

tions Act, rights were, as I have said, taken away from large numbers of people of this country; they were disfranchised; they lost their control of Parliament. Since that time they have been taxed without any representation in Parliament one way or the other, so that there has been a direct violation of the spirit of the constitution in that regard. I will not enlarge upon the different iniquities of that measure, but amongst the Government's own supporters of the day it would never have passed except for the fact that we were in the midst of a war at that time and the War-time Elections Act was excused as a war measure for war purposes only. How can my right hon. friend contend that a Parliament returned under a measure such as that can be of a representative character at the present time?

The Military Voters' Act was a measure passed by this Parliament for the purpose, not of defeating the will of the electorate, but of giving expression to it. My right hon. friend knows, perhaps more than anyone else in this House, that that Act was used to effect the representation in this particular Parliament. I shall spare the House a recital of that disgraceful chapter in our national history, whereby advantage was taken of the Military Voters' Act to coerce, in the matter of their political rights, thousands of the young men of this country who were serving their country and the cause of freedom overseas, and whereby their votes, together with the votes of hundreds of men and women who had never seen Canada, were poured by emissaries of the Government into specially selected constituencies, with no object other than that of ensuring the defeat of candidates opposed to the Administration, a course of action which, by the way, has been openly defended and commended by my right hon. friend on the very floor of Parliament. My right hon. friend knows quite well that there are sitting in this House of Commons to-day many members who would not be sitting here at the present time if the election had taken place under the old Dominion Franchise Act instead of under those particular Acts.

Unless we have a representative Parliament, what becomes of any theory of the supremacy of Parliament? The supremacy of Parliament is based in every particular upon the circumstance that Parliament is supposed to be truly representative of the will of the people. I have not, however, mentioned these two particular measures for the purpose of enlarging upon the

iniquities which helped to disgrace the record of our Canadian history at the time; my purpose is to draw the attention of Parliament to the circumstance that both those Acts have been repealed, and that we have at the present time upon the Statutes a new Franchise Act which was passed by this Parliament at the last session. The meaning of that is simply this, that this Parliament recognized that the franchise under which the members of the present Parliament had been returned was not a franchise which adequately represented the views of the people of this country at the present time. They recognized that that was a franchise permissible only for war purposes and that its ends were served when the war was over. When we have a new Franchise Act passed by this Parliament which gives the right of the ballot to thousands of citizens who had not that right previously, for the Government to continue to carry on in view of the support that it is getting from representation effected under those old methods, constitutes, I maintain, a direct usurpation of popular government in this country.

That brings me to the third point on which I think my right hon. friend has already attempted to justify his carrying on of the Government of the country. He has attempted to justify it on a literal interpretation of what was said in the campaign of 1917. He has said that the then Prime Minister gave no pledge at that time; that the Government of that day did not commit itself. That line of defence implies such colossal deception that I do not think any ministry could feel itself so unworthy as to come before the people on such a ground.

Does my right hon. friend wish it to be assumed that when he and his distinguished predecessor in the high office of Prime Minister of Canada were appealing in the name of patriotism to men and women of all classes to forget party and party considerations, when they were appealing to mothers for their support that an end might the more speedily be made to the sacrifice of their sons, and the slaughter of human lives, that all the time they were cherishing a mental reservation which looked beyond the winning of the war to personal aggrandizement and the maintenance of political power when the war was won, regardless altogether of the nature of their appeal. The thought is too abhorrent even to entertain. I refuse to believe any thing so unworthy of my fellow countrymen, and least of all of those who have come to occupy a distinguished position in our public life.