., 2149. Com., 2238. 3r., 2285

Clark, Mr. Hugh (Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for External Affairs)
Mounted police, 4668

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Army, canteens, 811
Budget, 736
Problems arising from the war, 736
Necessity for economy, 737
Taxation of incomes, 738
Maintenance and extension of our foreign commerce, 739
Free trade, 740
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4867
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1183
Military service, exemptions, 3367
Newspaper articles, correction of, 3617
Parliament, extension of term of, 3492
Political deadlock, rumoured, 1971
Referendum, 2665
Senate, appointments to, 934
Separation allowances, 1191
Soldiers, votes for, 1387
Taxation
Business profits, 737
Income, 738, 4639
Woman suffrage, 1518

Clarke, Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Military Service Bill, 2861

Clergy as immigration agents, 5361

Clements, Mr. H. S. (Comox-Atlin)
Wharves, construction of, 5318

Cloakey, George, employment of, 1819

Closure. *See* Speaker, Parliamentary Procedure; Canadian Northern Railway Acquisition Bill

Coal. *See* Mines

Coal miners' strikes. *See* Mines

Coalition government, 2463, 2887, 2901, 3000, 3014, 3023, 3727, 3732
Political deadlock rumoured, 1941
See National government
Correspondence between Sir Robert Borden and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2692

Cochrane, Hon. Frank (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Canadian Government railways
Cars, purchase of, 4928
Coal purchases, 664, 667
Freight rates, 3394
Hudson Bay railway, 5087
Intercolonial
Cars, 2227
Construction and betterments, 2224
Management and operation, 775
Officials, appointment of, 658
Passenger service, 2203
Line improvements, 2204
Military and hospital trains, 2205
Rails, 2224
National Transcontinental
Freight rates, 2210
Operation, 658
Salmon River viaduct, 2217
Operating expenses, 2203
Prince Edward Island railway terminals and car ferry, 2205
Canals
St. Peter's, 3406
Trent, 2206, 3405
Welland, 2206
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 584
Shortage, 83
Prices, 666
Government Railways Act Amendment Bill, 3845, 4339, 4365, 4386
Provincial legislators, free transportation for, 684
Quebec railways, 5472
Railway Act, the, 194, 602, 605, 3421, 3511-3553, 3592-3608, 3716
Railway, situation, inquiry into, 3408
Railways—France, removal of materials to, 311, 1825, 3407
Railways and Canals Department estimates, 657, 2202, 3385, 4925, 4928, 5428
St. John and Quebec Railway Act Amendment Bill, 2433, 3401

Cockshutt, Mr. William F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 100
The war, 100

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Camp Borden, 101
Recruiting, 101
France and the war, 102
President Wilson's peace proposals, 103
Control of foodstuffs, 106
Canada's trade, 108
Army; officers, reversion to ranks of, 4000
Bell Telephone Memorial Association, 5780
Flour, price of, 1065
Military service, 2599, 3233
Labour, 2604
Recruiting, 101
Soldiers' pay, 2603
Taxation
Income, 4077, 4080, 4092

Cold Storage,
Plants
Effect of, upon cost of living, 2027
Government control of, 1628
Proposed nationalization of, 2076
Subsidies for, 2076, 2255, 3744
Lockport Cold Storage Company, 2202

Commerce, Canadian Bank of, 4686

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Companies Act Amendment Bills,
Corporations for other purposes than gain, (No. 129, Sir Thomas White) 1r., 5242
General (No. 132, Sir Thomas White), 1r., 5880; 2r., 5918; com., 5918; 3r., 5953
Uniformity (No. 43, Mr. A. K. Maclean), 1r., 843; 2r., 1151

Compulsory military service,
See Army *and* Military Service Bill

Contract Prices, Bill to prohibit,
See Criminal code amendment

Confederation, fiftieth anniversary celebration, 11, 16, 24, 38, 47, 150, 161, 175, 524
Committee
Apointed 587
Joint action with Senate, 642
Report, made, 1865; adopted, 2283

Connaught, The late Duchess of
Expressions of sympathy on death of, 609

Conscription
Manhood, of, 14, 54, 191, 893, 1586. *See* Military service
Blondin, Hon. P. E., alleged statement of, 339
Wealth. *See* Taxation

Conservation
Commission, salaries, etc., 3744, 5793
Forestry—poplar trees. 3742

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland)
Address in reply to the Governor General's speech, 160

Copp, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Recruiting among the French Canadians, 160
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 161
National government, 161
Political patronage, 162
Extravagance of present administration, 163
The ex-Minister of Militia, 164
National service, 170
Westmorland county and war profits, 171
Extension of term of Parliament, 172
The Dorchester election, 173
Alleged statement of Mr. Blondin, 173
Budget, 1307
Speech of Sir Sam Hughes, 1307
Winning of the war, 1310
Charges of extravagance against the Government, 1310
High cost of living, 1313
Revenue and expenditure, 1314
Taxation proposals, 1315
Intercolonial railway, operation of, 1316
Canadian Government Railways
Construction and betterment, 3387
Intercolonial
Grand Narrows bridge, 2321
Management and operation, 773
Milford ballast pit, 2320
Peniac bridge, 2320
Government Railways Act Amendment, 4363
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5143
Cape Bald breakwater, 3873
Cost of living, 2005
Customs duties payable by provincial governments, 2135
Dorchester county election, 173
Fisheries officers, 2164
Food products, price and control of, 1313
Government Railways Act Amendment, 4363
Indians, 1892
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 3843
Labour problems, 1173
Migratory birds, 3658
Military Service, 3075
Moncton armoury site, 4787
National service, 170
National Transcontinental Railway, removal of rails, 2225
Patriotic Fund, 3077
Pensions, 6031

Copp, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 917
Railway Act, The, 3442
Sackville wharves, 3878
Soldiers, votes for, 1401, 4703
Taxation, 1315
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5382
War-time Elections Bill, 5610
Wilfrid C., boat, 4062

Cost of living
See O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., *also* Cold storage

Council of Indian Tribes of Canada Incorporation Bill, 1r., 3902

Courcelette, steamer, 1377

Court, Pte. Harry Ivan, request for discharge of, 3295

Courts, *See* Justice

Coutts quarantine reserve, 590

Cox, John, position of, 1472

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
Alien enemies prohibited from voting (No. 59, Mr. Currie), 1r., 1862
Capital punishment, abolition of, (No. 3, Mr. Bickerdike), 1r., 46; 2r., moved, 325, negatived, 1028-1036
See Capital Punishment
Contract prices, prohibition of, (No. 21, Mr. Knowles), 1r., 386; 2r., moved, 1617; debate adjourned, 1627
Insurance (No. 54, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 1773; 2r., 2104; com., 4388; 3r., 4395
Jurors, (No. 97, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 2567; 2r., 4293; com., 4318; 3r., 4383. Six months' hoist, moved by Mr. Lemieux, negatived, 4307
Non-support; foster parents; bawdy houses; insolvent traders; constables' fees, (No. 124, Mr. Doherty), 1r., 4291; 2r., 4463; com., 4463; 3r., 4466
Racing meets, limitation of, (No. 2, Mr. Wilcox), 1r., 8; 2r., 313-324

Cromwell, Mr. F. R. (Compton)
Live stock purchases, 2279
Railway Act, The, 3604

Cross point wharf, 988, 1228, 1571

Crothers, Hon. T. W. (Minister of Labour)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 831
Soldiers, voting of, 4702
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, abolition of office of, 686
Budget, 1267
The extravagant waste of time in the House, 1267

Crothers, Hon. T. W.—*Con.*
Administration of Labour Department, 1269
The labour situation, 1270
The coal situation, 1275
Food prices, 1273
Coal
Questionnaire concerning, 1996
Sale, regulation of, 1275
Western mining of, 159, 614, 1266, 1372, 1616, 2295, 2570, 2653, 2776
Food
Control of sales and prices, 1273, 1989, 2083
Flour, price of, 1043
High cost of living, 695
Industrial Dicputes Investigation Act, 1112, 1168, 1270
Labour Department
Administration of, 1269
Estimates, 686, 1112, 1166, 1989, 3652
Landry, Mr. Justice, findings of, 5248
Le Canada, correction of statement in, 2571
Military Service, 2483
Referendum, 2487
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., inquiry and report by, 3652, 3925
Strikes, prevention of, 1270
Technical education, 1236
Thetford mines labour trouble, 1118
War-time Elections Bill, 5867
Yukon, cost of living in, 2199, 2481, 2525

Cruise, Mr. Robert (Dauphin)
Budget, 1432
Taxation of profits, 1432
Government expenditure, 1434
Free wheat, 1435
Proposed Highways Bill, 1435
Manitoba boundaries extension, 1435
Campbell, Duncan J., 758
Chabot, Lt.-Col., 988
Free wheat, 1435
Glen, Col. Joseph, payments to, 1377
Railway Act, The, 3520, 3550
Railway transportation for members of Parliament, 3520
Smith's Falls postmaster, 1570
Taxation of business profits, 1432

Cunningham, Frances Henry, payments to, 1125

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Aliens, 3810, 3812
Austro-Germans in western provinces, 1265
Bill to prohibit voting by alien enemies, 1862

Currie, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Army
Recruiting, 3372
Officers, military pay of, 1676
See, under this head, Soldiers
Army and Navy veterans, 5912
Civil Service appointment, 2019
Coal, 2001
Companies, incorporation of, 5926, 5928
Criminal Code amendments, Jurors, 4299
Dominion Lands Act Amendment, 3801, 3805-3817
France, trade relations with, 2310, 2316
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5498, 5905
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company Branch Lines Company, 1375
Imperial Preference, 1584
Loans to farmers, 1965
Martell, Lt. L. A., 5914
Military Service
Classes, 3293, 3356
Exemptions, 3221, 3228, 3279, 3304, 3367
General provisions, 3243, 3252
Great Britain, in, 2908
Regulations, 3316
Reinforcements, need of, 2904, 2915
Selective draft, 2916
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3752
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale,—4069
Parliament, printing of, 5949, 5950
Pensions, 6008
Railway Act, The, 3548
Rifles, importations of, 1125
Rural mail carriers, 3643
Shipbuilding, 1584, 5449
Soldiers,
Parcels for, 3644
Returned, 1586
Votes for, 4775, 4832
Widows of, 3805
Steyner public building, 5412
Taxation, proposals of the Government, 2912
Telegraphs and telephones, 3548
War
Canada's part in the, 2906
Prosecution of, 1576
War-time Elections Bill, 5762, 5845

Currie, Col. J. A., M.P., military position and pay of, 595

Currie, General, despatch from, 4510

Customs
Bonded goods, shipments of, 1854
Department
Appointments of returned soldiers, 1850, 1858, 1884

Customs—*Con.*
Dismissals, 1844
Estimates, 643, 1843, 1881, 5098, 5777
Motor boats in use by, 3759
Motor car of, 1476
North Sydney officials, 1852
Staff and salaries, 643, 1843, 5908, 5777
See also Civil Service
Drawbacks, payments of, 1818
Forms, printing of in French and English, 3133, 3134
Minister of, private car for, 5082
Preventive service, 1881
Revenue cruisers, 1881
Unclaimed goods, disposal of, 3743

Customs Act Amendment Bill
Duties payable on Crown's goods. Res., 1978. 1r., 1985. 2r., 2119. Com., 2121. Rep., 2136. 3r., 2137

Customs Tariff,
Alcohol, proposed free admission for hospital use, 5103
Apples, 1472, 1615
Bags and sacks, 1867
Beans for seed, 671
Bran and middlings, 1867
British preference, proposed increase, 1776
Crown, goods of the, dutiable. *See* Customs Act Amendment Bill
Farm implements, 1686, 1708
Fertilizer, 1709
Food, proposed additions to the free list, 1776-1790
Gasolene, 1675
Hospital supplies, 5103
Imperial Munitions Board imports, 1978
Provincial governments, duties payable by, *See* Customs Act Amendment Bills

Dagneau, John F., position of, 1471

Dairying. *See* Agriculture

Dalhousie, N.B., militia buildings, 454

Danis, Joseph Maximilian, employment of, 2618

Davidson, Mr. Avard L. (Annapolis)
Army, soldiers, voting of, 4709, 4712, 4772
Carroll, Lieut. W. F., M.P., 6066
Douglas, Captain J. M., M.P., 6066
Ellis, Captain J. F., M.P.P., 6066
Neely, Captain D. B., M.P., 6066
Nova Scotia public works, 5320
Ralston, Major J. L., M.P.P., 6067
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 441
Taxation, income, 4136
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5376
War-time Elections Bill, 5733, 5737

Davidson, Hon. Sir Charles, Kt., Commissioner
Payments to, 898
Report of, 249, 524

Davies Company. *See* Food: Investigation

Dawson post office, 4952, 5313

Daylight Saving Bill. 1r., 2956; 2r., 2945, 3677; com., progress reported, 3687

Dean, Lieutenant R. I., position of, 5703

Decoders. *See* Censors

"Defeat or Victory," book, question as to prohibition of, 1473

Defence of Canada. *See* Militia and Defence

Delisle, Mr. Michel S. (Portneuf)
Chicoutimi, pure bred animals at, 4152
Desertions from army, 338
Dillon, Mr. G. A., 4061
Dorchester County Railway, 5361
Fiset, Theophile, 1959
Gazelle, Noel, enlistment of, 337
Grenier, Mr. Armand, 3757
Lacasse, Mr. Isidore, 5272
Lewis, Mr. J. H., 2944
Military Service Bill, 3064
Transcontinental railway, Portneuf claims, 1571
157th Battalion, 5272

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. John and Iberville)
Auditor General's report, 1469
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5078
Military Service Bill, 2561
Authority of Parliament, 2561
Motives of the Government, 2563
Referendum proposals, 2567

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. J. H. Rainville)
Address to Mr. Viviani, 1361
Election of, 334
Rulings and statements of
Bills—Sections allowed to stand not discussable, 4752
Censored publications, quotations in Parliament from, 5493
Irrelevancy, 2362, 2374, 5235, 5237
Money vote, how amendable, 521
Ways and means, second amendment to motion for, 1319

Descarries, Mr. Joseph A. (Jacques Cartier)
Address in reply to the Governor General's speech, 12
Tributes to deceased members, 13
The Allies' part in the war, 14
Conscription, 14

Descarries, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Imperial War Conference, 15
Expiration of term of Parliament, 15
Progressive policies of present administration, 16
Fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 16
Military Service Bill, 2982
Appeals, 3184
Burden of proof, 3323
Tribunals, 3172
Railway Act, The, 3441, 3444

Desjardins, Lt.-Col., employment of, 1818

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 244, 249
National unity and harmony, 244
Recruiting figures, 245
Quebec and the war, 247
Patriotic policy of Liberal party, 248
Statements of Hon. Mr. Blondin, 250
Attitude of the Government, 250
Blondin, Hon. Mr., alleged statements of, 250
Burgess, defalcation of, 1127
Canadian Expeditionary Force, 1576
Canadian Northern railway, 4863
Civil Service
Disfranchisement of civil servants, 2021
Salaries, 1038, 2010
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1176
Judges' salaries, 5797
Military Service Bill, 2731
Authority under Militia Act, 2732
Contraventions of Act, 3332
Persons liable for service, 3129
Quebec province, position of, 2736
Referendum proposals, 2736
Tribunals, 3153
Milsom, Major J. C., 1265
Recruiting, 245
Folkstone director of, 1226
Spittal, Lt.-Col. C. D., 1127
War loan bonds, 2774
War taxation, use of funds obtained from, 4147

DeWolfe, Fred. T., position of, 5703

Digby,
Government lands, 2321
Indian lands, 304

Dillon, Major G. A., appointment of, 1958, 4061

Distilleries. *See* Grain *and* Alcohol

Divorce, Committee to revise rules governing, 4192, 4291
See Gordon Divorce Bill

Dodge, L. B., payments to, 306

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Béland, Hon. Dr. H. S., M.P., 524
Capital punishment, abolition of
Proposed plebiscite, 1017
Spain case, the, 1021
Coalition government, 3023
Companies Act Amendment, Bills, 1155
Criminal Code amendments
Insurance, 1773, 2104, 4388
Jurors, 2567, 4293, 4307
Non-support, foster parents, bawdy houses, insolvent traders, constables' fees, 4291, 4463
Customs, Crown's goods, 1983, 2119
Davidson Commission report, 524
Exchequer Court expenses, 1811
Government Railways Act amendment, 4368
Interest Act Amendment Bill, 2569, 3401
Judges
Appointment of, 1807
Salaries. *See* Judges Act Amendment Bill
Saskatchewan and Ontario, 1973
Yukon, 5896
Judges Act amendment, 2137, 5954, 6062
Justice Department, estimates, 1805, 5896, 6033
Kelly, Thomas, 1813, 4926, 5794
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 2357, 4291
Military service, 3016
Appeals and appeal tribunals, 3184, 3301
Authority of Parliament, 3031
Burden of proof, 3320
Classes, division into, 3353, 3359
Contraventions of Act, 3326, 3351
Enforcement, 3264
Exceptions and exemptions, 3303, 3307, 3568
Referendum proposals, 3028
Tribunals, 3153, 3168, 3296, 4193, 5881
Military Voters' Bill, 4406, 4688, 4742, 4792, 4874, 4889, 5956
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5977
Penitentiaries
Kelly, Thomas, treatment of, 1813, 4926, 5794
Officials' salaries, 6039
Prisoners, proposed enlistment of, 1013, 1814
Pensions, 6039
Post Office Department, estimates, 2352, 2360, 3634, 6051
Prices, contract fixing of, 1624
Provincial legislatures, powers of, 1808
Provincial prohibitory legislation, Bill in aid of, 4192, 4395, 5514
Woman suffrage, 1491

Doherty, Hon. C. J., payments to, 898

Dominion Canners Company, 1105, 1289

Dominion Day; fiftieth anniversary. *See* Confederation

Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bills
General (No. 107, Mr. Roche), 1r., 2832. 2r., 3793. Com., 3793
Patents (No. 12, Mr. McCraney), 1r., 159. Withdrawn, 1157

Dominion Lands and Parks
Animals in, 1359
Estimates, 1344, 4917
Forest reserves, 1349
Officials, 1675
See Parks

Dominions, overseas, constitutional relations of, 1528, 1531

Dominions Royal Commission, 599, 2338

Donaldson, Mr. Samuel J. (Prince Albert)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 816

Dorchester county election, 92. 111, 120, 146, 173, 208, 255, 293

Dorchester County Railway, 5361

Dorchester, N.B.
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries
Wharf, 3874

Douglas, Mr. James M. (Strathcona)
Apples, duty on, 1472, 1715
Army, forestry battalions, 3950
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3805
Flour, price of, 5211
Gasolene, duty on, 1675
Grain
Elevators, 3705
Wheat, fixing of price of, 3705
Military Service Bill, 3051
Patriotic Fund allowances, 3952
Tariff revision, 1714
War-time Elections Bill, 5604

Douglas, Captain J. M., position of, 6066

Drake, steamship, duty on cargo of, 4245

Dredging. *See* Public Works

Dropped order. *See* Parliamentary Procedure

Drummond, T. J., steamer, 669, 4925, 4939

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amendment Bill. Res., 4455. 1r., 5771. 2r., 5887. Com., 5915. 3r., 5918

Dubreuil, Mr., dismissal of, 3635

Dussault, Mr. Albert, employment of, 457

Dynamite outrages
Arrests in Montreal, 5423
Atholstan, Lord, 5423
Bigras, Gedéon, 5360

East Bay wharves, 5315

Eaton, Ernest, enlistment of, 3419

Economic and Development Commission, 1125, 2200, 5792

Edmonton, enlistments, 336. 3373

Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, subsidy to, 4925

Edson, Alta., population of, 1816

Edward VII, monument to His late Majesty, 3897

Edwards, Mr. J. W. (Frontenac)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 204
The war, 204
Political patronage in purchase of war supplies, 205
Patriotic Fund separation allowances, 207
Military appointments, 207
Maritime Province elections, 207
The Dorchester compaign, 208
Recruiting in Quebec. 213, 221
Statements of the leader of the Opposition, 218, 220
Naval policy of Liberal party, 219
Extension of term of Parliament—votes for soldiers, 223
National ideals, 224
Bran and shorts, duty on, 1875
Budget, 1209
The record of the Liberal party, 1209
Canada's trade, 1211
Free wheat, 1212
Vessels for carrying flour, 1213
Free trade, 1214
Scarcity of food, 1216
Improvement of highways, 1217
The leader of the Opposition, 1219
Proposed general election, 1220
Cattle, British embargo on, 922
Censorship, 5943
Dorchester county election, 208
Experimental farms, 2055
Food, scarcity of, 712, 1216
Free wheat, 1212
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5500
High cost of living, 712, 1216
Highways, improvement of, 1217
Home defence recruiting officers, 3134
Horses, glandered, 2056
House of Commons stenographers, 5789
Immigration agents, 4914, 5361
Judges' salaries, 5799. *See, under this head,* Supreme Court
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 2619
Mail clerks, French-speaking, 5272
Military districts Nos. 3 and 10, 455
Military service, 2715, 3221
National service cards, 667, 713

Edwards, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Parcel post service, 3634
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4211, 4214
Party records, 2373
Patriotic Fund, 207, 595, 3951
Penitentiaries
Portsmouth, 3418
Report of inspector of, 3419
Salaries of officials, 6033
Pensions, 6012
Post office signs—language in which written, 5999
Potatoes, 5987
Pugsley, Lieut. J. A., 4895
Quebec and military service, 2719-2728
Recruiting, 213, 221, 569
Rural mail routes, 1959
Shipbuilding, 1213, 1670
Soldiers
Pay and pensions of, 3216, 6012
Voting of, 223, 4807, 4895
Storage elevators, 2099
Supreme Court—allowance to Chief Justice, 6049
Taxation of wealth, 2728
Unclaimed bank balances, 1010
Votes for soldiers, 223, 4807
War-time Elections Bill. 5570, 5678, 5742, 5873

Eggs, imports and exports of, 1573

Elaine, steamer, 1379

Elevators. *See* Grain.

Ellis, Captain J. F., position and pay of, 6066

Elrose, Sask., mail service, 899.

