

the present Government that we have not a national government to introduce this measure. In my judgment a national government would be better than any party government could possibly be during the war, and I am satisfied if we had a national government there would have been no necessity for disfranchising anybody. I would have preferred to put the matter squarely before all classes of people and take my chances. Possibly, by disfranchising certain classes of people, we may help win the war. This Bill may help elect a win-the-war government, but I am not so sure of that, and for what little advantage there may be in it I do not think it was worth while. If I understood my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) rightly this afternoon, he likened us twenty-six Liberals who had voted for conscription to Judases.

Mr. OLIVER: May I correct my hon. friend? I think I made myself perfectly clear when I alluded to the offers and counter-offers that were made across the floor of the House for positions in the Cabinet. I made no allusion to men who voted according to principles.

Mr. TURRIFF: That may be what was in my hon. friend's mind, but he certainly referred to members on this side of the House, although he did not have the courage to designate them, as my hon. friend from Humboldt had.

Mr. OLIVER: I think my hon. friend's conscience is bothering him.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend from Edmonton need not worry about my conscience. If the appellation Judas can be applied to a man who votes against his party, my hon. friend from Edmonton is certainly an authority on the subject. I remember that, not so many years ago, he made these halls ring with his denunciation of the very people he is now so anxious about, and he was voting against his party, which was in power then, almost as often as he was voting with it. However, he had a perfect right to do that if he wished, and I have no objection. I do object, however, to be called a Judas because on one occasion I have differed from my leader.

My leader, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), has been bigger, as we would naturally expect, than my hon. friend from Edmonton or my hon. friend from Humboldt. He said to every man on this side of the House: If you do not agree with my views, do exactly

as you like. But the hon. member for Edmonton and the hon. member for Humboldt apparently think that because a member on this side of the House takes that position, he must, if possible, be driven out of the party. I usually use my own judgment and nothing they can do, one way or the other, will influence me in the slightest degree as to what position I will take on this or any other question that may happen to come up.

The hon. member for Humboldt stated this afternoon that I had broken faith with the conscription Liberals by the action I took at the Winnipeg convention. I did nothing of the kind. He also stated that my amendment to the win-the-war motion that was brought up in the convention was unanimously voted against. If he had been watching—and he was on the platform—he would have found that some hundreds of votes were given in favour of my amendment.

Mr. NEELY: What I said, and it will be found in Hansard, was that the win-the-war resolution which I proposed was voted for unanimously, not that my hon. friend's motion was voted against unanimously.

Mr. TURRIFF: I accept the correction; I may have taken it wrongly. But, certainly, I broke faith with nobody, and if the resolution which my hon. friend moved in the convention was passed unanimously, what has taken place since then in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta shows that it was not unanimous with the Liberals of the country. Mr. Speaker, I have said what I wanted to say and I do not propose, even if the twenty minutes is not up, to take up any more of the time of the House. I am against disfranchising anybody, I will vote against that and I will vote for the amendment of my hon. friend from Humboldt.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention when I came here to-night to speak with regard to the measure which is now before the House but in view of the fact that the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) has moved a resolution which practically means that this House is asked to express an opinion as to the wisdom or otherwise of our putting into effect legislation that has the effect of disfranchising certain foreigners, coupled with the speech of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), it becomes necessary that the attention of this House and the country should be directed for a minute or two to the tremendous