

England he declared on several occasions that conscription would never be resorted to here. When he came back, he had evidently changed his mind. It is plain that he found conditions on the other side such as to indicate that more effort and more force would have to be put into this war. They said their sole intention was to win the war. Let us review what has taken place since that time and see whether the action has justified the pretension. We are told that actions speak louder than words. If we analyse the actions and means resorted to by the Government, we shall find that it is not the winning of the war that is uppermost in their minds but the winning of the election. The right honourable Minister of Trade and Commerce told us practically that they were the only true and loyal people in this country, that they have been the loyal party and the only party capable of putting the necessary energy, force and drive into the war. He further told us that the people were behind them in this matter. If the Government believe that they have the confidence of the people and that the people are behind them as the win-the-war party, why are they resorting to such methods as these? Why do they resort to the expedient of disfranchising a lot of people who are true and loyal citizens and proceed to enfranchise a lot of other people who never asked to be enfranchised, never thought of it and do not want it? When the right honourable Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) came back from England he said that he believed that the time had arrived when we should put forth a greater effort, and that that effort could not be put forth without a coalition Government, because he declared that a conscription Bill could not be legitimately carried out by any one party. I am not going to give the Prime Minister credit for having any great amount of diplomatic ability, but I still think he is too shrewd and wise to have gone about the formation of a coalition government in the way in which he did if he meant what he said. He said that he had come to the conclusion that we had to have more recruits, that a greater effort was to be put forth and that the first step in that direction was the formation of a coalition government. If he believed that, instead of going into this House and announcing his conscription measure, why did he not call my right honourable friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) into his councils, give him his confidence

and state to him the conditions which he found. The conditions which the Prime Minister says he found overseas were very different from what he believed them to be before he went away. When he went away he said that conscription would not be resorted to, but when he came back he said that conscription was necessary. If the right honourable gentleman had believed that, the first thing he, as an intelligent and sensible man, would have done, would have been to call in the leader of the Opposition and lay before him the condition that he found overseas and say: Now, cannot we come to some arrangement for the formation of a coalition, or union government so that we may carry this war to a successful conclusion? He did not do that. He first announced his conscription measure, knowing well that the leader of the Opposition was a man of very strong views upon some things and that he had an aversion to compulsion in any form. He knew he was a man who had spent nearly his whole life in trying to bring the different elements in this country together by persuasion, and that he would not favour a resort to force unless it was finally and absolutely necessary. Did that show that the leader of the Government wanted a coalition government? It did not. The fact of his announcing a policy that he knew beforehand the leader of the Opposition was opposed to, instead of taking him into his confidence, would indicate that it was not a coalition, or win-the-war government that he had in his mind, but that what he desired to do was to bring about a dividing of parties in this country.

Then he brings in the Military Voters' Act. Nobody finds any fault with the proposal to give every soldier of Canadian birth a vote. He is entitled to it. Nobody would object to the wife, sister, mother, or daughter, of a man who had lost his life being enfranchised. It is only common sense and reason that the man who is at the front should have the right to vote. He has the right to vote under this Act, and that being so, why should five or six of his sisters have the right to vote? I have in my mind the case of a young man who is at the front. He has seven sister and a mother. He will have a vote himself and the seven sisters and the mother will each have a vote—nine votes in all. Is there any reason for this unless you give votes to other women? There are men enlisting in the Canadian ranks who never saw Canada but