Elliot, Mr. George A. (North Middlesex)
Soldiers, votes for, 1387

Emigration
Restrictions on Canadians of military age, 1726, 1775
United States, to, 987, 3285
See also Immigration

Esquimalt dock yards, 5915

Estevan, Canadian Government Steamship, purchase of provisions for, 4923

Estimates. *See titles of Departments and subjects*

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C. (Two Mountains)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5019, 5112
Food requirements, 2869
Military service, 2863
Labour, attitude of, 2871
St. Jerome post office, 899
War-time Elections Bill, 5826

Exchequer Court. *See* Supreme Court, etc., Bill

Exchequer Court Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1422.

Excise. *See* Inland Revenue

Expeditionary force. *See* Army

Experimental farms. *See* Agriculture.

Faguy, Gaudiose. dismissal of, 2284

False Creek dredging, 900, 1126

Farm labour. *See* Labour

Farmers
Employment of soldiers by, 1677
Loans to. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bill
Western, relief for. *See* Grain

Farmers Bank
Depositors, proposed reimbursement of, 4508
Shareholders of, 301

Farming industry, development of, 1776, 1786. *See also* Agriculture

Fiddlers *See* "The Fiddlers"

Finance
Debt of Canada, 347
Department
Estimates, 578, 1790, 6289
Staff and salaries, 1796, 5289
Gold, handling of, 1796
Income and expenditure of Canada, 274, 718, 723, 745, 846
Interest. *See* Interest Act Amendment Bill
Loans
Dominion, $100,000,000
Cost of issue, 342, 435, 4957
Proceeds from, 4416, 4621. *See* Public Service Loan Bill
Farmers, to. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bills
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, 5292
Quebec harbour. *See that title*

Fiset, Theophile, payments to, 1959

Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2151
Bait, 2036
Bounties to fishermen, 457
Canneries
Licenses for operation of, 3399
See Meat and Canned Foods Act Amendment Bill *and* Fisheries Act Amendment Bill
Committee on supply of, 3400
Department
Appointments, 2149
Estimates, 2149
Development of industry, 2037
Dogfish, 2176
Exhibit at Toronto, 2033
Export of, 454
Herring, 2036

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Inspection, 2035
Inspector Fisher, 2170
Investigation of problems, 5288
Laws, violation of, 2389
Licenses, 2051, 2182
Lobsters, 2049, 2117, 2154, 4171, 5425
Marketing, 2037, 2042
Ministry of, proposed, 2026
Officers, 2151, 2157, 2161
Oysters, 2174
Patrol service, 2183
Protection service, 4163, 4166, 4170
Salt for curing purposes, 1027, 1319, 1373, 2044, 2290, 3556
Sardine fisheries, 4168
Telephone method of fishing, 2176
Transportation, 2031, 2042, 3392, 3556, 4933
Trawlers, steam, 300
Whitefish, 2159

Fisheries Act Amendment Bill. Res, 2116. 1r., 2118. 2r., 2149. Ref, to Com., 2149. Com., 3399. 3r., 3400

Fisher, Mr. John H. (Brant)
Recruiting in Paris and Burford, 601
Soldiers, votes for, 1386

Flags on public buildings, 4146

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, letter from, 2956, 4010
See O'Connor *and* Food

Flax industry, 4683

Flour. *See* Grain

Food
Adulteration of, 2387
Bacon and lard, 3915, 5274
Beef, exports and imports of, 1574
Butter. *See* Agriculture
Cheese. *See* Agriculture
Control of, 108, 695, 1304, 1313, 1427, 1989, 2076, 2471, 2509, 2580, 3045, 3744
Australia, in, 963
Prices, 3918
Sugar, 1992
Controller
Appointment, 2433
Office and assistants, 3502, 4413, 4414, 4244
Powers of, 3943
See also Food Products
Eggs, exports and imports of, 1573
Fish, committee on supply of, 3400
Flour, 700, 1868, 5207
Prices and profits, 1039, 1088, 5085
Yukon, in, 2237
See also Grain.
Imports and exports of, 1573
Inspectors, 607

Food—*Con.*
Investigations of Mr O'Connor:
Report of, 3652, 3914; inquiry into, 3914, 3744, 4243
Maple sugar and syrup, 1958
Order in Council *re* sale of, 1273
Packages and containers of, 4065, 4070
Potatoes, 702, 2095. *See* Agriculture
Prices and supply of
Flour, 700
Sugar, 695
See, under this title, Control *and* Controller
Scarcity of, 1216
Sugar, 695, 1957
Supply of, arrangements with British Government, 2260
See also Meat and Canned Foods Act Amendment Bill; Grain; Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill

Forestry
Poplar, conservation of, 3742
Timber, protection of, 1349
White pine, blister rust, 4677

Fortier, Mr. Edmond (Lotbinière)
Burke, Col. Rev. A. E., 5704
Customs, private car for Minister of, 5082
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 3418
Military service, 3067
Public Works Department,—automobile purchase, 2480

Foster, Mr. A. De Witt, government employ of, 303

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Gecrge E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., visit to Canada and to House of Commons, 613
Board of Grain Supervisors for Canada, 2236, 3692
Boards of Trade Act, 3657
Canada Temperance Act, 1263
Canada Year Book, 2337
Civil Service—employment of men in higher offices, 1260
Coal, supply of, 4064, 4788
Confederation, fiftieth anniversary of, 1865
Connaught, the late Duchess of, 609
Daylight saving, 2356, 2945, 3677
Dominions Royal Commission, 599, 2338
France, trade relations with, 597, 2309
Fuel controller, appointment of, 2235
Grain
Breweries and distilleries, for, 1185
Congestion in the West, 340
Elevators, 2334, 3707, 3710, 3689
Prices, fixing of, 3689, 4564
Hay, inspection and grading of, 3402
Industrial and scientific research, 5276
Joffre, General—visit to Canada, 613

Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir G. E.—*Con.*
Military service, 2404
Oil bounties, 2329
Packages, marking of,—inspection and sale, 4065
Parliament
Extension of term of, 3461
Sessions of, expenses of, 1262
Pay and Records Office, 1355
Pensions, 6007
Railway Act, 3717
Referendum on military service, 2410
Research Council Bill, 2357, 3905, 3957
Salt for fish curing, 2290
Scientific and industrial research, 3905, 3957
Secretary of State Department estimates, 3737
Shipbuilding, 1337, 5436
Soldiers, returned, care of, 1590
Steamship service, 2285, 2323
Submarine situation, 1335
Technical education, 1244
Trade and Commerce
Commissioners and agents, 2326
Department estimates, 1835, 2285, 2323, 3687, 5205, 5275
United States
Declaration of war by, 610
Tariff, changes in, 1264
Viviani, M., address to, 1366
War
Charities, 5489
Prosecution of, 1588
Supplies—munitions contracts, 5529
War-time Elections Bill, 5853
Wealth, conscription of, 3462
Zinc bounties, 2330

Foster parents
See Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Fotheringham, Surgeon General J. T., report of, 4059

France
Exhibitions project with Canada, 2260
Food supplies for, 2310
Railway material for, 310, 335, 1229, 1266, 1372, 1473, 1474, 1615, 1628, 1690, 1820, 3407, 3409, 5293
Trade relations with, 597, 2307, 2309
Visit of Prime Minister to, 1536

Franchise
See War-time Elections Bill; Military Voters' Bill; Woman suffrage

Frank, Alta., moving of residences at, 4919

Fraser river channel improvements, 1126

Free wheat *See* Grain

Freight rates *See* Transportation

French Army manœuvres, attendance of Canadian officers at, 5219

French-Canadians
Enlistment of. *See* Quebec *and* Army
United States, in, 4914

French language
Bills, printing of in, 5550, 5559
Government officials speaking, 2262, 2265, 2340, 2759, 5272

Fripp, Mr. Alfred E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Disfranchisement of Civil servants, 2018
Promotions, 2018
Salaries, 2247

Fuel
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 194, 334, 584
Mining
Director of operations, 2609, 2776
Government control, 1996
Western, 119, 169, 195, 341, 458, 523, 614, 1267, 1372, 1616, 1723, 1725, 2183, 2200, 2238, 2570, 2609, 2653, 2776, 3617, 4009, 4621
Ottawa prices, 1320
Pennsylvania, from, 2199
Prices and supply, 83, 665, 2092, 2292, 4621, 4788
Regulations *re* sale of, 1275, 2317
Transportation of, 1919, 3395, 4791
United States situation, 4788
Control, 1275, 2317
Controller
Appointment of, 2235
Assistant to, 4152
Staff of, 4245, 5422
Utilization of resources, coal, peat, oil shales, etc., 1405-1422
See also Mines and Minerals

Fullerton, Major T. F., employment of, 4508

Galt, Mr. Justice, report of, 599, 602, 2322, 2357; inquiry into, *see* McLeod-Tellier Commission

Game. *See* Northwest Game Bill

Gascons wharf, 2055

Gasolene. *See* Taxation

Gaspe steamship services, 2299, 2318, 2325

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5003, 5182
Language reflecting on the Chair withdrawn, 2609
Military service, 2551
Referendum, 2555
War-time Elections Bill, 5824

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A. (Temiscouata)
Bartlett, Major, 5422
Currie, Col. J. A., M.P., position and pay of, 595
Currie, General, despatch from, 4510

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Exchequer Court cases, 335
Government railways
Intercolonial, pension fund, 1476
Promotion of employees, 768
Jenkins, Lieut.-Col. S. R., 5422
Leigh, Major, 5422
L'Espérance, Hon. D. O., 4511
Lighthouse keepers' salaries, 3134
Louisville post office, 899
Military service, 2746
Exceptions, 3566
Recruiting in Quebec, 2748
Patent medicines, 335, 985, 1470
Riou, Mr. C S., 3904
Riviere du Loup, ferry service, 452
Seed grain for eastern Canada, 1150
Steamship service, Quebec, 2318
Temiscouata mail contract, 335
Thompson, Dr. Alfred, M.P., 5083

Gazelle, Noel, enlistment of, 337

Geological surveys, 4179

Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 452, 989, 3900, 5913

German, Mr. William M. (Welland)
Army
Equipment, 559
Medical service, 559, 3989
Officers, alleged surplus of, 560, 564
Recruiting, 560, 2631
Soldiers, voting of, 4701, 4718, 4818, 4893-4914
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4026, 4254, 4869, 4960, 5049, 5189
Civil servants, compulsory retirement of, alleged, 2059
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Branch Lines Company, 1375
High Commissionership, 4177
Loans to farmers, 1961
Military Service, 2630
Racing meets, limitation of, 322
Railways,
Government policy in regard to, 2219, 2221
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1131
Situation, inquiry into, 3408, 3414
Submarine warfare, 334
Taxation of income, 4072
Trent canal, 3405
War supplies,
Boots, 4062
Equipment generally, 559
Munitions, 5525
War-time Elections Bill, 5755
Welland canal, 3402
Woman suffage, 1508

Gerrie, Mr. Charles, appointment of, 4245

Gibson, Lieutenant William, position of, 5422

Girard, Mr. Joseph (Chicoutimi and Saguenay)
High cost of living, 2829
Military service, 2825, 3189, 3353
Recruiting, 2827
Riviere du Loup steamship service, 2358

Glass, Mr. S. Francis (East Middlesex)
Budget, 1432
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4039
Cheese, inspection of, 2268
Cold storage, 2080
Daylight saving, 3685
Grain Supervisors, 3699
Insurance, 4389
Lord's Day Observance Act, 936
Military service, 1676, 3145, 3224, 3230, 3277
Straw, utilization of, 4683
Taxation of business profits, 1646
Technical education, 1249
Unclaimed bank balances, 1010
War charities, 5484, 5491, 6064
War-time Elections Bill, 5602, 5686, 5740
Wheat, fixing of price of, 3696

Glen, Colonel Joseph, payments to, 1377

Goldman, Mr. I., employment of, 4510

Government Railways
See Canadian Government Railways

Government Railways Act Amendment Bill, 1r., 3845. 2r., 4339. Com., 4339, 4365, 4863. 3r., 4417
Amendment, proposed: Mr. Boulay, ruled out, 4382: Mr. Hughes, 4385; lost on div., 4387

Graham, Hon. George P. (South Renfrew)
Agriculture, development of, 2578
Aiken, Mr. G. O., 4151, 4508
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 835
Officers
Reversion to ranks of, 3997
Wives of, passports for, 3997
Soldiers, voting of, 4793-4834
Athletic associations, 5922
Bennett, Mr. R. B., M.P., reply to statement of, 804, 869
Breidert and Mudge patents, 1200
Canada Gazette, publication of, 3737
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4022, 4217, 4277, 4282, 4388, 4471, 4591, 4622, 4845, 5041, 5158
Capital punishment, 627, 1022
Charitable enterprises, organization and control over, 378, 5485
Chicago drainage canal, 302

Graham, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Civil Service
Appointments, 693, 2017
Employment of men in higher offices, 1259
Promotions, 2017
Companies Act amendment, 5922
Customs disposal of unclaimed goods, 3743
Defence of Canada, 359
Fisheries protection service, 4170
Food control, 2580
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5501
Government Railways
Cars, purchase of, 758, 1376
Promotion of employees, 770
Government Railways Act amendments, 4344, 4367
See under this head, Intercolonial; Transcontinental
Grain elevator facilities, 4188
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1183
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, loan to, 5299
Indians, British Columbia, 2340
Intercolonial, transfor of, alleged arrangements for,—denial, 804, 869
Judges, appointment of, 1807
McNab, Colin C., 578
Military buildings, inspector of, 1039
Military service
Classes, 3276
Contraventions of Act, 3225, 3349, 3580
Conscription of wealth, 2576
Enforcement, 3268
Exceptions, 3270, 3564, 3591
Exemptions, 3212, 3276
Industrial requirements, 2579
Insurance of war risks, 3557
Persons liable for service, 3128
Policies of leader of the Opposition, 2572
Quebec's attitude, 2572
Recruiting, 2573
Referendum proposal, 2582
Tribunals, 3160
Mines, Minister of, proposed, 2007
National Serivce Board
Expenses, 3676
Officers, 376
Noxious weeds, 2068
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4431
Packages, marking—inspection and sale, 4068
Parliament buildings, construction of, 4182
Parliament, extension of term of, 3458
Pensions, 6024
Post Office Department estimates, 2352
Prisoners in penitentiaries, release of for farm work, 803

Graham, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 911
Public works expenditure, 5343
Quebec and Saguenay Railway bondholders, 669
Railway Act, the, 605, 3420-3453, 3522
Railways—material for use in France, 335, 1833
Recruiting, 375, 568, 2573
Ross rifle, 482
Royal Military College, 5310
Senate, appointments to, 928
Soldiers
Cessation of working pay, 457
Returned, appointment of to government positions, 1850, 1858, 6054
Voting of, 4793, 4834
Taxation
Income, 1631, 3771, 4073, 4104
Land, 1629
Wealth, 2576, 3461
Telegraphs and telephones, 3545
Telephone lines, government, 5364, 5382
Trade and Commerce Commissioners, 2327
Transcontinental railway operations, 1573
War charities, 378, 5485
War, prosecution of the, 2320
War-time Elections Bill, 5589, 5674, 5686, 5693, 5729-5771, 5856
Wheat, free, 642
Grain and grain products
Bran and middlings, 1867, 4468
Breweries and distilleries for, 1176
Commission, Chairman of, 3711
Congestion of in the West, 340
Diseases—rust, 2063
Elevators, 986, 2099, 2334
Claims of employees, 386
Facilities, 4189
Operation of, 3705
Flour, sales of between Canada and United States, 5273
Freight rates on, 2210
Grading of, 1265
Middlings, duty on, 1867
Rust, 2063
Seed
Eastern Canada for, 1150, 1188
Payment for advances, 1126
Purchase of, 4677, 4916, 4924
Supervisors. *See* Board of Grain Supervisors
Transportation of, 1682, 3396, 3412, 3712
Wheat
Commission, 1381
Exportation of prohibited, 3882
Free, 729, 747-756, 850, 864-884, 889
Prices, fixing of, 3688, 4687, 4887, 4926, 5206, 5218, 6000

Grain and Grain products—*Con.*
Surplus, purchases of, 1126
Telegram from Non-Partisan League, on, 4512, 4564, 4661
United States tariff on, 1342

Grande Prairie immigration hall, 1575, 1817

Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company Bills
1. Bill No. 33 (Mr. Currie) 1r., 585; withdrawn, 667
2. Bill No. 41 (Mr. Currie) 1r., 843; 2r., 896; com., 1375; 3r., 1445

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway
Financial statements respecting, 4058
Loan to, 5292
Removal of rails from, 5293
Report of Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4011

Gravel, Lieut. Gedéon, 1674

Gravelle, Mr. Oscar, position of, 1226

Great Britain, military service in, 2908
See Army Act

Great War Veterans Association, 1574

Green, Mr. Robert F. (Kootenay)
Railway Act, The, 3514, 3542, 3545
Telegraphs, provisions governing, 3542

Grenier, Mr. Armand, employment of, 3757

Grey, Ambrose, employment of, 1818

Grilse, H.M.C.S., 4563

Grosse Isle quarantine station, 5306

Guthrie, Mr. Hugh (South Wellington)
Bags and sacks, duty on, 1873
Bran and shorts, 1874
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5035
Coalition government, 2463
Enlistment, voluntary, 2454
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5502, 5903
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
Military service, 2452
Personal, attitude respecting, 3721
Tribunals, 3300
Soldiers
Returned, care of, 470
Voting of, 4410
Tariff revision, 1780
Taxation
Income, 1783, 2453
Wealth, 2453
War-time Elections Bill, 5598
Windsor immigration officer, 2357

Guysborough public building, 5914

Gwatkin, General, administration of military affairs by, 4419

Halifax
Dry docks, 5915
Railway terminals, 2214

Halifax & Eastern Railway, contractors, 304

Hansard. *See* House of Commons

Hants county apple inspectors, 1380

Harbours. *See* Public works

Hardy, Lieut. M. R., employment of, 4509

Harris, Capt. R. V., position of, 5422

Hay, inspection and grading of, 3402
See Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Army
French front, visit to, 1563
Pensions, 1610
Wet canteens, 1561
British Admiralty, recruiting for, 4163
Coal, transportation of, 4791
Dry docks, 5887
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2151
Canneries, 2117, 3399
Department
Appointments, 2149
Estimates, 2149
Dogfish, 2176
Exhibit at Toronto, 2033
Herring, 2036
Inspection, 2035
Lobsters, packing of, 5426
Ministry of, proposed, 2030
Officers, 2163
Transportation, 2031
White fish, 2159
Fisher, Mr. Ward, appointment of, 2170
Fisheries Act Amendment Bill, 3399
Gwatkin, General, 4426
Imperial War Conference, 1556
Lake of the Woods water level, 4178
Live stock, shipments, inspection of, 1842
Marine Department, estimates, 1815, 1836, 1881, 1912
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 2114, 3400
Minto, steamer, food supplies for, 2175
Naval Service Department, estimates, 4157
Ocean Telegraph Act, 2024, 2108
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4426
Public Works Department estimates, 5890
Pugsley, Mr, statement of, 5274
Quebec harbour advances, 435, 577
Royal Naval College, 4163
St John harbour, 4187, 5892
Shipbuilding, 1557, 1665, 1912, 4164

Hazen, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Universal Radio Syndicate, Limited, 2024, 2108
War-time Elections Bill, 5717
Heals station rifle range, 1573, 1675
Heatherton, N.S, mail contract, 1817
Henderson, Mr. Geo. F., K.C., position of, 4010, 4211, 4243
See O'Connor
High Commissioner, Canadian, Office of, 4177
High cost of living, 129, 961, 2076, 2055
Yukon, in, 2199
See also Customs Tariff Act; Food Products; Price; O'Connor.
Highways, improvement of, 1217
Hindu immigration, 2145
Hobbs, Mr. Hugh, 1228
Home Defence, 336, 1038, 2628, 3955
Officers, recruiting of, 3134
Homesteads
Patents, delay of, 3759
Regulations, 1741, 1746
Settlers' names, 1819
See also Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bill
Hopetown post office, 989, 1474
Horses. *See* Agriculture
Hospitals
Marine, 1953
Military
Canadian Hospital No. 8, 1674
Conditions in, 54, 59, 464
Construction of in Canada, 4045
European, 527
Hospital trains, 2205
Parliament Hill, on, 1228
See Military Hospital Commission, *and* Canadian Army Medical Service
House of Commons
Accountant's office, lease of premises, 5703
Business of the
Adjournments. *See also general title* Adjournment
Ascension Day, 1422
Dominion Day, 2620
Imperial War Conference, for, 117, 597
Victoria Day, 1628
See also general title Adjournment
Daily routine orders, 1423, 1524
Morning sittings, 2619, 2755, 2833
Private Bills, extension of time, 585
Saturday sittings, 344, 2569
Wednesday sittings, 324
Clerk of the House, retirement of Dr. Flint, 6043, 6069
Committees, select standing, 296, 1956
Reports of, 2054
Estimates, 2359, 5784, 6045
House of Commons—*Con.*
Hansard, cost of, 607
Members
Active service, on, 713
Deceased, tributes to, 3
New, introduction of, 7
Sessional indemnity of, 5790, 6043
Messengers, proposed increases in salaries to, 4684, 6053
Officials
Appointments, 586, 642, 843, 1956
Deputy Sergeant-at-arms, 3
Library, clerk in, 2832
Pages, chief of, 522
Reporting Branch, 522, 5636, 5702, 5786, 5949
Salary increases to, 4834
Secretaryship abolished, 5702
Translator, Chief, 522
Troop, Mr. Herbert D., 434
Returns, complaint of delay in bringing down, 1373
Sergeant-at-Arms, death of, 6069
Speaker, election of, 1
See Speaker
Speaker's quarters, 5784
Effects removed and returned, 2058
Stenographers, 5788
Vacancies, 1, 605, 2836
Howe, Lieut. M. J., position of, 6066
Hudson Bay Railway
Expenditure, 596, 900
Terminals, 2205
See Canadian Government Railways
Hughes, Mr. J. J. (Kings, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 231
Naval affairs, 236
Purchase of war supplies, 232
Record of the present administration, 231
The Ross rifle, 235
Statements of ex-Minister of Militia, 234
Agricultural Instruction Act, payments under, 455
Bartlett, Major, 4292, 4416
Bruce report, publication of, 3845
Campbell, Capt. G. H., 4508
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5044
De Wolf, Fred. T., 5703
Ex-Minister of Militia, correspondence relating to resignation of, 991
Fullerton, Major T. F., 4508
Government Railways Act amendment, 4352, 4385
Government railways, management and operation of, 783
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1177

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Hardy, Lieut. M. R., 4509
Intoxicating liquor, 4396, 4404
Carriage on government railways, 591
James Simmonds Co., 5122
Labourers from the United States, 1193
Machine guns, 452
Magdalen islands steamship service, 2302
McQueen, Lieut. W. A., 4508
Military District No. 6, 5237
Military service, 2971
Referendum, 2977
Moffatt, Lieut. R. J., 5361
Potatoes
Marketing of, 5989
Powdery scab, 2269
Prince Edward Island
Medical officers, 4563
Patriotism of men of the province, 2974
Railway, widening of, 3902, 3945
Steamship service, 660, 3954
Princess Louise Fusiliers officers, 5271
Quebec, recruiting in, 2972, 2977
Ross rifle, 235
Shipbuilding, 1335
Souris breakwater, 3871
Steamship services, 2326
United Mine Workmen of Nova Scotia, 802
War-time Elections Bill, 5664

Hughes, Sir Sam (Victoria, Ont.)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 253
Appreciation of British military assistance, 253
Personal attitude and policy, 254, 271
Col. Armand Lavergne, 256
Dorchester campaign, 255
Canadian troops in the South African war, 256
Troubles in administration of military affairs, 256
Status of Canadian forces, 259
Military equipment, 262
Appointment of General Steele, 264
Method of purchasing war supplies, 265
Disposition and command of Canadian forces, 268
Recruiting, 269
Canadian industries and the war, 270
Army
Badges of identification, 5953
Canteens, 808
Enlistment, voluntary, 2434-2449
Medical service, 537, 4199, 4466
Recruiting
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 3090
Officers in Quebec, 3135
Rejected men, 3099

Hughes, Hon. Sir Sam—*Con.*
Soldiers, voting of, 4898
60th Battalion, 525
Bruce, Dr., report of, 602
Canadian overseas forces
Despatch of to the front, 574
Disposition and command of, 268
Status of, 259
Canteens, open, 536
Currie, Mr. J. A., statement of, 5773
Hospitals, military—Bruce and Babtie commissions, 538
Irish, Mr. Mark, statements of, 2707
Lessard, General, 368
Maclean, Mr. A. K., statements of, 2777
Military equipment, 262
Military service, 3135
Authority of Canada, 2435
Classes, calling out by, 3137
Compulsion, advantages of, 2438
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 2434, 2446, 2449
Labour, requirements of, 2441
Recruiting, alleged retarding of, 2442
Officers
Reversion in rank—pay in such cases, 5423
Unemployed, 573
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4198, 4207, 4419, 4422, 4444
Administrative staff, 4956, 4959
Pay and Records Office, 3106
Recruiting, 269, 366, 379
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 2446
Lessening of, reasons for, 2442
Resignation of, 602
Ross rifle, 416, 480-493, 2451
Steele, General, appointment of, 264
Von Donop, Stanley, 523
War supplies, method of purchasing, 265

Hughes, Brig.-Gen. W. S., position of, 5361

Hyde, Mr. J. W., position of, 301

Hydrographic surveys, 4173

Immigration
Agents, 1737, 1754
Clergymen and priests employed as, 5361
Montreal, 5122
Quebec, 5122
United States, in, 4914, 5361
Chinese. *See* Chinese Immigration Act Amendment Bill
Department, estimates, staff and salaries, 4914
Deportation and rejection, 803
Figures, 803
Forms, printing of in French, 899, 3133, 3134

Immigration—*Con.*
French-Canadians in the United States, 4914
Hindu, 1763
Inspection, 803
Military service, exemption of immigrants from, 1572
Officers
Salaries, 2245
Windsor, at, 2357
Quarantine stations, 5306, 5312
Regulations, 372, 525
Regulations, Chinese immigration, 447
Rejection of undesirables at N. B. ports, 454
Rimouski, immigrants landed at, 4151
United States, from, 1739, 1747
See also Emigration

Imperial Munitions Board
Clerks, 305
Construction of ships by, 1661, 1663, 1913
Imports, 1978
Labour, 1985
Employees, 5271

Imperial preference, 1532, 1584

Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference
Adjournment of Parliament, 117, 596, 603
Announcement of meeting, 42
Attendance of Canadian Prime Minister, 597, 603, 1525
Correspondence with Colonial Secretary, 5, 24
Minutes of, extracts from, 2354
Proceedings of, 1525
Cattle embargo, 1535
Dominions overseas, constitutional relations of, 1528, 1531
Development and control of natural resources, 1532
Imperial preference, 1532
India, representation of, soldiers' graves, 1534
References to, 15, 24, 42, 148, 294
Statements by British Prime Minister, 2354
Statement by Mr. Hazen, 1556

Imperial War Graves Commission, 1534

Income War Tax Bill. Res., 3765. 1r., 3793. 2r., 4070. Com., 4070, 4102, 4124. 3r., 4638. Senate amdts., 5475; no precedent, 5476, 5883; amendment proposed: Mr. Pardee, 4639; ruled out, 4648

India, representation of,—Imperial War Conference, 1534

Indians
Agents, Bear River, 1569
Department of Indian Affairs, estimates, 1891, 2340, 2346
Lands of, 1887, 2348, 2389
Cutting timber on, 1889, 1901
Surveys of, 1894
Valuation and protection of, 1887
See also, under this head, Provinces *and* Reserves
Provinces, in
British Columbia, 653, 1896, 2340
New Brunswick, 1889
Northwest Provinces and Territories, 1894
Nova Scotia, 1887, 2349
Ontario, 1886
Quebec, 1886
Reserves, 989
Blackfoot, 2389
Caughnawaga, 1735
Digby, 304
Edmunston, 4920
Kitsilano, 1129, 1899
Okanagan, 1378, 2341
Sydney, 3663
Royal Commission, British Columbia, 653, 1038, 1896

Industrial and Scientific Research Bureau
Advisory council, 5279
Expenses, 5276
See also Research Council Bill *and* Technical education

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. *See* Labour

Industrial requirements *See* Labour

Inland Revenue
Department
Appointments in 1916, 758
Employees at Montreal, 758
Estimates, 2360, 3817
Expenditure, 2380
Preventive, officers, 3837, 3847
Staff and salaries, 2360, 3380

Insolvent Traders. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill. Res., 4065. 1r., 4070. Withdrawn, 5887

Insurance
Civil Service, 3503
Premiums of men in military service, 3557
See also Criminal Code Amendment Bills

Insurance Act of 1910 Reenactment Bill. 1r., 1724. 2r., 2100. Ref. to Com., 2104. Com., 3848, 4138, 5196. 3r., 5205. Sen. amdts., 5956

Insurance Act Amendment Bills
Mr. W. H. Bennett
Bill No 45; 1r., 1037; withdrawn, 1157
Bill No. 50; 1r., 1568

Intercolonial Railway. *See* Canadian Government Railways

Interest Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2569. 2r., 3401. Com., 3401. 3r., 3402

Interest on judgments, 900

Interior Department
Appointments to under section 21, 1351
Calgary offices, 668
Estimates, 652, 1344, 1735, 4916
Expenditure, 1344
French-speaking employees of, 2340
Orders in Council relating to, 6000
Political activity of employees, 2349

Internal Economy Commission, 45

International Fisheries Commission, 892

International surveys, 1735

Interprovincial bridges, 3888

Intoxicating liquors
Army camps, in *See* Army
Manufacture and sale of, 454
Prohibition of, 2008
See also "The Fiddlers" *and* Canada Temperance Act
Prosecutions for sale of, 1575
Sale of, 3818
See also Provincial Prohibitory Legislation

Inverness harbour improvements, 5325

Irish-Canadian Rangers. *See* Army

Jack, Mr. E. Bryden, position of, 4508

Jaffray, Mr. J. P., position of, 4062

Jails. *See* Penitentiaries

Jameson, Mr. Clarence (Digby)
Fisheries, proposed ministry of, 2026
Military Service Bill, 2969
Soldier Settlement Board, 3784
Technical education, 1243

James Simmonds Co., The, purchase of goods from, 5122

Jamesville breakwater, 5328

Jenkins, Lieut.-Col. S. R., duties and pay of, 5422

Joffre, General, 613

Judges Act Amendment Bill. Res., 1973. 1r., 1978. 2r., Com., 2136. 3r., 2137. Sen. amdt., 5954, 6062

Judgments, interest on, 900
See Interest Act Amendment Bill

Justice
Administration of, 1805
Baugh, Edward Levi, case of, 1814

Justice—*Con.*
Department, estimates, 1805, 5097. 5794, 5896, 6033, 6049
Exchequer Court
Cases, 335
Expenses, 1811
Publications, 5804
Judges
Appointment of, 1806
Provincial commissions, on, 593
Salaries, 1973, 5798, 5954
Saskatchewan and Ontario, 1973
Yukon, 5896
Minister of, payments to, 898, 1225
Provincial legislatures, powers of, 1807, 1811
Supreme Court, Chief Justice of, special allowance to, 6049

Kay, Mr. William F. (Missisquoi)
Ballots for overseas forces, 452
Food Controller's office,employees, 3502
Foster, Mr. A. De Witt, 303
Fuel Controller, staff of, 4245
Oleomargarine, prohibition of, 304
Parliament buildings, marble for, 2833
War profits and income tax—cost of collection, 4686

Kelly, Thomas, treatment of in penitentiary, and release of, 896, 4926, 5273, 5794

Kemp, Sir Edward (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 815
Discharges, 3096
Enlistments
Total, 3098
Voluntary, 3381
Forestry battalions, 3950
Medical service, 3967
Officers
Pay of, 1628
Retention of on leave, 5902
Salutes to, 5425
Surplus, 3103
Pay and Records office staff, 3104
Rejected men, 3099
Soldiers
Behaviour of, 5235
Personal requests concerning, 4203
Separation allowances, 4203
Civil servants, enlisted, pay and separation allowances to, 663
Expeditionary Force, disposition of, 2356
Home defence campaign, 2628
Irish-Canadian Rangers, 195
Lens, valour of Canadian soldiers at, 5195
Military service, 2620, 3239
Classes, 3357
Discharges from army, 3096
Exceptions, 3270

Kemp, Sir Ed.—*Con.*
Exemptions, 2624
Home defence, 2628
Quebec, recruiting in, 2626
Referendum, 2623
Voluntary enlistment, 2624
Militia and Defence Department, estimates, 3949, 3967, 3980, 4044, 5218
Officers, alleged surplus of, 562
Pensions
Canadians in Imperial forces, to, 4688
Prisoners of war, 666
Money orders and parcels for, 714
Recruiting, 562
British subjects in the United States, 2482
Quebec, in, 2626
War affairs, Government, administration of, 3381
War Purchasing Commission, purchases by, 341
156th Battalion, 523

Kentville armoury
Caretaker, 4509
Militia stores, 4510

Knight, Mr. N. H. R., position of, 4952

Knowles, Mr. William E. (Moosejaw)
Army
Officers' wives, passports for, 3996
Soldiers, votes for, 4690, 4806, 4877
Budget, 887
Free wheat, 889
Canada Grain Act, proposed amendment, 2954
Canadian Government railways
Private cars, 4938
Intercolonial, appointment of officials, 659
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4637, 5022
Civil Service salaries, 2946
Coal, shortage of, 2294
Western supply of, 4621
Coalition government, 2901
Daylight saving, 3686
Farming industry, development of, 1787
Flax industry, 4683
Flour prices, 5214
Food control, 2002
Free wheat, 889
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5493
Immigration
Chinese and Hindu, 2141
United States, from, 1742
Indians, British Columbia Commission, 653
Industrial and scientific research, 5277
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 2371-2381

Knowles, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway, appointment of officials, 659
Interior Department employees, political activities of, 2350
Legislators, free transportation for, 4935
Military service, 2895
Date of second reading of Bill, 2322
Referendum, 2900
Senate amendments, 4665
Mining industry, 657
Moosejaw, enlistments at, 5122
Moosejaw News, patronage, 2708
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4670
Postal clerks, salaries, 2708
Prices, contract fixing of, 385, 1617
Public works expenditure, 5333
Racing meets, limitation of, 324
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2371
Seed grain, 4678
Collections, 2351
Shipbuilding, British Columbia, 4940
Tariff revision, 1785
Taxation, income, 4075, 4105
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2614
Toronto Telegram, statement of, 5085
Trade and Commerce Department, estimates, 2338
War charities, 5493
War-time Elections Bill, 5637, 5658, 5721, 5810, 5818, 6083

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 195
Appointment of Senators for Nova Scotia, 196
The high cost of living—war profits, 197
National Service Commission, 200
Resignation of ex-Minister of Militia, 201
Canadian Army Medical Service, 201
Separation allowances, 203
Political patronage in military affairs, 203
Army
Medical service, 201
Soldiers' assigned pay, 3224
Bear River post office site, 1378, 1569
Budget, 956
Free wheat, 956
Business profits, 959
High cost of living, 961
Control of foodstuffs in Australia, 963
Taxation of business profits, 965
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4041, 5010, 5165
Censors at Louisburg, 4008, 4048
Civil Serice appointments, 647

Kyte, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Coal, 1998
Shortage of, 1919
Cost of living, O'Connor Commission report, 700, 961, 3914, 4010
Flour, 1039
Food control, 961, 988
Customs Department officials, 5101
Dawson post office, 4952
Dredge Cape Breton, loss of, 596, 1024, 3881
East Bay wharves, 5315
False Creek dredging, 900, 1126
Fish and fisheries, 2050
Advisory Board, 2152
Dogfish, 2179
Officers, 2157, 2161
Flags on public buildings, 4146
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
Flour, price of, 1039
Food control, 1998
Fraser river channel improvements, 1126
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5904
Heals station rifle range, 1573
Imperial Munitions Board Labour, 1985
Inland Revenue Department officials, 2377
Intercolonial railway — improvement of grades, 456
Judges' salaries, 1974
Leblanc, Dr. B. A., 2283, 4416
Lewis machine guns, 590
Louisburg
Censors, 4008
Pilot Commissioners, 3677
Wireless station, 5122
Macdonald, Dr. J A., 2283
Mail contracts, 3636, 3639
Maritime Provinces military affairs, 5228
Military District No. 6, 5228
Military Hospitals Commission, 4243
Military service
Exemptions, 5271
Tribunals, 3158
Militia Department estimates, 5221
National Service Commission, 200
Naval Service officers at Halifax, 6000
Neilly, Dr., position of, 2707
Nova Scotia public works, 5315, 5324
O'Connor report, 4010
Ogilvie Flour Mills Company, Limited, 1818, 2389, 3677
Ottawa Journal-Press—correction of statement, 3759
Pacific Dredging Company, 1126
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4211
Pensions, 6018
Point Tupper mail service, 3502
Pommery, Mr. Samuel, 4952
Port Malcolm wharf, 3866

Kyte, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 915
Rainbow, H.M.C.S., sinking of vessels by, 457
Recruiting, 2482
Returned soldiers, appointment of to goveernment positions, 6055
Richmond county medical officers, 3758
Ross rifle factory, taking over of by the Government, 663
Salt, shortage of, 3556
Shipbuilding, 5434
Steamship services, 2325
Sydney industrial sites, 3956
Taxation
Business profits, 965
Income, 4115, 5291
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5336
Turner, Mr. Harvey, 1469
Urquhart, Mr. Hector, 5367
Vancouver drill hall site, 456
War supplies
Munitions contracts, 5526
Purchase of, 4053
Waterford explosion, 5775
Women munitions workers, 4063
Yukon
Administrator, 5122
Commissioner, 3677

Labour
Attitude of on military service, 2426, 2488, 2451, 2604, 2663, 2795, 2871, 2958, 3725, 3732
Australian labour troubles, 698
Bureaus, 118
Chinese labourers, 2139
Conditions on munition work, 2492
Department administration, 1269
Assistant Deputy Minister, abolition of office of, 686
Estimates, 686, 1112, 1166, 1989, 3652
Staff and salaries, 686
See also Mines and Minerals, Coal
Fair wages and inspection officers, 3652
Farm labourers from the United States, 665, 1193, 1740, 1747, 3504, 4512
Government elevators, claims by employees, 386
Imperial Munitions Board, 1985
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1112, 1166, 1270
Military service, attitude to
See under this head Attitude
Strikes. *See* Coal *and* Thetford
Brantford moulders, 2322
Sorel strike, 1912, 1935
Yukon miners, 3086
Thetford mines. *See that title*

Labour—*Con.*
United Mines Workmen of Nova Scotia, 802
Women munitions workers, 4063

Lacasse, Mr. Isidore, employment of, 5272

Lachance, Mr. Arthur (Quebec Centre)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5080, 5192
Faguy, Gaudiose, 2284
High cost of living, 2922
Military Service Bill, 2919
St. Charles river dam, 2525

Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Montcalm)
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5072, 5187
Capital punishment, 632
Coalition government, 3014
Criminal Code amendment, jurors, 4335
Military service, 3004
Referendum, 3013
Montreal, postmaster, 582
Ottawa Journal-Press, statement in, 3085
War supplies, munitions contracts, 5541

Lake of the Woods water level, 2775, 4178

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Budget, 1096
Comparision of Conservative and Liberal administrations, 1097
Revenue and expenditure, 1098
Our part in the war, 1098
Fiscal policies, 1101
Reciprocity, 1103
Dominion Canners Company, 1105
Civil Service salaries, 2245
Coal, 2097
War-time Elections Bill, 5876

Lanctot, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Arthurs, Lieut.-Col. James, 5914
Belford, Capt. J. F., 5703
Bernard, Lieut.-Col. E. S., 5703
Breadner, Mr. R. W., 3676
Budget, 1221
The farming situation, 1221
Free wheat, 1221
Embargo on hay, 1222
Canada's prosperity, 1223
The Nationalist party, 1224
Payments to Minister of Justice, 1225
Business Profits War Tax, 3676
Canadian Bank of Commerce, 4686
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5065
Caron, Mr. Hector, 4151
Davidson, Sir Charles, payments to, 898
Dean, Lieut. R. I., 5703
Doherty, Hon. C. J., payments to, 898, 1225
Food Controller, staff of, 4413

Lanctot, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Fuel Controller, assistant to, 4152
Hay, embargo on, 1222
Ice breakers, 1818
Imperial Munitions Board employees, 5271
Intercolonial railway, damage claims, 2707
Judges' salaries, 5801
Laporte, Mr. Hormidas, 4510
Military Service, 2962
National Service Commission employees, 4787
National Trust Company, directors of, 4685, 4417
Plaxton, Mr. C. P., 4416
Postmaster General, recruiting by, 4415
Rimouski
Immigrants, landing of, at, 4151
Medical officers, 4509
Public works employees, 4244
War measures, 525
War Veterans Association, 1574
Wealth, conscription of, 2965

Landry, Mr. Justice, findings of, 3109, 3609, 4512, 5248

Lapointe, Mr. E. (Kamouraska)
Civil Service employment of men in higher offices, 1260
Dussault, Albert, employment of, 457
Exchequer Court Act Amendment Bill, 1422
Inland Revenue Department estimates and officials, 361, 2364, 3825
Military service
Contraventions of Act, 3341
Exemptions, 3304, 6002
Voluntary enlistment, 2514
Referendum proposals, 2521
Provisions of the Militia Act, 2519
Quebec's position, 2515
Murray Bay railway service, 617
Quebec, available men for military service in, 3255
Riviere Ouelle-Murray Bay steamship service, 643
St. Roche Traverse light-keeper, 1378
War-time Elections Bill, 5807
Women in the Civil Service, 1260

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A. (Montreal, St. James)
Alcoholic liquors, revenue from sale and manufacture of, 304
Army—Soldiers, voting of, 4725
Bank Act amendment, 1037
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5036
Grain, fixing of price of, 3704
Hansard, cost of, 607
Military Service, 2770
Exemptions, 2773, 3226, 3308

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A.—*Con.*
Quebec's contribution of men, 3256
Recruiting, 2772
Quebec electoral lists, 6002
Senate Hansard, cost of, 1571
War-time Elections Bill, 5621, 5639, 5722, 5741, 5759, 5865

Laporte, Mr. Hormidas, payments to, 4510

Latchford, Ont., plant and buildings, sale of, 5706

Laurentian, steamer, 4563

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec, East)
Address in reply to, the Governor General's Speech, 17
Canada's Governor General, 17
The war situation, 18
German peace proposals, 19
Our soldiers at the front, 20
Laxity of present administration, 20
Control of our military forces, 20
Equipment of Canadian troops, 23
The fiftieth Anniversary of Confederation, 24
Imperial War Conference, 24
Amqui-St. Leonard mail contract, 3903
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 813
Control of, by Canada, 20
Discharges, 3111
Equipment, 23
Recruiting
Quebec, in, 2395
Retarding of, 3094
Rejected men, 3101
Soldiers, voting of, 2403, 3727
Army Act, regulations, 3111
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., address to, 1772
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 4216, 4625, 4635, 5128
Capital punishment, 622
Coalition government, 3727
Correspondence with Sir Robert Borden, 2690
Confederation, fiftieth anniversary of, 24
Connaught, the late Duchess of, 610
Daylight saving, 3681
Defence of Canada, 358
Fisheries protection service, 4166
Galt, Mr. Justice
Report of, 2057
Rogers, Hon. Robert, criticism of, by, 599
Government Railways Act amendment, 4384
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Branch Lines Company, 1375

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
House of Commons
Business of the House, 1524
Morning sittings, 2619, 2775
Saturday sittings, 325, 2569
Wednesday sittings, 325
Clerk of the House, retirement of, 6070
Officials, appointments of, 586
Rights of House in dealing with taxation, 5479
Speaker's quarters, 5784
Imperial War Conference, 24
Adjournment of Parliament, 118
Visit of Prime Minister to, 1542
Insurance, 3848
Intoxicating liquor, 4397
Landry, Mr. Justice, report of, 4152, 5250
Mace, vote of thanks to donors of, 1469
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 2357, 5245
Members, deceased, tributes to, 4
Migratory birds, 3657
Military Service, 3111, 3254
Appeals, 3177
Board of Selection, 5084
Burden of Proof, 3319
Classes, 3132, 3140
Conscription, need of, considered, 2396
Contraventions of Act, 3324, 3337
Exceptions, 3559
Exemptions, 3207, 3362
Labour, attitude of, 3725
Men, available, 3724
Parliament, power of, 2392, 3723
Persons liable for service, 3116
Quebec enlistments, 2398
Referendum, 2403, 3721, 3728
Senate amendments, 4663
Tribunals, 3149, 3165, 3296, 3575, 5880
Votes for soldiers, 3727
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 4668
National Service Commission, 309
Newsprint paper, 757
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4195
Parliament
Extension of term of, 2396, 3420, 3484
Printing of, 5950, 5952
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4195, 4206
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5972
Point of order—Hon. Robert Rogers' reference to Mr. Justice Galt, 599
Prisoners, proposed enlistment of, 1014
Quebec and Saguenay Railway purchase and completion of, 303
Quebec harbour advances, 435
Railway Act, the, 606
Railway material, removal of to France, 310, 1372
Rogers, Hon. Robert, resignation of, 4739

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Ross rifle, 477, 3487
Scientific and industrial research, 3911
Senate, proposel change in constitution of, 1148
Right of to amend taxation bills denied, 5479
Soldier Settlement Board, 1163
Soldiers, votes for, 2403, 3727
Speaker, election of, 2
Taxation
Business profits, 1637
Income, 4084, 4114, 4122, 4132
Senate's right to amend taxation bills denied, 5479
Transcontinental railways, removal of rails to France, 1229, 1266
United States, declaration of war by, 612
Viviani, M., address to, 1367
War
Expenditure, 476
Supplies, munitions contracts, 5518
Votes ($500,000,000), 585
War-time Elections Bill, 5421, 5572, 5637, 5652, 5706, 5805, 5849
Woman suffrage, 1499

Laval, steamer, 1470

Lavergne, Col. Armand, 256, 1038, 2619

Leblanc, Dr. B. A., employment of, 2283, 4416

Le Blanc, Maurice, position and salary of, 1816

Lefebvre, Major Alfred, position and pay of, 1037, 2618, 3003

Legislatures, members of provincial, free transportation. *See* Railway Act Amendment Bills

Leigh, Major, position of, 5422

L'Espérance, Hon. D. O., appointment of to Senate, 4511

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)
Abbotsford postmaster, 608
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 136
National government, 136
The Opposition's duty, 137
Ross rifle, 137
True loyalty, 139
Attitude of the leader of the Opposition, 140
Great Britain's attitude in the war, 141
Quebec's view of the war, 141
What England and France are accomplishing, 142
Nationalism in Quebec, 143
The Dorchester election, 146
Recruiting in Quebec, 147

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
The Imperial War Conference, 148
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 150
Alcohol, distilling of, 3743
Angers, Captain, dismissal of, 758
Anglo-French delegates, visit of to Canada, 669
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 806, 840, 1226
Demobilization, plans for, 3118
Enlistment, 2463-2478
Recruiting in Quebec, 363, 3136
Recruits, urban and rural, 3135
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 690
Bell, steamer, 1377
Brindle, Mr. William, 3758
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4043, 4217, 4278, 4554, 4600-4619, 5046 5184
Cattle, British embargo on, 987
Civil Service insurance, 3503
Civil Service salaries, 583, 1804, 2241
Enlisted men, pay of, 2254
Coal
Confiscation of by railways, 584
Ottawa prices of, 1320
Cold storage, 2076
Courcelette, steamer, 1377
Criminal Code amendments, 4464
Jurors, 4306
Customs
Duties payable on Crown's goods, 2127
Silks, valuation of for customs, 1574
Customs and immigration forms, 3133, 3134
"Defeat or Victory," 1473
Dorchester county election, 146
Dynamite outrages in Montreal, 5423
Elevator men, pay of, 2946
Exhibitions, 2260
Farmers' Bank, shareholders of, 301
Fish, transportation of, 3556
Foodstuffs, control of, 2471
France, promotion of trade with, 597, 2307
French-Canadians in the United States, 4914
French-speaking employees, Department of Agriculture, 2264
Gaspe steamship service, 2299
Gerrie, Mr. Charles, 4245
High cost of living, 2055, 2077
Hudson Bay railway, 5090
Immigration
Agents, 1760
Department, printing of forms in French, 899

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Hindus, of, 1763, 2144
Japanese, of, 2144
Indians—Caughnawaga hospital, 1886
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 3831
Officials, 3817
Montreal, at, 758
Insurance of war risks, 3557, 3589
Intercolonial railway, cars, shortage of, 1378
Intoxicating liquor
Prohibition of, 4401
Sale of, 3819
Jack, Mr. E. Bryden, 4508
Kelly, Thomas, 4926, 5794
Labour bureaus, 118
Laval, steamer, 1470
Lessard, General, 363, 2055
Levis railway, station, 2208
Magdalen Islands
Cable service, 5408
Steamship service, 2303
Mail matter, registration of, 668
Matane Harbour light, 1575
McWilliams, Mr., dismissal of, 2167
Military service
Burden of proof, 3318
Contraventions of Act, 3329
Enlistment — Canada compared with United States and France, 2463
Exceptions, 3560
Exemptions, 3131
Insurance of soldiers, 3557, 3589
Militia Act, provisions of, 2465
Persons liable to serve, 3117
Pledges of government, 2467
Quebec's position, 2473, 3137
Referendum, 2478
Regulations, 3316
Tribunals, 3158
Mining industry, development of, 4181
Mitchell, Private J. F., death of, 1377
Montreal postmaster, 523, 581
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3746
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4202, 4420, 4442
Parcel post, 2075
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4202, 4207, 4212, 4420
Parliamentary sessions, expense of, 1262
Quebec harbour advances, 577
Improvements, 3879
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix; Quebec and Saguenay, and Lotbiniere and Megantic Railways, 4848, 5454
Railway Act, The, 3514, 3716
Railway company, advance to, 2100

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Ross rifle, the, 137
Rouville county mail carrier, 608
Ste. Anne bridge, 3888
Sainte Luce, changing of name, 673
St. Malo railway buildings, 1128
Soldiers, postage on parcels for, 1263
Soldier Settlement Board, 1165
Steamship service, France, 2307
Sulphur, embargo on, 4889
Taxation
Income, 3776, 4071, 4086
Wealth, 2469
Technical education, 1229, 1252
Telegraph service, 2108, 2113
Thompson, Mr., employment of, 4008
Vaudreuil bridge, 3888
Victoria bridge toll rates, 672
War, prisoners of, 4194
War-time Elections Bill, 5550, 5633, 5641
Washington Conference, Canadian delegates to, 1127
West Indies, promotion of trade with, 2289
Wharves, 1944

Lens, valour of Canadian soldiers at, 5195

Lessard, General, position and services of, 363, 365, 368, 2055

Levis railway station, 1129, 2208

Lewis, Mr. J. H., position of, 2944

Life insurance. *See* Insurance

Life saving. *See* Naval Service

Liquor. *See* Intoxicating liquors

Little Bras d'Or dredging, 3886

Live Stock. *See* Agriculture

Live Stock and Produce Bill. Res., 4287. 1r., 4292. Ref. to Com., 4417. Com., 5503. 3r., 5514

Loans
Farmers, to. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bills
Public. *See* Finance

Lockhart, Mr. Hugh, employment of, 1265

Lockport Cold Storage Company, 2202

Loggie, Mr. William S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Budget, 1280
Reply to Mr. Crothers, 1280
Canada's contributions to the war, 1282
Taxation proposals, 1282
Freer trade policies, 1283, 1287
Free wheat, 1286
The Dominion Canners Company, 1289
Reply to Mr. Edward's criticism of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 1290
Coalition Government, 2988

Loggie, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*
Dominion Canners Company, 1289
Fish and fisheries
Development of industry, 2047
Lobsters, 2049, 2155, 5426
Free wheat, 1286
Government railways, branch lines, 2223
Military Service, 2984
Referendum, 2986
Recruiting, 380
Shipbuilding, 1929
Soldiers, voting of, 4778
Steamship service, 2311
Taxation
Business profits, 1645
Income, 4069

Lord's Day Observance Act
Suggested suspension of, 936

Lotbiniere and Megantic Railway
Completion and operation of, 4948, 5452

Louisburg
Pilot Commissioners, 3677
Wireless station at, 5122

Louisville post office, 899

Lovett, James, dismissal of, 453, 759

Loyal Orange Order, 85, 91

Macdonald, Mr. E. M. (Pictou)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 47
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 47
Imperial War Conference, 47
The War, 48
The present Government and the war, 49
Extension of term of Parliament, 50
Canada's participation in wars of the Empire, 51
Recruiting, 51
Political patronage, 52, 55
Conscription, 54
Conditions in military hospitals, 54, 59
Administration of military affairs, 54
Government expenditures, 60
The winning of the war, 61
Aeroplane service, 805, 844
Army
Allowances, separation, 336, 383, 387, 4006
Camps and canteens, 535, 820, 1266
Canteen system in England, 718
Conscription, 54, 893
Criticism of military affairs, duty of the Opposition, 571
Enlistment of Canadians in the United States, 3758
Hospital No. 8, 1674
Irish-Canadian Rangers, 195, 458

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Medical service, 527, 3962
Pensions, 845
Recruiting, 51, 360, 372
Advertising of, cost, 986
State of, 936
Unfit men, of, 697, 4006
United States, in, 3758, 3904
Soldiers
Farms, employment on, 1677
Medical treatment of, 3962
Voting of, 4692, 4704, 4729, 4741, 4786, 4792, 4834, 4876, 4887
Army and Navy Veterans, 5911
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 688
Babtie, report, Dr. Bruce's reply to, 669
Bull, Mr. Perkins, 1130
Canadian Government Railways
Cars, purchase of, 4928
Coal purchases, 664, 667, 3388
United States, in, 592
Employees Magazine, 452
Level crossing near Trenton, 304
Quebec and Saguenay, etc., 5460
Safety-first inspectors, 337
Steamers, purchase of, 669
See under this head Government Railways
Amendment Act *and* Intercolonial Railway
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 4030, 4283, 4544, 4606-4618, 4628-4632, 4864, 4996, 5124
Carson, Major General, 986
Coal, Western mining of, 159, 614
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4296, 4322
Customs duties on goods of the Crown 1979, 1982
Dominions Royal Commission, 2338
Emigration of Canadians, 987
Food control, 2001, 3744
Supplies for Great Britain, 2260
France, trade with, 2312
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5904
Government Railways Act amendment, 4339, 4366, 4386
Grain, 4679
Gwatkin, General, 4419
Heals station rifle range, 1675
High cost of living, 695, 3935
Hospitals, military, 54, 59
Hudson Bay railway expenditure, 900, 5088
Immigration
Chinese of, 2143
Regulations, 447

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Indians, 2349
Kitsilano, 1129
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1123
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 3825, 3827, 3833, 2842
Expenditure, 2380, 2384
Officials, 2360
Intercolonial Railway
Cars, 2226
Employees, promotion of, 779
Operation of, 776
Judges' salaries, 5955
Kentville armoury
Caretaker, 4509
Militia stores, 4510
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 1129
Loan ($100,000,000), 4416, 4621
Lobster fishing, 2155, 5425
Master mariners, 4416
Medically unfit persons, certificates to, 5423
Military bands, 4044
Military service, 2947
Board of Selection, 2954
Contraventions of Act, 3339
Exemptions, 2955
Labour, attitude of, 2958
Quebec, position of, 2959
Referendum, 2961
Minto, steamship—food supplies, 2179
Munitions contracts, 4928
New Glasgow-Mountville mail service, 1037
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3935
Overseas Military Forces, Ministry of, 4417, 4442
Overseas Militia Department, non-combatant positions in, 4786
Parliament, extension of term of, 3478
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5958
Pensions, 6005-6033
Canadians in Imperial Forces, for, 4662
Pictou
Freight, handling of, at, 303
Marine and Fisheries agency, 304, 596, 1937
Rural mail routes, 900
Post Office Department, estimates, 2352
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 2305
Freight for, 1037
Steamship service, 3389
Prisoners of war, 666
Provincial governments, duties payable by, 2119, 2129
Provincial legislatures, powers of, 1807
Public works expenditure, 1038
Railway Act, The, 3426, 3439, 3441
Railway Department, steamers purchased by, 669

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
Railway employees, payment of salaries of, 5998
Robb, P.A., 1572
St. John harbour works, 5894
Scientific and industrial research, 3912
Senate, appointments to, 932
Shipbuilding, 802, 1325, 1341, 1914, 1934, 1661, 5430
Soldiers, votes for, 1393, 1399
Stellarton
Public building, 4951
Postmaster, 669, 897, 3758
Submarine situation, 1320, 1339
Taxation
Business profits, 1641
Income, 1652, 3775, 5884, 5886
Wealth, 3480
Taxation measures; Senate's power to amend denied, 5477
Technical education, 1241
Trade and Commerce, South America, 2331
United States
Labourers from, 665
Tariff, changes in, 1264
Vancouver Harbour Commissioners, 1575
Victoria Sealing Company, 5958
Walsh, J. J., 1675
War charities, 5482
War supplies
Munitions contracts, 5517
Political patronage in purchase of, 4050, 4053
Ross rifle, 477, 479
Trenton, contractors for, 303
Wealth, conscription of, 3480
Yukon territory, 1736

Macdonald, Dr. J. A., employment of, 2283

Macdonald, Mrs. Jessie, separation allowances to, 5361

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (South Toronto)
Military service, 2847
Parliament, authority of, 2848
Quebec situation, 2852
Referendum, 2849
Reinforcements, need of, 2853
Railway Act, The, 3433, 3533
Soldiers, voting of, 2850

Mace, presentation of, 1468

Machine guns. *See* War supplies

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)
Aldershot camp grounds, 3295, 3419
Apples, embargo on, 5776
Army
Allowances, 4001
Enlistments, 4152

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Soldiers
Leave of absence for, 4005
Voting of, 1398, 4702, 4712, 4736, 4741, 4786, 4820, 4876, 4887, 4889, 4914, 5196
Atlantic mail service, 452
Baxter, Leslie E., 3418
Bay State Fish Company, 2321
Budget
Trade and financial condition of Canada, 722
Income and expenditure, 723
Political patronage, 726
Taxation of business profits, 727
Free wheat, 729
Encouragement of production, 733
Canadian Northern Railway, 5057
Censorship, 5493
Coal mining, 616
Companies Act Amendment Bills, 843, 1151, 5918, 5942
Customs—bonded goods, 1854
Digby government lands, 2321
Dodge, L. B., payments to, 306
Dredge Cape Breton, 1026
Dry docks, 4458, 5889, 5917
Eaton, Ernest, 3419
Flour, price of, 1059
Food Controller, powers of, 3943
France, trade with, 2314
Government Railways Act amendment, 4361
Halifax and Eastern Railway contractors, 304
Industrial and scientific research, 5281
Intercolonial Railway stations, naming of, 3386
International Fisheries Commission, 892
Letter carriers, salaries of, 581
Loan ($100,000,000), 343
Lockport Cold Storage Company, 2202
Lovett, Mr. James, dismissal of, 453
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5252
Military District No. 6, 5229
Military hospitals, 4045
Military service, 2674
Classes, 3289
Enforcement, immediate, not desirable, 2681
Exemptions, 3218, 3209, 3309
Motor boat Alase, 5360
Moxom, Major, 4415
Muchaboom wharf, 304
Newsprint paper, 1645
Nickerson, William C., 2283
Nova Scotia Patrol Service, 5423
Outlook Publishing Company, 607

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Parliament, extension of term of, 3420
Political patronage, 726
Public works expenditure, 5308
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2363
Ross rifle, 423, 426, 478
Salt, shortage of, 1373
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 438
Scientific and industrial research, 3909, 3957
Senate, appointments to, 924
Shipbuilding, 1669, 5442
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1140
Soldier's cove wharf, 5339
Taxation
Income, 3766, 3767, 4070, 4111, 4124
Business profits, 727, 1660
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5386
United States, head tax on Canadians, 892
Vessels in government service, 1130
War supplies—mattresses and covers, 6065
War-time Elections Bill, 5595, 5637-5702, 5707-5771, 6072
Polling divisions under, 6070
Windsor Junction mail service, 5913

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 130
Party co-operation, 130
National government, 132
Loans to farmers, 134
The winning of the war, 135
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4531
Civil Service, appointments and promotions, 2018
Conscription, 1550
Federal law and its enforcement, 3263
Food control, 3750
Government Railways Act amendment, 4362
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1181
Imperial War Conference, 1548
Letter carriers, 1805
Loans to farmers, 134
Military service, 1550
Enforcement, 3263
Railway Act, The, 3423
Telegraph service, 2109
War supplies, purchases of by British Government, 4952
War-time Elections Act, 5593

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Aliens, enlistment of, 3656, 4413
Ottawa Journal-Press, statement of, 3655
Parker, Mr. R. G. M., 2201
Soldier Settlement Board, 3790
Tariff revision, 1718, 1727

Macpherson, Capt. Kenneth C., position and pay of, 4292, 4416, 4685

McCoig, Mr. A. B. (West Kent)
Army, soldiers' pay, 3217
Beans for seed, duty on, 671
Cold storage plants, 1628, 2078
Flour, price of, 1063
Food control, 2087
Grain, congestion in the West, 340
Henderson, Mr. Geo. F., K.C., 4243
Hogs, inspection of, 2271
Cholera, 2273
Loans to farmers, 1965
Military service, 2785
Exemptions, 3218
Potatoes, supply of, 936
Titus, Private John, 2237
Tractor engines, duty on, 674
Training camps in Canada, 899

McCraney, Mr. Geo. E. (Saskatoon)
Alcohol for public institutions, 5103
Army, medical service, 3993
Budget, 949
Taxation, 951
Policies, after the war, 953
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4551, 4633, 5174
Coal, western mining of, 2184
Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bills, 1157, 3805, 3811
Elrose mail service, 899
Fuel, 1417
Homestead patents, delay in, 3759
Immigrants—exemption from military service, 1572
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1166
Military service, 2558
Enforcement, 2560
Exemptions, 1572, 3221, 3369
Referendum, 2559
Parliament, railway transportation for members of, 3519
Provincial legislators, free transportation for, 300, 683
Railway Act, The, 3519
Seed grain indebtedness, 302, 1126
Soldiers, returned, care of, 475
Soldier Settlement Board, 1164
Taxation, income, 3778, 4075, 4094, 4099
War-time Elections Bill, 5559, 5643-5702, 5712

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Budget, 1300
Taxation of business profits, 1300
The pulp and paper industry, 1302
Flour, price of, 1069
Horses, purchases of pure bred, 2279
Military service, 3035

McCrea, Mr. F. N.—*Con.*
Potatoes supply of, 1087
Pulp and paper industry, 1302, 1464
Railway Act, The, 3444
Sherbrooke exhibition grounds, 302
Taxation, business profits, of, 1463
War-time Elections Bill, 5862

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Parliamentary Secretary, Department of Militia and Defence)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 833
Military Service Bill, 2890
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4210, 4450
War-time Elections Bill, 6085

McCutcheon, Stanley, dismissal of, 306

McGee, the late Thos D'Arcy, monument to 3899

McInnis, Mr. M. A., assistant to Fuel Controller, 5422

McKee, A. J., steamer, 669, 4925, 4939

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D. (North Cape Breton)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 78, 83
The attitude of Nova Scotia, 79
Mal-administration of the present Government, 81, 89
Canada's duty in regard to the war, 80
Militia Department affairs and the late Minister, 82
Loyal Orange Order, 85
Political patronage in recruiting, 86
Voting of soldiers, 87
Representation of Cape Breton in the Senate, 89
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 826, 1567
Enlistment of Canadians in British Army, 385
Forestry battalions, 4509
Recruiting, 86
Soldiers' votes, 87, 4729, 4759
Baddeck mail contract, 1819
Bell, Mr. Alexander Graham, 5783
Budget, 1809
Record of the present Administration, 1090
Political patronage, 1092
Purchase of horses in Nova Scotia, 1093
Development and progress under late Administration, 1094
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4039, 4521, 5032, 5162
Civil Service, promotions, 4667
Coal, 2005
Confiscation of by railways, 194

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Criminal Code amendment, jurors, 4305, 4330
Customs
Duties payable on Crown's goods, 2130
Officials, 5100
Preventive service, 1882
Dry docks, 4463
Fish and fisheries
Officers, 2170
Development of industry, 2045
Fisher, Mr. Ward, 2170
Flags on public buildings, 4147
Flour, 1879
High price of, 1076
Fuel, 1418
Control of, 2317
Government Railways Act amendment, 4375
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1178
Highland Brigade, 552
House of Commons—messengers, 6053
Imperial Munitions Board clerks, 305
Imperial War Conference, 1565
Indians, 1893
Sydney reserve, 3664
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 2379, 3840
Expenditure, 2379, 2388
Officials, 3840
Insurance, 2102, 4393
Intercolonial Railway
Boisdale contracts, 4415
Claims, 3416
Operation of, 784
Rates on coal, 4292
Stations at North Sydney, McKinnon's Harbour and Christmas Island, 2227
Sydney train service, 2222
Jamesville breakwater, 5328
Judges' salaries, 1976
Labour, 1174, 1988
Conditions on munition work, 2493
Letter carriers, salaries of, 583
Little Bras d'Or dredging, 3886
Magdalen Islands cable service, 5407
Mail contracts, 3637
Margaree harbour improvements, 5336
Matheson post office, 3502
Military service
Appeals, 3185
Burden of proof, 3322
Classes, 3289
Contraventions of Act, 3588
Exemptions, 3232
Labour, attitude of, 2492

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Referendum, 2498
Tribunals, 3173
Morton, Dr. A., position of, 5706, 5913
North Sydney
Customs service, 607, 1852
Railway station, 2227
Nova Scotia steamship service, 2286
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3753
Investigations of, 3653, 3928
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4424, 4449
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4449
Patenaude, Hon. E. L., resignation of, 2494
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5975
Pensions, 6017
Provincial Governments, duties payable by, 2130
Public works—harbour improvements, 4186
Quarantine service, 3756
Quebec railways, 5473
Racing Form, The, 306, 336, 896
Railway Act, The, 3533
Railway mail clerks, 3650
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2368
St. Peter's canal, 3406
St. Pierre Miquelon mail service, 3649
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 443
Shipbuilding, 1566
Soldiers, votes for, 1397
Soldier's cove wharf, 5337, 5341
Soldier Settlement Act, administration of, 4917
Steamship services, 2324, 2286
Submarine situation, 1333
Taxation, income, 4128, 4135, 4658
Technical education, 1239
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4191, 5362, 5401
War
Charities, 5490, 6062
Expenditure, 549
Supplies, munitions contracts, 5537
War-time Elections Bill, 5606, 5670, 5751, 5841
Wharves, 1945
Wheat, fixing of price of, 3694
Woman suffrage, 1516

McKenzie, Lieut. F. J. S., payments to, 986

McLean, Mr. Angus A. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3947
Pensions, 6013
Submarine situation, 1327

McLeod-Tellier Commission
Appointment of, 2056
Counsel, 3418
Expenses of, 5245

McLeod-Tellier Commission—*Con.*
Report of, 4291
Sittings of, 2322, 2357
See also Galt, Mr. Justice, *and* Landry, Mr. Justice

McMillan, Mr. John A. (Glengarry)
Cheese purchases by British Government, 1774
Dairying industry, 2256

McNab, Colin C., proposed allowance to, 578

McNeil, F. C., payments to, 1380

McNeil, Lt. John D., promotion of, 5272

McQueen, Lieut. W. A., employment of, 4508

McSpadden, Lt.-Col., position of, 2618

McWilliams, Mr., dismissal of, 2165

Magdalen Islands, cable service, 5407

Magladery, Mr. Thomas, M.L.A., position and pay of, 4685

Mails. *See* Post office

Manitoba, County Court judges, 5083

Maple sugar. *See* Food products

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 109, 119
Canada and the war, 109, 119
The Nationalist party, 109, 120
The Dorchester election, 111, 120
Recruiting in Quebec, 112, 119, 127
Quebec, past and present. 123
National service, 126
The high cost of living, 129
Army, Fifth Canadian Division, 459
Béland, Hon. Dr., M.P., 311, 341
Bonaventure
Breakwater, 988
County, mail service, 1126
Recruiting officer, 1675
Campbellton-Gaspe steamship service, 1126, 1228, 1959
Carleton Beach protection works, 1126
Civil Service, salaries, 2238
Court, Private Harry Ivan, 3295
Cross Point wharf, 988, 1228, 1571
Customs Department, dismissals from, 1844
Dagneau, John F., 1471
Daylight saving, 3685
Dorchester county election, 111, 120
Elaine, steamer, 1379
Gascons wharf, 2055
Gaspe steamship services, 2325
Government Railways Act amendment, 4343
Hopetown post office, 989, 1474
Interprovincial bridges, 3891
Intoxicating liquors, 2008
Le Blanc, Maurice, 1816

Marcil, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Marcil, Private Joseph, 893
Maria Beach protection works, 898
Matapedia public highway, 1379, 1816
Migratory birds, 3660
Miguasha wharf, 1126
Military service
Classes, 3354
Exceptions, 3564
Exemptions, 3219, 3307, 3364
Persons liable for service, 3129
Quebec situation, 2428, 3257. *See under this head,* Quebec
Referendum, 2432
Militia Department, employees, 312
Montreal, customs collectorship, 311
Nationalist party, 109, 120
New Carlisle, war expenditure in, 1575
New Richmond post office, 898
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4209
Packages, marking of,—inspection and sale, 4067, 4070
Paspebiac wharf, 898, 988
Paspebiac-Hopetown mail service, 1126
Pratt Bros., payments to, 1570
Prisoners of war, exchange of, 341
Quebec and Oriental railway, 1674
Quebec, recruiting in, 112, 127, 213, 342, 2428
Railway Act, The, 3513
Read, Lance Corporal, 717
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2375
Restigouche river, bridging of, 988
Ross rifle, 422
Ruisseau le Blanc breakwater, 898
St. Charles de Caplan wharf, 898
Separation allowances, 386
Shigawake post office, 898
Shigawake East post office, 988
Shipbuilding, 1921, 1930
Soldier Settlement Board, 3626, 3789
Taxation, income, 4102, 4123, 4130
United States troops, training of in Canada, 2482
War-time Elections Bill, 5641, 5717, 5813
Wharves, 1944

Marcile, Mr. Joseph E. (Bagot)
Budget, 1292
Trade and financial conditions, 1293
The French-Canadian people, 1294
Recruiting, 1294
Transcontinental railway, 1295
Government appointments and dismissals, 1296
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4998
House of Commons Accountant's office, lease of premises, 5703
Military Service Bill, 3053
Recruiting, 1294

Margaree harbour improvements, 3867, 5330

Maria Beach protection works, 898

Marine
Coastal regulations, 1912
Hospitals. *See that title*
Icebreakers, 1818, 1836
Insurance. *See that title*
Life-saving, 1949
Lighthouse and coast service
Agencies, 1936
Compressors, sale of, 4920
Lights, experiments with, 2173
Maintenance and repairs, 1940
Salaries, 1939, 3134, 6049
Signal service, 1942
Maritime road repairs, 1815, 1947
Minto, steamer, food supplies for, 2175
Navigation
Aids to, 1940
Obstructions to, 1841
Schools, 1838
Ocean and river service, contracts for provisions, 4923
Pilotage, 4922, 6049
Pilots' pensions, 1948
St. Lawrence signal and telegraph service, 1471
Shipbuilding, 242, 292, 703, 1325, 1342, 1551, 1556, 1565, 1566, 2293
Contracts by Imperial Munitions Board, 1371, 1661, 1663, 1913
Government aid to, 802, 1371
Government vessels, 1912
Vessels under construction, 665, 1666
Wooden, vessels, construction of, 1775, 1924
Steamers, government
Construction, 1912
Maintenance and repairs, 1836
Revenue cruisers, 1881
Steamship services. *See that title*
Vessels
Commandeering of, 662, 1667
Government service, in, 1130
Investigations into, 1838
Wharves, repairs to, 1943

Marine and Fisheries Department
Appointments, 1937
Estimates, 655, 1815, 1836, 1912, 4920, 6049
Pictou agent, 1936
Services of, 2027

Maritime Provinces
Elections, 207
Military affairs, 5226

Marlow, Lt.-Col. F. W., appointment of, 1227

Martell, Lieut. L. H., position and pay of, 5914

Martin, Mr. Méderic (Montreal, St. Mary's)
Food control, 2094, 2097
High cost of living, 708
Letter carriers, salaries of, 580, 1474
Military service, 2813
Amendments, 2820
Quebec situation, 2813
Oleomargarine, 2202, 2283
Soldiers, behaviour of at public gatherings, 5233
Taxation, income of, 4127
War-time Elections Bill, 3612

Matane harbour light, 1575

Matapedia public highway, 1379, 1816

Matheson post office, 3502

Matthews-Blackwell, Limited. *See* O'Connor

Matthews, Mr. L., 1228

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amendment Bill. Res., 2114. 1r., 2116. 2r., 2149. Ref., to Com., 2149. Com., 3400. 3r., 3401. Sen. amndts., 5425

Medicine Hat, military reserve, 301

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Solicitor General)
(From p. 4926 Secretary of State and Minister of Mines.)
Army
Desertions, 3111
Discharges, purchase of, 3112
Enlistment, 2530
Budget. 845
Revenue and expenditure of Canada, 846
Fiscal policies, 848
Free wheat, 850
Amendment of Mr. Turriff, 859
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 4257. 4264, 4580, 4597-4614, 4631, 4842, 5133
Capital punishment, 619, 636
Censorship
Censors and decoders, 576
"The Fiddlers," 5947
Coalition government, 3732
Companies Act amendment, 5918-5942
Flour, price of, 1073
Free wheat, 850
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5245, 5255
Military service, 3237-3261
Appeals, 3175, 3301
Burden of proof, 3318
Classes, 3140
Calling out by, 3130, 3271
Division into, 3355
Contraventions of Act, 3325-3352, 3360, 3579
Exceptions, 3362-3371
Exemptions, 3130, 3188, 3196, 3205, 3211, 3219, 3272, 3303, 3362

Meighen, Hon. A.—*Con.*
Expenses, 3262, 3361
Labour, attitude of, 3732
Parliament, authority of, 2530
Penalties, 3271
Persons liable for service, 3116, 3125
Quebec situation, 2536
Referendum, 2533
Regulations, 3314
Tribunals, 3149, 3295, 3574
Passports for women, 5783
Press statements correction of, 4889
Provincial legislators, free transportation for, 685
Senate, appointments to, 926
Soldiers
Returned, appointment of to government positions, 6058
Votes for, 1390, 3730
Transcontinental railway—removal of rails to France, 1229, 1266
United Grain Growers, Limited, 894
War charities, 6062
War supplies, Ross rifle, 479, 493
War-time Elections Bill, 5582, 5637-5702, 5708-5771, 6076
Merritt, Col. W. H., collection by for Aviation Fund, 5362
Michaud, Mr. Pius (Victoria, N.B.),
Blain, Lieut. Roswell, 4245
Canadian Northern Railway, acquisition of, 5028
Civil Service promotions, 2021
Dalhousie militia buildings, 454
Danis, Joseph M., 2618
Farm labourers from United States, 4512
Immigration regulations, 454
Intercolonial railway, 798
Mail service, 3639
Military Service Bill, 2808
United States, head tax on foreigners entering, 1266
Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Army, soldiers' votes, 4894
Breidert and Mudge patents, 1199
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4512
Companies, incorporation of, 5939
Food control, 2509
Government Railways Act amendment, 4378
House of Commons—sessional indemnity of members, 6046
Military service, 2502
Exemptions, 2506, 3202
Parliament authority of, 2503
Provinces, recruiting by, 2511
Referendum, 2502, 2512
Pensions, 6010
Soldier Settlement Board, 3624

Middlebro, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*
Taxation
Business profits, 2508
Wealth, 2507
Income, 4073, 4106
Migratory Birds Convention Bill. 1r., 2525. 2r., 3657. Com., 3657. 3r., 3662
Miguasha wharf, 1126
Military
Bands, 4044
Districts
Nos. 3 and 10, 455
No. 6, Halifax, Capt. R. V. Harris, 5422
Officers, 5226, 5236, 5422
Forces
Overseas, Minister of, 4195, 4417, 4441
Administration of, 4200
Hospitals. *See that title*
Trains, 2205
Military and Naval Aid Bill ($500,000,000). *See* War Appropriation
Military Hospitals Commission, 464, 473, 4243
See also Canadian Army Medical Service *and* Hospitals
Military Service. *See also* Army *and* Conscription
Appeals, 3175
Army Act, provisions of, 3111
Authority of Parliament, 2392, 2419, 2435, 2465, 2530, 2539, 2622, 2632, 2643, 2669, 2743, 2848, 2851, 2911, 3031, 3723
Available men, 2390, 2439, 2455, 2551, 3049, 3255, 3371
Board of selection, 2954, 5083, 5474
Burden of proof, 3318
Certificates, 3261
Classes
Calling out by, 3130, 3138, 3272
Division into, 3353
Contraventions of Act, 3324, 3360, 3579
Correspondence between Prime Minister and ex-Minister of Militia, 2434, 2446, 3086
Council, 5314
Enforcement, 2416, 2545, 2560, 2681, 2744, 2780, 3262
Examiners, medical, 6069
Exceptions, 3269, 3362, 3559
Exemptions, 2607, 2624, 2806, 2955, 3043, 3130, 3187, 3272, 3303, 3362 5417, 6002, 6068
See also under this title Classes *and* Persons liable for service
Expenses, 3262, 3361
Great Britain, military service in, 2908
Industrial requirements, 2441, 2579, 2798, 3020
See also Labour

Military Service—*Con.*
Insurance premiums of soldiers, 3557, 3589
Labour, attitude of. *See* Labour
Medically unfit persons, certificates to, 5423
Penalties, 3271. *See under this title,* Classes
Persons liable for service, 3116
Quebec Province, relation to, 2398, 2424, 2428, 2473, 2515, 2536, 2543, 2549, 2602, 2626, 2638, 2659, 2685, 2697, 2704, 2716, 2728, 2736, 2748, 2754, 2784, 2792, 2812, 2828, 2841, 2852, 2866, 2898, 2926, 2959, 2965, 2998, 3005, 3017, 3037, 3257, 3255
See also Quebec
Referendum proposed, 2403, 2478, 2498, 2521, 2527, 2533, 2555, 2582, 2589, 2601, 2623, 2632, 2651, 2659, 2665, 2670, 2713, 2729, 2736, 2787, 2849, 2858, 2860, 2882, 2889, 2894, 2900, 2961, 3013, 3028, 3046, 3721, 3728, 3730
Registrars, 3174, 5900
Regulations, 3235, 3314
Selective draft features, 2438, 2458, 2910, 2954
See also, under this title, Board of Selection
Tribunals, 3149, 3295, 3301, 3574, 5881
Location of, 4193

Military Service Bill, 1917. 1r., 2184. 2r., 2390, 2434, 2458, 2483, 2526, 2571, 2592, 2654, 2709, 2777, 2833, 2881, 2903, 2944, 2947, 3004. Div., 3085. Com., 3086, 3110, 3135, 3187, 3237, 3295, 3353, 3375, 3554, 3557. 3r., 3718. Sen. amdts., 4663
Amendments proposed
Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2403; lost on div., 3074
Mr. Barrette, 2524. Point of order respecting, 2844; Committee of inquiry into, 2880, 2944. Lost on div., 3074
Mr. Copp, 3075; lost on div., 3084

Military Service Council, 5314

Military Voters' Bill, 1917. 1r., 4406. 2r., 4688. Com., 4693, 4740, 4792, 4874, 4889. 3r., 5086, 5195
Amendments proposed: Mr. Pugsley, (1) 4762; lost on div., 4774. (2) 4892; lost on div., 4907. Mr. German, 4907; lost on div., 4909. Sen. amdts., 5956

Militia and Defence
Department
Administration of, 82, 287
Automobiles, 2525, 3903
Employees, 312
Estimates, staff and salaries, 3949, 3962, 4044, 5218
Drill halls, control of, 4146

Militia and Defence—*Con.*
Ex-Minister of,
Charges by, 226, 234
Resignation of, 164, 287
Correspondence relating to resignation of, 991
Headquarters staff at Halifax, 5226
Home defence, 336, 359, 1038, 2628, 3955
Officers, recruiting of, 3134
Military buildings, inspector of, 1039
Overseas Minister of. *See* Overseas Forces
Permanent force, 4055
Princess Louise Fusiliers, officers of, at Halifax, 5271

Mill feeds. *See* Grain

Milsom, Major J. C., inquiry into conduct of, 1265

Mines and Minerals
Department estimates, 657, 4179, 5780
Ministry of, proposed, 2007
Smelting, provision for, 66
Zinc, bounties on, 2330
See also Fuel

Minister of the Overseas Military Forces, the Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence, and the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs Bill. Res., 4195. 1r., 4215. 2r., 4417. Com., 4441. 3r., 4661
Amendments proposed: Mr. Lemieux, 4448; lost on div., 4449. Mr. Proulx, 4453; lost on div., 4453
See also Parliamentary Secretaryships

Mint, Royal, Ottawa Branch, 1474

Mitchell, Private J. F., death of, 1377

Moffat, Lieut. R. J., expenses of, 5361

Molloy, Mr. John P. (Provencher)
Army allowances, 3082
Kelly, Thomas, treatment of, 896
Loans to farmers, 1964
Military Service, 3082
Railway mail clerks, 4102
Tariff revision, 1776

Moncton
Armoury site, 4787

Mondou, Mr. A. A. (Yamaska)
Military service, 2989
Montreal Gazette, statement of, 3004

Montreal
Contributions to the war, 249
Customs collectorship, 311, 648
Immigration agents, 5122
Inland Revenue officials at, 758

Montreal—*Con.*
Postmaster, 523, 581
Post office sub-station, 596
Public building, 305

Montreal Trades and Labour Council, 2198

Monuments, erection of, 3896, 3899

Moore, Major Rev. A. H., 1265

Moosejaw
Enlistments, 5122

Moosejaw News patronage, 2708

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Army
Soldiers, voting of, 4701, 4756, 4786, 4815, 4900
Cheese manufacture, regulations, 2265
Civil Service salaries, 2013
Companies, incorporation of, 5941
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4299, 4324
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5906
Insurance, 5196
Live Stock and Produce Bill, 4290, 5505, 5513
Military service
Classes, 3142, 3284, 3291
Exemptions, 3193, 3364
Persons liable for service, 3118
National Gallery of Canada, 5301
Pensions, 6010
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5378

Morris, Mr. James (Chateauguay)
Budget, 973
Nationalist party, 974
Free wheat, 975
The record of the Government, 975
Military Service, 2978
Newspaper article, correction of, 1775
Woman suffrage, 1523

Morton, Dr. A., position of, 5706, 5913

Mounted Police
See Royal Northwest

Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal, 4835

Maxom, Major, position of, 4415

Muchaboom wharf, 304

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 225
Proposed committee of inquiry, 225
Charges by ex-Minister of Militia, 226
Army medical service, 227
The Ross rifle, 228
Armstrong, S. A., 802

Murphy, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Army
Medical service, 227, 3978
Overseas forces, proposed holiday for, 5902
Rejected men, 3100
Soldiers, voting of, 4760, 4812, 4890
Baugh, Edward Levi, 1470, 2481
Canada Gazette, publication of, 3738
Canadian Northern railway acquisition of, 4593-4608, 4637, 4972
Cheese purchases by British Government, 1863, 2197
Civil Service appointments, 643, 648, 2021, 2238
Under Order in Council of Jan. 1, 1917, 3003
Promotions, 4666
Firearms in Quebec hardware stores, 5083
Flour, alleged profit on, 5085
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 3901
Hospital on Parliament Hill, 1228
Inland Revenue Department, estimates, 2388
Latchford, Ont., plant and buildings, sale of, 5706
Lessard, General, 365
Marlowe, Lt.-Col. F. W., 1227
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5251
McSpadden, Lt.-Col., 2618
Military Service, 2538
Enforcement, 2545
Labour, attitude of, 2543
Quebec, attitude of, 2543
Senate amendments, 4665
Montreal
Post office sub-station, 596
Public building, 305
Monuments, erection of, 3900
Ottawa, government land in, 1130
Parliament buildings
Brick for, 337
Contract for construction of, 454
Stone for, 304
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4213
Public Works Department architect, 5104
Recruiting of British subjects in United States, 2482
Rideau canal, lighting of, 1939
Ross rifle, 228, 421
Substitute for, 1012, 1594
Valuation of factory, 1265
Taxation, income, 4131, 4649
War supplies, clothing, 3556
War-time Elections Bill, 5618, 5656, 5669, 5732, 5764

Murray Bay railway service, 617

National Battlefields Commission, 2061

National Gallery of Canada, 3398, 5301

National Government, 132, 136, 161, 177
See Coalition

National Organization for War, pamphlet, 4685

National Service, 71, 93, 126, 170, 191
Cards, 2479
Distribution and return of, 361, 667, 713, 1376
Effect of on recruiting, 361, 374
Commission, 64, 200
Employes of military age, 4787
Expenditure, 3676
Officials, 309, 376, 3676
Purpose of, 370, 2413
Statement by the Director General, 6086

National Trust Company, 4417, 4685

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian Government railways

Nationalist party, 109, 120, 143, 179, 1224
Statement by Prime Minister, 4564

Naturalization Acts, administration of, 3741

Naval Service
Department
Estimates, staff and salaries, 660, 4157
Statement by the Minister, 4157
Grilse, H.M.C.S., command of, 4563
H.M.C.S. Niobe and Rainbow, 4162
Life saving, 661
Master mariners at Halifax, 4416
Officers at Halifax, 6000
Patrol service, 4163, 4164, 4170, 5243, 5274
Recruiting for British Admiralty, 4159
Transport service, 4161
Wilfrid C., vessel, 4062
See Air Service

Niobe
See Naval Service

Neely, Mr. D. B. (Humboldt)
McInnes, M. A., 5422
Military Service Bill, 2778
Sifton, Sir Clifford, statement of, reply to, 5774
Tariff revision, 1730
Taxation, farm implements, 1730
War-time Elections Bill, 5587, 5643-5652, 5724, 5821
White, Rev. Ward, 3903

Neely, Captain D. B., M.P., position and pay of, 6066

Neilly, Dr., military position of, 2707

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 94
Canadian troops at the front, 95

Nesbitt, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Economy in government expenditure, 95
Camp Borden, 96, 100
National Service cards, 96
Expenditure on public works, 97
Political patronage, 97
Military officers, 98
Recruiting, 98
Army
Medical service, 542
Soldiers
Pay, 3216, 5223
Voting, 4705, 4769, 5196
Bran, prices of, 4466
Brantford moulders' strike, 2322
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4501, 4609, 4632, 5131
Cattle, British embargo on, 920
Cheese purchases, 2197, 2258
Cold storage, 2255
Criminal Code Amendment, proposed, 1677
Daylight saving, 3684
Farm labour, 3510
Government Railway Act amendment, 4346
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
Insurance, 3850, 5200
Live stock exchanges, 4289, 5503
Loans, public, 347
Military Service
Classes, 3143
Exemptions, 3211, 3216, 3272
Quebec situation, 2594
Voluntary enlistment, 2592
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3747
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4208
Penitentiaries, 6036
Pensions, 6016
Political patronage, 97
Potatoes, 1437
Quebec railways, 5463
Railway Act, The, 3520, 3530
St. John harbour works, 5895
Scientific and industrial research, 3911
Taxation
Business profits, 1436, 1445, 1654
Wealth, 2597
Telegraph and telephones lines, 5400
Tractor engines, duty on, 677
United Grain Growers, Limited, 895
War charities, 5481
War expenditure, 541

New Brunswick Public Works. *See* Public Works

New Carlisle, war expenditure in, 1575

New Glasgow-Mountville mail service, 1037

New Hamburg postmaster, 6053

New Richmond West post office, 898

Newsprint paper, 757, 1464, 1645
See Pulp and paper

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 238
Canada under Conservative rule, 238
Enlistments from Prince Edward Island, 241
Prosperity of Canada, 241, 243
Shipbuilding, 242
The French-Canadian people, 243
Military Service, 3001

Nickerson, W. H., dismissal of, 1472

Nickerson, William C., employment of, 2233

Nickle, Mr. W. F. (Kingston)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 838
Forestry battalions, 3951
Pensions, 1615
Canadian Northern railway acquisition of, 4587
Civil Service salaries, 2250
Industrial and scientific research, 5284
Military Hospitals Commission, 473
Military Service
Classes, 3290
Exemptions, 3203
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale, 4066
Penitentiaries, officials, 6037
Pensions, 6011, 6033
Quebec railways, 5462
Railway Act, The, 3532, 3540, 3604, 3603
Royal Military College, 5310
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1141
Separation allowances, 382
Soldiers, returned, care of, 472
Taxation, income, 4074, 4107
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2611
War charities, 5488
War-time Elections Bill, 5753, 5837

Nixon, Mr. A. W., military position of, 6067

Non-support
See Criminal Code Amendment Bills

North Battleford, government employees, 453

Northrup, Mr. W. B. (East Hastings)
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5497, 5904
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1184
Parliamentary sessions, expense of, 1261, 2524
Racing meets, limitation of, 321

North Sydney customs service, 607, 1852

Northwest Game Bill, The. 1r., 2569. 2r., 3665. Com., 2665, 4659. 3r., 4661

Nova Scotia
Electoral lists, 6068
Judge for district No. 6, 6003
Patrol service, 5423
Public works. *See* Public works

Ocean Telegraph Act Repeal Bill. Res., 2024. 1r., 2026. 2r., 2108. Rep., 2114. 3r., 2137

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C. *See* Food: Investigation

Officers. *See* Army

Ogilvie Flour Mills Co., earnings and taxes of, 198, 1818, 2389, 3677

Oil, bounties, 2329

Oil-boring machinery, 301

Oleomargarine, 304, 2202
Resolution of Montreal Labour Club, 2283

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 67
Our obligations in the war, 68
Recruiting, 69-77
National service, 71
The present Administration and the war, 77
Aliens, homestead rights of, 3808
Army
Allowances, 3079
Enlistment
Alberta, in, 3373, 3375
Retarding of, 2411-2415
Unfit men, of, 4003
See, under this head, Recruiting
Expeditionary force, 1816
Forestry battalions, 3951
Medical service, 3975
Officers, salutes to, 5425
Pensions, 384
Recruiting, 69
Edmonton, in, 366, 3371, 3375
Expenses, 1959
Government, 3371
Unfit men, 3107
United States, in, 3759
See, under this head, Enlistment
Soldiers
Pensions, 1603, 4051
Returned, care of, 474
Separation allowances, 383, 387
Voting of, 4791, 4812, 4892-4914
Widows of, 3806
Binder twine, 2333
British Cattle Supply Company, 1817
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1343, 1525

Oliver, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Canada Year Book, 2337
Canadian Government railways, rolling stock, 4930
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4304, 4505, 4610-4619, 5180
Capital punishment, 630
Cloakey, George, 1819
Coal, western mining of, 2200, 2238, 2525, 2653, 2776
Cold storage, 2259
Conscription, statement in L'Evenement, 434
Customs Tariff Act, proposed amendment, 1685, 1689, 1727, 1776
Dominion Lands officials, 1675
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3793-3812
Drake, steamer, 4245
Edmonton railway bridge, 3892
Edson, town of, 1816
Elevators *See, under this title,* Grain
Experimental stations, 2065
Fiddlers, the. *See, under this title,* "The Fiddlers"
Fisheries, Lac la Biche, 2158
Flour, 5209, 5212
Sales between Canada and United States, 5273
Free food, proposed amendment, 1686
Food control, 2081
Freight rates, 3715
Game in the Northwest, 3665
Government employees, political activity of, 2349
Grain
Board of Supervisors, 3697
Elevators, 2334
Transportation of, 1681, 3396, 3412, 3712
Wheat
Export, prohibition of, 3882
Prices and control, 3690, 4512, 4661, 4687, 4887, 5209, 6000
Grande Prairie immigration hall, 1575
Grey, Ambrose, 1818
Homestead regulations, 1747
Homesteaders, names of, 1819
House of Commons
Estimates, 2359
Sessional indemnity of Members, 6047
Howe, Lt. M. J., 6066
Hudson Bay railway, 5092
Immigration, 1764, 2140, 2148
United States, from, 1747
Indians
Kitsilano reserve, 1899
Lands, 1888
Okanagan reserve, 1378, 2341
Industrial and scientific research, 5280

Oliver, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Inland Revenue Department officials and expenditure, 2362, 2380-2387
Intercolonial railway, rails, 1575
Interior Department employees, 1344, 2349
Live stock
Exchanges, 5508
Improvement of, 2278, 2281
Mail service, 3638
Merritt, Col.—Aviation Fund, 5362
Military service
Authority of Parliament, 2419
Available men, 3371
Burden of proof, 3322
Classes, 3358
Contraventions of Act, 3328, 3351, 3360, 3579
Enforcement, 2416
Exemptions, 3195, 3227, 3234, 3311, 3364
General provisions, 2411, 3238
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 301, 335, 4674
National service, 71, 361, 370, 374, 2413
National Transcontinental railway, 2209, 2218
North Battleford government employees 453
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3938
Oil bounties, 2329
Parliament, extension of term of, 3496
Patriotic Fund, 3079
Penitentiaries—officials' salaries, 6043
Pensions, 6005-6033
Poplar trees, conservation of, 3742
Public buildings
Construction, 4181
Rentals, 4149, 5097
Repairs, 5106, 5304
Telephone service, 4147
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 1575
Railway material, removal of to France, 301, 310, 1473-1474, 1615, 1628, 1820, 3407-3408, 3398, 5293
Railways
Expenditure on, 2233
Operation of, 3412
Transportation of coal by, 3395
Recruiting. *See, under this title,* Army
Rogers, Lt.-Col. Maynard, 1818
Ross rifle, 427, 432, 478, 510
Shore, George, suspension of sentence on, 1373
Soldier Settlement Board, 2780, 3625
Tariff revision, 1776
Taxation, 1677
Income, 4644
Telegraph and telephone lines, 3893, 5389

Oliver, Hon. F.—*Con.*
"The Fiddlers" forbidden circulation, 3503. 3654, 3881, 5942. 5944
War
Charities, 3489
Government, administration of, 3371
Munitions contracts, 5532
War-time Elections Bill, 5553, 5638-5702, 5816
Ways and Means—amendment to motion for second reading of resolutions, 1677
Yukon
Judges' salaries, 5897
Miners' strike, 3086
Prices and cost of living, 2199, 2237, 2481, 2525, 2945

Orangemen. *See* Loyal Orange Order

Ottawa
Government land in, 1130
Rents paid by the Government in, 4149, 5097

Outlook Publishing Company, payments to, 607

Overseas Minister of Munitions. *See* War

Overseas Forces, Minister of the, 5
Non-combatant employees of Department, 4786
See Minister of the Overseas Forces, etc., Bill

Overseas forces. *See* Army.

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Megantic)
Military Service Bill, 2916
Thetford mines labour trouble, 1113

Pacific Dredging Company, 1126

Packages, marking of. *See* Inspection and Sale Act Amendment Bill

Palmerston post office building, 1127

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Lefebvre, Major Alfred, 1037, 2618, 2003
Military service, 2997

Paquet, Mr. Eugène (L'Islet)
Budget, 1297
Union and solidarity of the Canadian people, 1297
The financial position of Canada, 1298
Munitions manufacture, 1299
Development of agriculture, 1300
Food products, imports and exports of, 1573
Immigration, 803
Military service, 2789
Public health, 992
Repatriation of Canadians, 803

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 823
Enlistments, 1125
Medical service, 3971

Pardee, Mr. F. F.—*Con.*
Budget, 1304
Investigation into cost of foodstuffs, 1304
Plea for better Canadianism, 1307
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5136
Drawbacks, payments of, 1818
Food products, control of, 1304
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 452
Home Defence Force, 1038
Judges on provincial commissions, 593
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 1038
Lewis machine guns, 2201
Mackenzie, Lieut. F. J. S., 986
Military service
Exemptions, 3191
Personal attitude respecting, 3721
Persons liable for service, 3127
Tribunals, 3163
National Gallery, 5303
National Service cards, 1376
New Hamburg postmaster, 6053
Parliament, extension of term of, 3481
Pensions, 6007
Post office employees—salaries, 6051, 6053
Returned soldiers, 459
Shipbuilding at Prince Rupert, 4787
Taxation
Income, 4118, 4638
Wealth, 2528
Traction engines, duty on, 680
War-time Elections Act—tribunals, 6070

Paris, Ontario, recruiting in, 601

Parker, Mr. R. G. M., salary and position of, 2201

Parks, Canadian National; Jasper, 1477

Parliament
Adjournment of—Imperial War Conference, 117
Extension of term of, 15, 37, 157, 172, 175, 189, 223, 293, 2396, 3419.
Address to His Majesty the King, 3453, 3475; Div., 3501
Proposed amendment of Mr. Graham, 3461; Div., 3483
Statement by Prime Minister—no action, 3504
Members
Military pay of, 713
Railway transportation for, 3519
Printing of, 2007, 5901
Report of Committee on, 5949
Sessions—expense of
Motion for Committee to consider, 1261
Committee appointed, 1568
Joint action with Senate proposed, 2024
Reports, 2524, 5636

Parliament Buildings
New
Brick for, 337
Construction of, 454, 4181
Marble for, 2833
Stone for, 304
Old—destruction of—indemnities for losses, 4413

Parliamentary Procedure
Adjournment motion for discussion of definite matter of urgent public importance
Discussion closely limited, 1176
When allowable, 5517, 5547
Appeal from ruling of Chairman, 2366
Bills
Discussion on introduction of, 4410
Discussion of subsequent to amendments being reported from Committee, 5771
Printing of in both languages, 5550, 5559
Sections allowed to stand not debatable, 4752
Censored publications, quotation from in Parliament, 5492
Closure
Applied
Canadian Northern Railway Bill, notice, 5121; carried, 5123
War-time Elections Bill. 2r., 5565, 5566. 3r., 5806
Concurrence in resolution of Committee of Supply not debatable, 5095
See Speaker
Rules of debate under, 5002, 5015, 5121, 5123, 5565
Committee of Supply
Application of rule 17c to Saturday sittings of, 5891, 5901
Procedure in discussing items of which votes are made up, 4947
See, under this head, Concurrence
Committee of Ways and Means amendments when in order
Moved, 478
Chairman's ruling, 521
Resolutions from, amendment to second reading must be relevant, 1686
Concurrence in resolution of Committee of Supply—form of notice, 5095
Irrelevancy, 2362, 2374, 5235, 5237
Language reflecting on the Chair, 2567, 2609
Letter read in violation of rules of the House, not printed, 3956
Motions, debatable, 5094
Motion for delay, Speaker's ruling, 3078
Order of business, 5891, 5901

Parliamentary Procedure,—*Con.*
Order of the day lapsed for want of a quorum, reinstatement of, 2877
Orders of the Day—motion to read, 5703
Petitions, form for presentation of, 2284
Privilege—statement of member, how limited, 599
For Privilege, *see that title*
Questions
Answers to, discussions on, 4959
Not in proper form, 4834
Receiving report of Committee of Supply—form of notice, 5095
Saturday sittings, Committe of Supply, how constituted in, 5890
Senate
Regularity of its proceedings not to be questioned in House of Commons, 5498
Taxation measure amended by, 5480, 5883
Sitting of House suspended, 1766
Taxation exclusive rights of House of Commons over, 5480, 5883
Votes and Proceedings, correctness of entry in, Committee to inquire into appointed, 2880. Report of, 2944

Parliamentary Secretaryships, 5
See Minister of the Overseas Forces, etc., Bill

Paspebiac wharf, 898, 988

Paspebiac-Hopetown mail service, 1126

Passports, Atlantic, for women, 3996, 5783

Patenaude, Hon. Esioff L. (Secretary of State)
Post Office Department estimates, 660
Resignation of office, 2199, 2235
Correspondence with Prime Minister, 2494
Secretary of State Department, of the, estimates, 655
Victoria bridge toll rates, 672

Patent medicines, 1470
Classification of, 335
Controller of, resigns, 986
Legislation, inquiry as to proposed, 935
Regulations governing, 3817

Patent Record, printing of, 2062

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund

Patronage. *See* Political

Pay and Records Office, 3104

Payne, Mr., employment of, 5272

Peace
Dominions, consultation with on, 300
Proposals
President Wilson's, 103
Rumoured, 4466

Peat, 1405, 1422

Pelagie Sealing Treaty, claims under, 5958

Penitentaries
Dorchester, 1813
Meat supplies for, 337
Guards, salaries, of, 5803
Kelly, Thomas, treatment of, 1813
See Kelly
Officials, salaries of, 5898, 6033
Portsmouth, 3418
Prisoners
Enlistment of, proposed, 1012, 1814
Labour of, 6036, 6040
Release of, for work on farms, 803
Report of inspector, 3419

Pennsylvania coal, embargo on, 2199

Penny Bank Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1773. 2r., Com., 3r., 2059

Pensions
Military, 1594
Amount required for, 5899
Board of Commissioners and staff, 608, 4176, 4958
Canadian in Imperial forces, for, 4662, 4688
Dependents of soldiers, 4051
Erroneous announcement denied, 5423
European war, 6005
Militiamen, 6004
Patriotic Fund, agents in applications, 382
Proposed bill, 845
Inquiry concerning, 4293
Revision of scale, 5424
Naval, pilots, 6049
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 5704

Perley, Sir George Halsey
Appointment as Minister of the Overseas Forces, 5

Petroleum. *See* Oil

Pictou (County)
Rural mail routes, 900

Pictou (Town)
Contractors for war supplies at, 303
Freight, handling of, at, 303
Marine and Fisheries agency, 304, 596, 1936

Plaxton, Mr. Charles P., position of, 4416

Point Tupper mail service, 3502

Political deadlock, rumoured, 1971

Political meetings, attendance of soldiers at, 4338

Political patronage, 203, 205, 287, 726
Recruiting, in, 86, 97, 154, 162

Pollution of streams, 454

Pommeroy, Mr. Samuel, position of, 4952

Poplar trees, utilization of, 3742

Port Hood wharf, 5336

Port Malcolm wharf, 3866

Post Office
Country postmasters, salaries of, 3634, 3642
Department
Estimates, 660, 2352, 2360, 3633, 5898, 6051
Staff and salaries, 660, 3633, 5898, 6051
Letter carriers, salaries of, 580, 1474, 1805, 2244
Mail carriers, 2243-4, 2708
Mail clerks, French-speaking, 5272
Mail contracts, 3635
Mail matter for soldiers, 3644
Mails, misuse of, 893, 1027
Parcel post, 2072, 3634, 3639
Prisoners of war, to, 3958
Postal clerks salaries, of, 2708, 3639
Railway mail service, 2244, 3650, 4102, 6051
Registration of mail matter, 668
Rural mail service, 3634, 5898
Carriers, 2247, 3634, 3636, 3643
Routes, number of, 2247
Signs, printing of, in French and English, 5999

Potatoes. *See* Agriculture *and* Food products

Power, Mr. William (Quebec, West)
Military Service, 2805

Pratt Brothers, payments to, 1570

Press censorship, 3503, 3654, 3718, 3881, 3995, 4059

Prices, fixing of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills, Food *and* Cold storage

Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 2205, 2304
See also Steamship services
Enlistments from, 241, 4563
Freight, handling of, 1037
Military organization, 5422
Payments to under Agricultural Instruction Act, 455
Public works. *See that title*
Steamship service, 660, 3389

Prince Edward Island Railway. *See* Canadian Government railways

Prince Rupert, shipbuilding at, 4787

Princess Louise Fusiliers, 5271

Printing, Government, 3737

Prison Labour, utilization of, 6036, 6040

Prisoners. *See* Penitentaries *and* War

Private Bills, discussed
Aerial League of the British Empire, 3633
Alliance Nationale, 1547
Bishop of Mackenzie River, 868
Breidert and Mudge Patents, 1199
Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers, 1198
Cascade Scenic Railway Company, 4365
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5496, 5541, 5902
Grain Growers Grain Co., Ltd., 1110
Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, 1373
Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire and the Children of the Empire (Junior Branch), 5495
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Co., 1110
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2590, 2609, 3865, 3955, 3980
United Grain Growers Limited, 893

Privilege, questions of
Barrette, Mr.—statement in Halifax Chronicle, 3352
Blondin, Hon. P. E.—statement in Ottawa Evening Journal, 339
Boulay, Mr.—statement in Ottawa Citizen, 2776
Bureau, Mr.—statements in Montreal Gazette, 2709, 4730
Burnham, Mr.—correction of remarks in Hansard, 869
Clark, Mr. Michael—statements in the press, 3617
Descarries, Mr.—vote on Military Service Bill, 3846
Graham, Mr.—statement of Mr. R. B. Bennett, 804, 869
Hazen, Mr.—statement by Mr. Pugsley, 5274
Hughes, Sir Sam
Statement of Mr. Mark Irish, 2707
Statement of Mr. A. K. Maclean, 2777
Statement of Mr. Currie, 5773
Knowles, Mr.—statement in Toronto Telegram, 5085
Lafortune, Mr.—Ottawa Journal-Press, 3085
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—statement of Sir Clifford Sifton, 4009
MacNutt, Mr.—Ottawa Journal-Press, 3656
Mondou, Mr.—statement in Montreal Gazette, 3004
Neely, Mr.—statement by Sir Clifford Sifton, 5774
Oliver, Hon. Frank—statement in L'Evenement, 434
Pugsley, Hon. William
Mr. Justice Landry, 3109
Statements of the Prime Minister, 3609

Privilege, question of—*Con.*
Statement in Toronto Star, 4959
Newspaper reports, 5273
Rogers, Hon. Robert—Ottawa Citizen editorial, 599
Sévigny, Hon. Albert—statement in Montreal Gazette, 2058
Sinclair, Mr.—statements in Ottawa Journal, 4927
Taylor, Mr. J. D.—remarks of Mr. Thomson, 1370
White, Sir Thomas—Toronto Globe editorial, 2707
Wilcox, Mr.—statement in Toronto Globe, 47

Prohibition or Restriction of the sale and use of Intoxicating Liquors Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 4192. 2r., com., 4395. 3r., 4405. *See also* Intoxicating liquors, Canada Temperance Act *and* Provincial prohibitory legislation

Proportional representation, 902

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Boyce, George H., 1472
Canadian Association of Returned Soldiers, 4951
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5075
Cox, John, 1472
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4305
Customs Department, motor car for, 1476
Dillon, Major G. P., 1958
Georgian Bay Canal Commission, 5913
Gibson, Lieut. Wm., 5422
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1179
Grilse, steamer, 4563
Hants county apple inspectors, 1380
Harris, Capt. R. V., 5422
Hughes, Brig.-Gen. W. S., 5361
Interprovincial bridges, 3890
Jaffray, Mr. J. P., 4062
Knight, Mr. N. H. R., 4952
Laurentian, steamer, 4563
Macpherson, Capt. Kenneth C., 4292, 4416, 4685
Magladery, Mr. Thomas, 4685
Military service, 3056
Exceptions, 3563
Exemptions, 3189, 3192, 3366
Militia Department automobiles, 3903
National Organization for War, 4685
Nixon, Mr. A. W., 6067
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4431, 4449
Pensions, 6005
Quebec railways, 5474
Salter, R. J., 1472
Senate, the, proposed change in constitution of, 1144

Proulx, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Spence, Andrew, 1472
Steamer C. E. Tanner, 5362
Taylor, Lt.-Col. J. D. M.P., 986
Tremain, Lieut.-Col. H. B., M.P., 608, 1472
War supplies—hay, 338
War-time Elections Bill, 5623, 5669, 5829
Webb, Lieutenant, 4563
Wood, Lieutenant, 4563

Provincial governments, duties payable by, 2119, 2129

Provincial prohibitory legislation. Bill in aid of, 1r., 4192; 2r. and Com., 4395; 3r., 4405; Senate amendments, 5514
See also Intoxicating liquors, Prohibition *and* Canada Temperance Act

Public health, proposed department of, 992

Public Service Committee, recommendations of, 3633

Public Service Loan Bill. Res., 242. 1r., 353. 2r., 435. Com., 435. 3r., 476

Public Works
Buildings
Alberta, 5312
British Columbia, 1126, 5312
Generally, 4147, 5314
Manitoba, 5311
Nova Scotia, 4145
Ontario, 4146, 5309, 5412. *See* Ottawa
Quebec, 1935, 4145, 5309
Saskatchewan, 4146, 5312
Department
Automobile, purchase of, 2480
Estimates, 652, 1935, 3867, 3882, 4145, 4181, 5096, 5304, 5314, 5362
Staff and salaries, 3893, 5104
Dredging
British Columbia, 5359
Dredge Cape Breton, loss of, 596, 668, 1024, 3881
Dredge No. 6, 5404
Generally, 5096
Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 3887
Maritime Provinces, 5359
Ontario and Quebec, 3886, 5359
See, under this title, Harbours and Rivers
Dry docks. *See* Dry Docks Subsidies Act Amendment Bill
Expenditure 1916-17, 1038
Harbours and Rivers
British Columbia, 3885, 5304, 5357
Manitoba, 5356
New Brunswick, 3872, 4185, 5347, 5411, 5890
Nova Scotia, 3866, 5314

Public Works—*Con.*
Ontario, 3883, 5355
Prince Edward Island, 3871
Quebec, 3879, 5353
See Quebec Harbour Advances Bill
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 3884
See, under this title, Dredging
Roads and bridges, 3888, 5360
Wharves, 1943

Publication Committee, 5791

Pugsley, Hon. William (St. John City)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 286
The political situation, 286
Returned soldiers and political patronage, 287
Administration of military affairs under late Minister of Militia, 287
Utilization of our natural resources, 291
Shipbuilding, 292
The Dorchester campaign, 293
Canada's naval policies, 293
Extension of term of Parliament, 293
Imperial War Conference, 294
Army
Desertions, 3111
Discharges, purchase of, 3112
Enlistments, 2647
Soldiers
Returned, employment of, 3846, 6057
Voting of, 2651, 4689-4736, 4740-4786, 4808-4834, 4874-4887, 4889-4914
165th Regiment, 1725
Bathurst harbour improvements, 3872
Budget, 863, 870
Trade conditions, 863
Free wheat, 864, 870
The Minister of Inland Revenue, 879
Amendment of Mr. Turriff, 881
Canadian Government railways
Branch lines, 2228, 2232
Cars for, 4928
Employees, promotion of, 762
Intercolonial railway
Coal, freight rates on, 3511
Maritime Express service, 8
Passenger service, 2207
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4230, 4248, 4486, 4837, 4990-5015, 5108
Capital punishment, 631
Civil servants, enlisted—pay and separation allowances, 664, 2252
Civil Service
Officials, proposed dismissal of, 3633
Salaries, 1791, 2012

Pugsley, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Coal
Prices and supply, 665, 2092
Maritime Provinces, in, 4063, 5085
Transportation of, 4138
Coastal regulations, 1912
Conscription, 1555
United States citizens, of, 1743
Criminal Code amendments, jurors, 4293, 4334
Customs, duties payable by provincial governments, 2121, 2133
Daylight saving, 2945
Divorced persons, re-marriage of, 46, 1383, 1524
Dominion Lands Act Amendment, 3796
Dredging, 5096
Drill halls, control of, 4146
Dry docks, 4455, 5772, 5888, 5917
Fish and fisheries
Licenses, 2150
Lobsters, 4171
Sardine fisheries, 4168
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
Food control, 2091
Free wheat, 864, 870
Fuel, 1421
Game in the Northwest, 3670
Grosse Isle quarantine station, 5306
Hansard, correction of statement in, 6067
Members' sessional indemnity, 6048
Morning sittings, 2619
Stenographers, 5788
Hudson Bay railway, 5086
Immigration, 2141, 2146
Imperial Munitions Board, imports, 1978
Imperial War Conference, visit of Prime Minister to, 1551
Indian lands, 1908
Insurance, 3849, 3864, 4138, 5198
Landry, Mr. Justice, findings of, 3109, 3609, 5265
See under this title, McLeod-Tellier
Lighthouse keepers' salaries, 6049
Live stock exchanges, 5504
Loans to farmers, 1962
Loans, public ($100,000,000), 342
Mail contracts, 3635
McLeod-Tellier Commission, 5245, 5265
See under this title, Landry, Mr. Justice
Military Service, 2642, 3254
Appeals, 3175, 3181
Classes, 3144, 3287
Definitions, 3111
Enforcement, 2651
Enlistments, voluntary, 2647
Exemptions, 3209, 3213

Pugsley, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Militia Act, 2643
Persons liable for service, 3123
Referendum, 2651
Soldiers, voting of, 2651
Tribunals, 3164, 3574
National Service Commission, remuneration to officials of, 309, 457
Newspaper reports, correction of, 5273
Order of the day, reinstatement of, 2877
Ottawa public buildings
Rents paid by Government, 4149, 5097
Telephone service, 4147
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4446
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale,—4065
Parcel post, 2072
Parliament, extension of term of, 3468, 3475
Parliamentary secretaryships, 4452
Peace proposals, 300
Potatoes, removal of duty on, 703
Provincial legislators, free transportation for, 684
Public Works Department
Estimates and expenditure, 3871, 5414, 5306, 5413
Quebec, railways, operating expenses of, 5452
Railway Act, The, 606
Railways, material for use in France, 1826
St. John harbour improvements, 3875, 5349, 5413
Shipbuilding, 665, 703, 1371, 1551, 1775, 1912-1928, 2293, 5432-5452
Soldier Settlement Board, 3618
Steamship services, 2292
Supply, voting one-sixth for 1917-18, 2946
Supreme Court, allowances to Chief Justice, 6050
Taxation
Business profits, 1636
Income, 4089
Wealth, 3471, 3475
Telegraph and telephone service, 5364, 5401
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2616
Toronto News, statement of, 4959
Vancouver harbour improvement, 5304
Volunteers to operate trains in France, position of, 5123
War charities, 5482
War supplies
Munitions, 5527
Ross Rifle, 501
War-time Elections Bill, 5629, 5640, 5657, 5751-5771

Pugsley, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Wealth, conscription of, 3471, 3475
Woman suffrage, 309, 672, 759, 1482, **1521**, 1594 1627, 4958
Pugsley, Lieut. J. A., position of, 4895
Pulp and paper
Newsprint, fixing of price of, 1302
Quarantine service, 3756
Quebec (City)
Firearms in hardware stores, 5083
Harbour master, 897
Immigration agents, 5122
Quebec (Province)
Bridges, 3889
Electoral lists, 6002
Judges' salaries, 5798
Military districts Nos. 3 and 10, 455
Public Works. *See that title*
Recruiting in, 94, 112, 119, 127, 147, 160, 185, 213, 221, 342, 363, 2398, 2424, 2515
Officers, recruiting of, 3135
See Military Service Bill *and* French Canadian
Quebec Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway, completion and operation of, 4948, 5452
Quebec and Oriental railway, 1674
Quebec and Saguenay railway
Bondholders, 669
Completion and operation of, 303, 668, 1575, 4948, 5452
Expenditure, 1658
Legislation concerning, proposed, 458
Quebec Harbour Advances Bill. Res., 435. 1r., 438. 2r., 577. Com., 577. 3r., 578
Quebec Harbour Commission, 436
Racing Form, The, exclusion from mails of, 306, 336, 896
Racing meets, limitation of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bills
Radiotelegraph service. *See* Telegraphs, *also* Ocean Telegraph Act
Railway Act Amendment Bills
1. Bill No. 13, Mr. Cochrane, general. 1r., 194; 2r., 602; special committee, 602; motion to amend, stands, 605; com., 3420, 3511, 3592, 3716; 3r., 3740
2. Bill No. 18, Mr. McCraney, free transportation for provincial legislators. 1r., 300. 2r., 685. Ref. to Railway Com., 685
Railway Commission, 1862, 3407
Railway mail clerks. *See* Post office
Railways
Alleged advance to Company, 2100
Bridges, 3889
Railways—*Con.*
Cattle getting on tracks, 3549
Coal
Confiscation of, by, 584
Handling of, by, 3395, 3402
Constables, 3599
Employees, payment of salaries of, 5956
Expenditure on, 2233
Fires from locomotives, 3552, 3602
French language, printing of literature in, 3511
Material, removal of to France, 310, 335, 1229, 1266, 1372, 1473, 1474, 1615, 1628, 1690, 1820, 3407, 3409, 5293
Overdue trains, notice of, 3594
Situation, 2219, 2221, 4011, 4058, 4217, 4247, 4467, 4512, 4566, 4622, 4835
Cost of inquiry into, 3408
Traffic, congestion of, 587
For Canadian Government railways, see that title
For individual railways, see their titles
Railways and Canals
Department
Estimates, staff and salaries, 2202, 3385, 3402, 4925, 4928, 5428
Steamers purchased by, 669
Rainbow, His Majesty's Canadian Ship, 457, 1472
See Naval Service
Rainville, Mr. Joseph H. (Deputy Speaker)
Emigration to the United States, 3285
Military service
Classes, 3285
Exemptions, 3189, 3194, 3213
Farmers, of, 6002
See Deputy Speaker
Ralston, Major J. L., position and pay of, 6067
Rankin, Captain Ramsay, position of, 987
Recruiting. *See* Army
For recruiting by localities, see names of localities
Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)
Canadian Government railways
Intercolonial, management of, 769
Passenger service, 2207
Promotion of employees, 769
Quebec, 4948, 5452, 5458
Civil Service appointments, 644, 1023
Coal, confiscation of by railways, 585
Customs
Crown goods, duties payable on, 1978-1985, 2119
Departmental estimates, staff and salaries, 643, 1843, 1881, 5098, 5777
Disposal of unclaimed goods, 3743

Reid, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Imperial Munitions Board imports, 1978
Montreal collectorship, 648
Revenue cruisers, 1882
Dredging, 5096
Dry docks, 5771
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
House of Commons—sessional indemnity of Members, 6047
Naval Service Department estimates, 660
Pensions, 6004, 6533
Public Works Department estimates, 5104, 5304, 5314, 5362
Railway Act Amendment Bills, 5997
Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 440
Shipbuilding, 5440, 5453
Spittal, Major, dismissal of, 646, 651
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5362
Reid, Lance Corporal, allowances to, 717
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2361
Repatriation of Canadians, 803
Research Council Bill. 1r., 2357. 2r., 3905. Com., 3909. 3r., 3957
Restigouche river, bridging of, 988
Returns, complaints of delay in bringing down, 1373
Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. (Cumberland). *See* Speaker
Richmond county medical officers, 3758
Rideau canal
Lighting of, 1939
Pretoria Avenue bridge, 4926
Rimouski
Medical officers, 4509
Public works engineer, 4244
Recruiting officers, 456
Riou, Mr. C. S., payments to, 3904
Riviere du Loup-Tadoussac ferry, 452, 2358
Riviere Ouelle-Murray bay steamship service, 643
Robb, Mr. James A. (Huntingdon)
Bags, duty on, 1867-1881
Bran and middlings, duty on, 1867-1881
Budget, 969, 1317, 1319
Tariff changes, 969, 971
Free wheat, 970
Duty on mill feeds, 971
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5055
Farm labour, 3509
Free wheat, 970
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1182
Harbour facilities, 4190
Live stock exchanges, 5507
National Transcontinental freight rates, 3394
Rural mail service, 3641
Taxation—income, 4106
Robb, P. A., employment of, 1572
Robidoux, Mr. Ferdinand J. (Kent, N.B.)
Military service, 2703
Authority of Parliament, 2703
Enlistment in Quebec, 2704
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5380
Robinson, Captain J. T., appointment of, 1377
Roche, Hon. W. J. (Minister of the Interior)
Agricultural labourers from the United States, 1194
British Columbia Indian Commission, 653
Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bill, 159, 2832, 3793-3817
Farm labour, 3507
Frank, Alta., moving of residences at, 4919
French-Canadians in the United States, 4914
Game in the Northwest, 3665, 4659
Homestead regulations, 1741, 1747
Immigration
Agents, 1738
Chinese, 843, 2139
Department estimates, 4914
Regulations, 449, 525
Indians, 2340, 2349
Department estimates, 1886
Sydney reserve, 3663
See Indians
Interior Department
Employees, political activities of, 2350
Estimates, 652, 1344, 1735
French-speaking employees of, 2341
Orders in Council relating to, 6000
Migratory birds, 2525, 3657
Seed grain collections, 2352
Soldier Settlement Act, administration of, 4917
Soldier Settlement Board, 686, 1157, 2653, 3618, 3779
Surveys, 1345, 1735
United States' head tax on Canadians, 892
Rogers, Lt.-Col. Maynard, salary of, 1818
Rogers, Hon. Robert (Minister of Public Works)
Dry docks, 4456, 5915
Ottawa Citizen, statement of, 599
Public works
Buildings, 4145, 4181
Department: estimates, staff and salaries,, 3866, 3882, 3893, 4145, 4181, 5104
Harbours and rivers, 3866, 3882, 4187
Roads and bridges, 3888
Resignation from the Cabinet, 4736
Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Army
Officers, surplus, 3104
Soldiers, votes for, 1393
Substitutes, buying of, 3113

Ross, Mr. D. C.—*Con.*
Food control, 3045
Assistants to Food Controller, 4244
Industrial and scientific research, 5284
Military service, 3041
Army Act regulations, 3113
Exemptions, 3224
Persons liable for service, 3126
Tribunals, 3170
Taxation
Income, 4652
Wealth, 3045
Unclaimed bank balances, 1001
War supplies, horses, 453
War-time Elections Bill, 5677, 5687
William Davies Co., 4151

Ross rifle. *See* War supplies

Rouville county mail carrier, 608

Roy, Judge L. R., payments to, 1130

Royal Assent, The, 603, 3766, 5084

Royal Astronomical Society of Canada, 5304

Royal Military College, 5310

Royal Mint, Ottawa branch, 1474

Royal Naval College, 4163

Royal Northwest Mounted Police
Pensions, 5704
Salaries and contingencies, 4147
Saskatchewan and Alberta, duties in, 301, 335
Subsistence, etc., 4667

Ruisseau le Blanc breakwater, 898

Russell, Mr. T. A., purchase of motor trucks by, 266, 280

Salt. *See* Fish

Salter, R. J., payments to, 1472

Sand Point wharf, 5316

Sauve, Pte. James, application of for pension, 5776

Savings banks, deposits in, 4685

St. Charles de Caplan wharf, 898

St. Charles river dam, 2525

St. Jerome post office, 899

St. John and Quebec Railway Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2433. 2r., Com., 3r., 3401

St. John harbour improvements, 3875, 4185, 5347, 5411, 5890

St. Lawrence Flour Mills Company, Government contracts with, 4509

Sainte Luce. Changing of name, 673

St. Maurice river improvements, 1381

St. Peter's canal, 3406

St. Pierre-Miquelon mail service, 3649

St. Roch Traverse lightkeeper, 1378

St. Romuald public works, 1129

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)
Army, enlistment of unfit men, 4004
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5061
Cattle, British embargo on, 918
Civil Service, 2246
Daylight saving, 3683
Flour prices, 5214
Grain, rust in, 2067
Military service, exemptions, 3365
Ottawa public buildings, 4150
Public health, 1001
Rural mail carriers, 2247
Taxation
Farm implements, 1713
Income, 4096

Schaffner, Mr. L. P., dismissal of, 438

School lands, western, 1378

Scientific and Industrial research. *See* Research Council Bill

Scotch Hill post office, 3649

Scout, motor boat, 5271

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Budget, 884
Canada and the war, 885
Free wheat, 885
Present prosperity, 886

Secretary of State, Department of the, estimates, 655, 3737, 5242

Security Life Insurance Company Bill. 1r., 2479. 2r., 2592. Com., 3r., 2857

Seed grain, 302, 303, 305
See Grain

Seguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption)
Enlistments, 1476, 1572
Military Service Bill, 2765

Senate
Appointments to, 924
Hansard, cost of, 1571
Proposed change in constitution of, 1131
Taxation measures, precedent in amendment denied, 5480, 5883

Sévigny, Hon. Albert (Minister of Inland Revenue)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 837
Inland Revenue Department
Estimates, 2360, 3817
Expenditure, 2379
Military service, 2636
Exceptions, 3572
Quebec, recruiting in, 2638, 3256

Sévigny, Hon. A.—*Con.*
Privilege—statement concerning effects removed from Speaker's chambers after Parliament Buildings fire, 2058
Renault, Raoul, appointment of, 2361
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5385, 5391

Sexsmith, Mr. John A. (East Peterborough)
Agriculture and Colonization, report of Committee, 1956
Railway Act, The, 3443, 3543, 3546, 3605
Telegraphs and telephones, 3543, 3546

Shaw, F. D., dismissal of, 1847

Sherbrooke exhibition grounds, 302

Shigawake post office, 898

Shigawake East post office, 988

Shipbuilding
British Government, for, 4164
Canadian-built ships, 591
Prince Rupert, at, 4787
Railway Department, for, 4939, 5429
See Marine

Shipping. *See* Marine *and* Transportation

Shore, George, suspension of sentence on, 1373

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 150
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 150
The winning of the war, 151
Canadian soldiers at the front, 152
Military record of the Government, 152
The Ross rifle, 154
Political patronage, 154
Commandeering of ships, 155
Small arms ammunition, 156
Extension of term of Parliament, 157
Army
Casualties, July, 1917, 4151
Enlistments, July, 1917, 4151
Medical service, 3969
Officers, surplus of, 3102
Recruiting, 2884
Soldiers, age of on enlisting, 4001
Canada Temperance Act, 5243
Canadian Government railways, ice for, 301
See, under this title, Intercolonial
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4600, 4872, 5061
Civil servants, enlisted, pay and separation allowances to, 663
Civil Service, 649
Appointments under sec. 21, 607, 1023, 1351, 1937
Coalition government, 2887
Customs Department staff, and expenditure, 649, 1845

Sinclair, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Dredges, 668, 1025, 5405
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2152
Bounties, 457
Development of industry, 2040
Exports, 454
Investigation of problems, 5288
Laws, violation of, 2389
Lobsters, packing of, 5427
Marketing, 2042
Salt, 1027, 2044, 2290
Telephone method, 2176
Transportation, 3392, 4933
Trawlers, 300
Food inspectors, 607
Government Railways Act amendment, 4371
Grain, seed, 4680
Guysborough public building, 5914
Heatherton mail contract, 1817
High cost of living, 707
Hudson Bay railway expenditure, 596
Immigration regulations, 312, 525
Inland Revenue Department officials, 758
Intercolonial railway
Appointment of officials, 658
Branch lines, 3386
Tracadie siding, 2618
Intoxicating liquors, prosecutions for sale of, 1575
Manitoba County Court judges,, 5083
Margaree harbour improvements, 5332
McCutcheon, Stanley, dismissal of, 306
Migratory birds, 3661
Military District No. 6, 5236
Military service
Appeals, 3179
Classes, 3141
Referendum, 2881
Tribunals, 3157
Military Voters' Bill, 4694, 4726, 4728, 4758-4786
Navigation, training in, 1839
Nickerson, W. H., 1472
Nova Scotia judges, 6003
Ottawa Journal, statement in, 4927
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4445
Parliament, extension of term of, 157
Pensions, 6030
Political patronage, 154
Pollution of streams, 454
Public Works Department estimates, 3863, 3874
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 668
Quebec harbour advances, 437
Railway Act, The, 3526, 3529
Railway Commission, appeals from, 1863
Rainbow, steamship, 1472

Sinclair, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Returns, delay in bringing down of, 1373
Ross rifle, 154, 425, 451
Rural mail service, 5898
St. John harbour works, 5896
Salt for fish curing, 1027, 2290
Sand Point wharf, 5316
Savings banks deposits, 4685
Shipbuilding, 1671, 1923, 5434, 5452
Small arms ammunition, 156, 2480
Soldiers, returned, appointment of, 6059
Soldier's Cove wharf, 5337
Sonora preventive officers, 4244
Steam trawlers, 300
Steamship services, 2288, 2300
Steele, Arthur, dismissal of, 338
Submarine situation, 1328
Superannuation payments, 595
Technical education, 1247
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5371
Toronto water-borne traffic, 454
Tracadie Inland Revenue officer, 1817
War-time Elections Bill, 5567, 6081
Welland canal, 3404
Wells, Clarence, 2480
White, N. W., payments to, 1038
Whitehead life saving station, 1469

Small Arms Ammunition. *See* War supplies

Smith, Pte. J. I., discharge of, 3418

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Army, casualties, 2201
Cattle, British embargo on, 923
National Service cards, 2479
Railway Act, The, 3442

Smith's Falls postmaster, 1570

Soldiers. *See* Army

Soldiers' Settlement Board
Advances to soldiers, 4918
Commissioners, 4917

Soldier Settlement Board Bill. Res., 1157, 2653, 3618. 1r., 3630. 2r., 3779. 3r., 3792

Sonora preventive officers, 4244

Sorel, strike at, 1912, 1935

South African War—Canadian contingent, 2200

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes), rulings and statements of
Adjournment motions, when in order, 5517, 5547
Amendments ruled out not subsequently debatable, 1686
Bills
Not debatable in detail on motion for leave to introduce, 4410
Printing of in both languages, 5550

Speaker—*Con.*
Censored publications, quotations from in Parliament, 5944
Closure
Bill reported amended, amendments not debatable; Rule 17A overrides Rule 56, 5771
Concurrence in resolution of Committee of Supply not debatable, 5095
Crown property, Bills to dispose of, must have Crown's consent, for third reading, 1157
Flint, Dr., retirement of, 6044
House of Commons
Estimates, 2359, 5784
Officials, 5786
Interjections, 2596
Irrelevancy, 444, 5478
Language reflecting on the Chair to be withdrawn, 2567
Letters from persons outside referring to House proceedings not to be quoted, 3956
Member must take his seat when Speaker addresses House, 4410
Motions dealing with questions already before House, 1017, 1022, 1150
Motions, irregular
Repetition of matters disposed of, 1867
Substantial repetition of notice of motion standing on order paper, 1490, 1508, 1523
Taxation, to levy, without recommendation by the Crown, 3078, 4648
Order of the day, reinstatement of, 2878, 2880
Orders of the Day, on, extended remarks irregular, 665, 804
Petitions, form for presentation of, 2284
Privilege, statements under to be confined to denial of matters complained of, 599, 3612, 3614, 3616
Questions and answers
Answers not debatable, 4959
Questions not to contain allegation of fact or inuendo, 4834
Quorum, absence of, 2877
Reply, privilege of, confined to mover of substantive motion, 1880
Order of speakers varied by unanimous consent, 1015
Rules, lenient interpretation not to establish a precedent, 3078
Saturday sittings, Committee of Supply, how constituted (Rule 17C), 5891
Senate proceedings, regularity of not to be questioned in House, 5498

Speaker—*Con.*
Taxation, amendment by Senate of a Bill; rights of House to be reserved by special declaration, 5480, 5883
Unanimous consent; change in order of Speakers permitted, 1015
Unparliamentary expressions
"A man who was ashamed, Sir, of what he was doing," 5587
"Vile motives," 4313
Votes and Proceedings, error, not immediately discovered, referred to special committee, 2880
Ways and Means, amendment to second reading of resolution reported from Committee must be relevant, 1686
See also Deputy Speaker *and* Parliamentary procedure

Spence, Andrew, position of, 1472

Spittal, Lt.-Col. C. D., dismissal of, 645, 651, 1127

Spotten, Judge, 1127

Stanfield, Mr. John (Colchester)
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 823
Medical service, 3984
Government railways, promotion of employees, 765

Stayner public building, 5412

Steamers utilized by British Government, the C. E. Tanner, 5362

Steamship services
Australia and New Zealand, 2285
Canada
British Columbia, 2299
Magdalen Islands, 2302, 2326
New Brunswick, 2292, 2297, 2323
Nova Scotia, 2286, 2299, 2300, 2304, 2319
Prince Edward Island, 2303, 2319, 3389, 3945
Quebec, 2299, 2318, 2325
China and Japan, 2298
France, 2307
Great Britain, 2285, 2291, 2297
Ireland, 2292
Newfoundland, 2286, 2291
South Africa, 2291
South America, 2287
United States, 2299
West Indies, 2287
See also Transportation

Steam trawlers. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Steele, Arthur, dismissal of, 338

Steele, General, appointment of, 264

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Aerial League of the British Empire, 3633
Alcohol, on charge to medical stores, loss of, 2776
Army, soldiers, voting of, 1383, 4825
Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers, 1198
Cheese purchases, 2258
Coal, shortage of, 83
Cold storage, 2079
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5496
Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, 5495
Public health, proposed department of, 992
Railway Act, The, 3442, 3452
Scientific and industrial research, 3909

Stefansson expedition, 4173

Stellarton, N.S.
Postmaster, 669, 897, 3758
Public building, 4951

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 62
Our troops at the front, 62
Reply to criticisms of Mr. Macdonald, 62
The Ross rifle, 63
National Service Commission, 64
The smelting and refining of ores, 66
Care of returned soldiers, 67
Army, soldiers, voting of, 4749
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 4965
Enlistment, 2421-2428
Fisheries, proposed ministry of, 2029
Grain for breweries and distilleries, 1182
Indians, Kitsilano Reserve, 1902
Military Service, 2421
Enlistment, interference with, 2421
Labour's attitude, 2426
Quebec's attitude, 2424, 2428
Referendum, 2427
National Service Commission, 64
Ross rifle, 63
Shipbuilding, 5445
Telephone lines, 5402
Wealth, conscription of, 2427
Woman suffrage, 1522

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (West Hamilton)
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2590, 2609, 3865, 3955, 3980
Tractor engines, duty on, 680

Submarine situation, 1320

Sulphur, United States embargo on export of, 4889

Superannuation payments, 595

Supply Bill. *See* Appropriation Act

Supply, committee of, 353, 578-584, 643-663, 1112-1124, 1166-1176, 1344-1361, 1735-1766, 1790-1815, 1835-1862, 1881-1912, 1912-1956, 1989-2006, 2061-2099, 2149-2183, 2202-2235, 2255-2282, 2285-2320, 2323-2364, 2359-2388, 3385-3399, 3402-3417, 3633-3654, 3687-3716, 3737-3740, 3740-3757, 3817-3844, 3866-3881, 3882-3902, 3949-3955, 3962-3979, 3980-4008, 4044-4058, 4145-4150, 4157-4191, 4666-4684, 4914-4926, 4928-4951, 5098-5108, 5205-5242, 5242- 5270, 5275-5314, 5314-5360, 5362-5415, 5428-5474, 5777-5805, 5890, 5892-5900, 5948, 5997, 6004-6060
For details see titles of departments and subjects

Supreme Court Act and Exchequer Court Act amendment Bill. 1r., 2568; 2r., Com., 3r., 3630

Surveys, 1345, 1357
Astronomical, 4917
Generally, 1345, 1357, 3898
Geological, 4179
Hydrographic, 4173
Indian Lands, 1894
International, 1735

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Army camps, sale of liquor in, 829
Coalition government, 2690
Flour, price of, 1080
Live stock purchases, 2280
Military service, 2682
Classes, 3282
Quebec, recruiting in, 2685
Referendum, 2692
Railway Act, The, 3545, 3547
Railways, government operation of, 2234
Rural mail carriers, 3636
Soldier Settlement Board, 3786
Soldiers, behaviour of, 5234
Soldiers, votes for, 1395
Telegraphs and telephones, 3545
War-time Elections Bill, 5685, 5860
Women Suffrage, 1477

Swiss Army manoeuvres, attendance of Canadian officers at, 5219

Sydney
Harbour improvements, 5342
Industrial sites, 3956

Tanner, C. E., Steamer or Motor Boat, 5362

Tariff. *See* Customs *and* Customs Tariff Act

Taxation. Senate amendment of taxation measure no precedent, 5476
Special
Business profits, 719, 727, 737, 745, 750, 959, 965, 1432, 1437, 1447, 1628, 2107
Comparative statement, 2508
Cost of collecting, 4686

Taxation—*Con.*
Returns of business concern, 4245
See Wealth, Conscription of
Income, 719, 738, 1424, 1441, 1631, 1687, 3760, 3767, 4070, 4102, 4124, 4638
Cost of collecting estimated, 4686
See also Income War Tax Bill
Land, 1630
Hudson's Bay Co., lands, 986
Patent medicines, 363
Use made of funds obtained by, 4177
Wealth, 2453, 2469, 2508, 2528, 2576, 2587, 2597, 2608, 2671, 2728, 2859, 3045
See Wealth, Conscription of

Taylor, Mr. James D. (New Westminster)
Army
Medical service, 3981
Non-commissioned officers, 1608, 3999
Officers, employment of, 565
Recruiting, 565
Soldiers
Pensions, 1607
Voting of, 4703, 4757-4786
Fraser river dredging, 5357
Hindu immigration, 2145
Military service, 3145, 3275
Thomson, Mr. Levi, reply to statement of, 1370,

Taylor, Lt.-Col. J. D., M.P., payments to, 986

Technical Education, 1229
See Industrial and Scientific Research.

Telegraphs, telephones and radiotelegraphs
Government lines
Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3892, 5393
British Columbia, 3893, 5365, 5395, 5410
Manitoba, 5411
Magdalen Islands cable, 5407
New Brunswick, 5379
Nova Scotia, 5362
Prince Edward Island, 5407, 5411
Quebec, 5384
Telephones for, 4147
Ocean service, 2024, 2108
Provisions governing, 3542, 3546
Radiotelegraph service, 4159
Subsidies, 3892
West India cable, 2339

Temiscouata mail contract, 335

"The Fiddlers," circulation of forbidden, 3503, 3654, 3718, 3881, 3955, 4059, 5942

Thetford Mines, labour trouble at, 590, 606, 1113

Thoburn, Mr. William (North Lanark)
Gordon Divorce Bill, 5909
Military service, 3358
Postmasters, salaries of, 3642
Technical education, 1238

Thompson, Mr., of Winnipeg, employment of, 4008

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Game in the Northwest, 3668
Yukon, cost of living in, 2571

Thompson, Dr. Alfred, M.P., employment and salary of, 5083

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Army, soldiers' pay, 3216
Budget, 976
The duty on farm machinery, 977
Inequalities in the tariff, 979
Free wheat, 982
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5143
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3811
Free wheat, 982
Military service, 2993
Exemptions, 3193, 3225
Railway transportation for Members of Parliament, 3521, 3523
Soldier Settlement Board, 3629

Thornton, Mr. Charles J. (Durham)
Packages, marking of,—inspection and sale,—4066
Railway Act, The, 3544
Telegraphs and telephones, 3544

Three Rivers
Harbour improvements, 3879
Public buildings, 662

Titus, Private John, 2237

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Bromptonville postmaster, 1129
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5052
Horses for war purposes, 1120
Military service, 2810
Militia Department motor cars, 2525
Ross rifle, 2054
Telegraph and telephone lines, 5388
Wool, exportation of, 1130

Toronto water-borne traffic, 454

Tracadie
Inland Revenue officer, 1817
Railway siding, 2618

Tractor engines, duty on, 674

Trade and Commerce
Agents and commissioners, 2326
Department of
Estimates, 1835, 2285, 2323, 3687, 3737, 5205, 5275
Publications, 5275
Foreign trade
France, 597, 2307
South America, 2331

Transportation
West Indies, 2288
Coal, of, vessels for, 4791
Grain, 3712
Lake and ocean freight rates, 3715
Legislators, for, 4935
Problems, report of Royal Commission on, 1012
Terminal facilities, 4189
See also Marine, Railways, Shipbuilding, *and* Steamship Services

Tremain, Lieut.-Col. H. B., M.P., pay and allowances to, 608, 1472

Trent canal, 759, 2206, 3405, 3417

Trenton, N.S., contractors for war supplies at, 303

Truax, Mr. R. E. (South Bruce)
Brampton-Palestine mail route, 590
Military Service Bill, 3048
Royal Mint, Ottawa branch, 1474

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore (Gloucester)
Army—dental corps, 4008
Budget, 1108, 1194, 1201
Government railways, 1108
Canada's prosperity, 1195
Taxation, 1197, 1201
Protection or free trade, 1197
Conservative and Liberal policies contrasted, 1203
Duty on potatoes and flour, 1204
Free wheat, 1205
The shipping industry, 1206
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5029
Caraquet and South Shore railway, 3387
Flour, duty on, 1204
Free wheat, 1205
Goldman, Mr. I., 4510
Insurance, 4390
Intercolonial railway, operation of, 795
Lobsters, 2050
Military service, 2667
Classes, 3354
Exceptions, 3572
Overseas Military Forces, Minister of, 4434
Potatoes, duty on, 1204
Salt, shortage of, 1319
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1143
Shipbuilding, 1931
Shipping industry, 1206
Soldiers, returned appointment of to government positions, 1858
Soldiers, votes for, 1394
Taxation—business profits, wealth, income, 1197, 1201, 2671
War-time Elections Bill, 5557

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 175
The fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 175
Extension of term of Parliament, 175
National government, 177
Taxation of war profits, 178
The Nationalist party, 179
Recruiting in Quebec, 185
Enlistment of Canadians, 187
The manufacture of munitions, 188
Cost of the war to Canada, 189
Extension of term of Parliament, 189
Increased production, 190
National service, 191
Recruiting from the Civil Service, 192
The Ross rifle, 193
Aliens, naturalization of, 3814
Anderson, Mr. Daniel, 1265
Army
Officers, surplus of, 3103
Rejected men, 3099
Ashcroft mail service, 668
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 687
Beans for seed, 1473
Blow, Dr., payments to, 668
Budget, 746
Trade relations with Great Britain, 746
Free wheat, 747, 750
Government expenditure, 747
Taxation of business profits, 750
Revenue of Canada, 755
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5026
Civil Service
Disfranchisement of Civil servants, proposed, 2020
Recruiting from, 192
Daylight saving, 3684
Dominion Lands Act amendment, 3798
Farm labour for western Canada, 3504
Flour, price of, 1070
Food Control, 1999, 3751
Fuel, 1414
Grain
Breweries and distilleries, for, 1180
Commission, 1381
Elevators, 3707
Grading of, 1265
Rust in, 2063
Wheat
Free, 747, 756
Surplus, purchase of, 1126
United States tariff on, 1342
Hobbs, Mr. Hugh, 1228
Loans to farmers, 1968
Lockhart, Mr. Hugh, 1265

Turriff, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Mails, alleged misuse of, 893, 1027
Matthews, Mr. L., 1228
Military service, 3719
Exemptions, 3192, 3272
National service, 191
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., report of, 3751
Palmerston post office, 1127
Parliament, extension of term of, 189
Patent records, 2063
Pensions, revision, 5424
Potatoes for seed, 1473
Proportional representation, 902
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 1658
Railway Department estimates, 3410
Robinson, J. T., 1377
Ross rifle, 193, 489
Saskatchewan coal miners' strike, 3237
Senate, proposed change in constitution of, 1137
Smith, Pte. J. I., 3418
Soldier Settlement Board, 3779
Spotten, Judge, 1127
Taxation
Business profits, 178, 750, 1458
Income, 1463
Tractor engines, duty on, 678
National Transcontinental railway, operation of, 657
War
Prisoners of, parcels to, 3958
Prosecution of the, 1591
War-time Elections Bill, 5711, 5836
Woman suffrage, 1518

Turner, General, appointment of, 268, 279

Turner, Mr. Harvey, position of, 1469

Union Government
See Coalition Government; National Government

United Mines Workmen of Nova Scotia, 802

United States
British subjects in, recruiting of, 2482, 3904
Declaration of war by, 610
Exodus of Canadians to, 3285
Farm labourers from, 665, 1740, 1747, 1193, 4512
French Canadians in, 4914
Head tax on foreigners entering, 892, 1266
Tariff
Changes in, 1264
Wheat, on, 1342
Troops, training of, in Canada, 2482

Universal Radio Syndicate Limited. *See* Ocean Telegraph Act

Urquhart, Mr. Hector, dismissal of, 5367

Vancouver
Dredging in False Creek, 900, 1126
Drill Hall site, 456
Harbour Commissioners, 1575
Harbour improvements, 5304
Venereal diseases, 817, 839, 869
Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneuve)
Army, soldiers, attendance of, at public meetings, 5231
Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, suspension of, 686
Canadian Northern Railway acquisition of, 5066
Civil Service salaries, 2245
Cold storage, 2089
Food control, 1989, 2089
High cost of living, 710
House of Commons, sessional indemnity of Members, 6047
Labour
Attitude of on Military service, 2795
Requirements, 2798
Military Service, 2795
Moore, Major Rev. A. H., 1265
Tariff revision, 1789
Taxation, income, 4103, 4121, 4130
Technical education, 1237
Thetford Mines labour trouble, 590, 606, 1120
War-time Elections Bill, 5741
Veterans
Army and Navy, Bill, 5421
Victoria bridge toll rates, 672
Victoria, B.C.
Breakwater, 1381
Victoria Sealing Company, 5958
Viviani, M., visit and address to Parliament of, 1318, 1361, 1362
Votes for soldiers. *See* Army, Soldiers
Voters Lists
Provision for under War-time Elections Bill, 5418
Walsh, J. J., payments to, 1675
War
Charities. *See* Charities Bill
Defence of Canada. *See* Militia and Defence
Expenditure, 274, 354, 386, 408, 476, 522, 525, 549, 718, 2936
See also War Appropriation Bill
Loans, 720, 2774
Minister of Overseas Services, proposed, 277, 279
Pay and Records office, 1355
Prisoners of, 666
Arrangements for exchange of, 4194
War—*Con.*
Money orders for, 714
Parcels for, 714, 3958
Prosecution of the, 2320, 3371, 3375
Motion of Mr. Currie, 1576
Submarine situation, 1320
Taxes
See Taxation
Supplies
Boots, 4062
Clothing, 556, 3556
Davidson Commission, 249
Equipment, 40, 262
Hay, 338
Horses, 453, 1093
Machine guns, 590, 2201
Mattresses and covers, 6065
Methods of purchase, 232, 265
Motor trucks, 262, 266, 280, 558
Munitions, 31, 36, 188, 4928, 5517, 5541
Rifles
Importations of, 1125
Ross, 63, 154, 193, 228, 235, 451, 2451, 3487
Correspondence brought down, 7
Factory, 663, 1265
In Committee (statement by Prime Minister), 388-434; resumed, 477-522
Substitute for, 1012, 1594
Small arms ammunition, 156, 2480
Supplies
Patronage in purchase of, 4050, 4053
Pictou contractors for, 303
Trenton contractors for, 303
Transports, 1280
Transportation of, 33, 36
Trophies, exhibition of, 6003
Wagons, 556
See War Purchasing Commission
War Appropriation ($500,000,000) Bill. Res., 354, 386, 408, 476. 1r., 522. 2r., 525. Com., 525, 549. 3r., 585
War Charities Bill. 1r., 5242. 2r., 5424. Com., 5424, 5481, 6062. 3r., 6065
See also p. 378
War Purchasing Commission, 32, 340
See War Supplies
War Revenue Act
Prosecutions under, 2379, 3835
See Inland Revenue Department, Estimates
War-time Elections Bill. 1r., 5415. 2., 5550, 5565. Com., 5637, 5706. 3r., 5805, 5806
Closure applied, 5565, 5706, 5806

War-time Elections Bill—*Con.*
Amendments proposed: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 5576; lost on div., 5628. Mr. Pugsley, 5629; lost on div., 5635. Mr. Neely, 5650; lost, 5659. Mr. McCraney, 5659; lost on div., 5660. Mr. Lapointe, lost on div., 5770. Mr. Neely, 5824; lost on div., 5879
Senate amdts., 6071

War-time Elections Act
Female enumerators, 6071
Polling Divisions, 6070
Qualifications of voter, 6092
Tribunals, candidates for federal elections serving on, 6070

Washington Conference, Canadian delegates to, 1127

Waterford, N. S., explosion at, 5775

Ways and Means, Committee of, 584, 1436, 1445, 1628, 3760, 5242, 6061
Amendment, Mr. Oliver, 1677
See Budget and Taxation

Wealth, Conscription of
Amendments to address for extension of term of Parliament, Mr. Graham, 3641, 3471, 3480
Statement by Finance Minister, 3187
See Taxation

Webb, Lieutenant, position of, 4563

Webster, Mr. John (Brockville)
Army, 122nd Battalion, 5083
Budget, 953
The dairying industry, 953
Canada's part in the war, 956
Cheese, manufacture and sale of, 2268
Packages, marking of—inspection and sale, 4068

Weichel, Mr. William G. (North Waterloo)
Military Service Bill, 2801
National Transcontinental Railway, ties, 455
War-time Elections Bill, 5832

Weights and measures, inspection of, 2383, 3842

Welland canal
Construction of, 2206, 3402, 4925
Dynamiters of, 4926

West Edmonton forest rangers and homestead inspectors, 1476

Western Canada, farm labour for, 3504

Wheat. *See* Grain

White, Rev. Ward, position of, 3903

White, Sir Thomas (Minister of Finance)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 272
Reply to statements of Sir Sam Hughes, 272
War expenditure, 274
Proposed Minister of Overseas Services, 277, 279
Appointment of General Turner, 279, 280
Purchase of motor trucks and transports, 280
Canada and the war, 282
Army
Camps, sale of liquor in, 818
Medical service, commission of inquiry into, 542
Soldiers, life insurance of, 3589
Officers, unattached, 563
Beans, duty on, 671
Bran and shorts, duty on, 1870
British Government and Canadian Pacific Railway Financial arrangement Bill, 1369, 2059
Budget, 718, 937
National income and expenditure, 718
War expenditure, 718
Income taxation, 719
Taxation of business profits, 719
War loans, 720
Trade of Canada, 721
Free wheat, 937
Amendment of Mr. Oliver, 949
Business Profits War Tax, 5290
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 4011, 4217, 4247-4287, 4467, 4595-4620, 4622-4638, 4835-4873, 4960-5015, 5154
Canadian Pacific railway—Bill to facilitate financial arrangements, etc., 1369, 2059
Civil Service
Enlistments from, 2014, 2253
Promotions, 2010
Salaries, 2008, 2238
Civil Service Act amendment, 2008, 2238
Customs Tariff Act amendment, proposed, 1689
Enlistment, voluntary, 2583
Finance, Department of, estimates, 1790, 1796
Flour, price of, 1053, 1088
Fuel, 1419
Grand Trunk Pacific railway, loan to, 5292
Rails, removal of from, 5296
Hughes, Sir Sam, reply to statement of, 3110
Military Service Bill, 2582
Voluntary enlistment, 2583
Progress of the war, 2584

White, Sir T.—*Con.*
Canada's position, 2584
Our duty to the men at the front, 2585
Conscription of wealth, 2587
Referendum proposals, 2589
Income War Tax Bill
See, under this title, Taxation
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 2381, 3832
Insurance, 1724, 2100
Life insurance of soldiers, 3589
Insurance Act Amendment Bills, 3848, 4138, 5196
Loans to farmers, 1960
Loans, public, 720
$100,000,000 for Public Service, 342, 435, 4957
Amount received and commission paid, 4957
McNab, Colin C., 579
Members, deceased, tributes to, 5
Motor trucks, purchase of, 280
National Gallery of Canada, 5301
Newsprint paper, 757, 1646
Penny Bank Act, 2061
Pensions, 845
Denial of erroneous statement, 5423
Proportional representation, 908
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 1658
Railway, situation in Canada, 4011, 4058
Recruiting, retarding of, 3110
Senate, appointments to, 930
Shipbuilding, 666
Imperial Munitions Board contracts, 1661
Soldier Settlement Board, 3788
Supply, vote for three months, 2946
Tariff revision, 1689
Taxation measures; Senate amendment no precedent, 5476
Taxation
Business profits, 178, 719, 1438, 1635, 2108
Returns by business concerns, 4246
Income, 719, 1441, 1449, 1631, 3760, 3768, 4070, 4102, 4126, 4638
Wealth, 2587
Toronto Globe, correction of editorial in, 2707
Unclaimed bank balances, 1004
United Grain Growers, Limited, 894
War charities, 5424, 5481
War expenditure, 718
War finance, vote of $500,000,000, 542
War supplies for British Government, 4953, 5522
War taxation
See, under this title, Taxation

White, Sir T.—*Con.*
Wealth, conscription of, 3187
See, under this title, Taxation

Whitehead life-saving station, 1469

Williams Head quarantine station, 5312

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver J. (North Essex)
Racing meets, limitation of, 8, 313
Toronto Globe—correction of statement in, 47
Tractor engines, duty on, 676

Wilfrid C., vessel, 4062

William Davies Co., 4151
See Food Investigation

Wilson, Mr. Charles A. (Laval)
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition of, 5069
Criminal Code amendment, jurors, 4300, 4326
Military Service Bill, 2925
Contraventions of Act, 3328
Exemptions, 3303
Quebec, recruiting in, 2926
Penitentiaries, salaries of guards, 5803
Potato consignments, 607
Railway Act, The, 3444, 3447
Ships built in Canada, 591
Soldiers, voting of, 4722
Taxation, income, 4073

Wilson, Mr. Gordon C. (Wentworth)
Address in reply to the Governor General's Speech, 9
Canada and the war, 9
Tribute to deceased Member, 10
Provision for returned soldiers, 10
National service, 10
Canada's financial stability, 11
Fiftieth anniversary of Confederation, 11
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo railway, 2610

Windsor, N.S.
Tribune building, 1380
Wharf repairs, 1380
Windsor, Ontario, immigration officers, 2357
Windsor Junction, N.S., mail service, 5913
Wireless telegraph. *See* Telegraphs
Woman suffrage
Enfranchisement under War-time Elections Bill, 5416
Pugsley, Mr., motion and amendments by
Notice stands, 309; postponed, 672, 759
Amendment to motion of Mr. Sutherland, 1488
Ruled out by Mr. Speaker, 1490, 1508
Amendment to amendment of Sir Robert Borden, 1522

Woman suffrage—*Con.*
Sutherland, Mr., motion of, 1477, 1627
Borden, Sir Robert, amendment of, 1508
Inquiry by Mr. Pugsley, 4958

Women
Atlantic passports for, 3996, 5783
Munition workers, 4063

Wood, Lieutenant, position of, 4563

Wool, exportation of, 1130

Wright, Mr. William (Muskoka)
Grain, 5208
Wheat, fixing price of, 3694, 3703
Live stock exchanges, 5512
Public Works Department estimates, 5335
Railway Act, The, 3514

Wright, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Railway transportation for Members of Parliament, 3521
Soldier Settlement Board, 3629
Woman suffrage, 1479

Yarmouth harbour improvements, 3870

Year Book, Canada, 2337

Yukon territory, 1736
Administrator, 5122
Commissioner of, 3677
Expenditure, 592
Judges' salaries, 5896
Miners' strike, 3086
Population, 593
Prices and cost of living, 2199, 2237, 2481, 2571, 2954

Zinc. *See* Mines and minerals