

could be secured for the formation of a national government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. gentleman's statement is absolutely inaccurate. I did not send Sir Clifford Sifton West; he went entirely of his own initiative, and so far as I am aware he had not the promise of any portfolio to any one.

Mr. NEELY: The country will be very glad to know that, because the people failed to understand why preceding that Winnipeg convention Sir Clifford Sifton made it a point to go West and make the speeches he did. Evidently he had the blessing of the Prime Minister, if he had not his actual endorsement or authority. I may tell you that the West has no use for Sir Clifford Sifton. The people believe he betrayed them in 1911, and so far as he is concerned the West is short on faith and long on memory. I think I have almost reached the limit of my time, although there were some interruptions. I presume there is no hope the present Government will abandon this measure. I wish to say to this House that I go back to my constituents with shame and sorrow in my heart.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NEELY: That is the way with hon. gentlemen opposite. They often go off at ha'f cock. I go to my constituents with shame and sorrow in my heart that any representative body of men in Canada, let alone this Parliament, should mete out to innocent men such a measure of injustice as this Bill proposes. The people I speak for are in every respect law-abiding citizens, who have given freely of their substance for war effort, and who have refused no form of national service; nevertheless they are disfranchised, and their political rights are taken away without any pretext that hides a purely partisan motive. I make my protest, and if it were the last word I should speak in this Parliament—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NEELY: —but it is not going to be, and hon. gentlemen need not worry about that. If it were the last word I were to speak in this Parliament I would declare that this measure is unjust, un-British, autocratic, and damnable to the very last degree.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw the last adjective. It is not properly used.

[Mr. Neely.]

Mr. NEELY: Then, I withdraw it, but I looked in Webster and I find the meaning of the word "damnable" is "worthy of condemnation."

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be better to use the expression "worthy of condemnation."

Mr. NEELY: Therefore, to make my protest effective, I beg to move the following amendment:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be again referred to the Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend it by eliminating from it all such provisions as tend to remove the franchise from any class of His Majesty's subjects who are now qualified electors according to the laws of the province in which they reside.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GAUTHIER (Saint-Hyacinthe) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I shall improve the twenty minutes, allowed to us by the rules of this House to express my views upon the Bill now under discussion, and also upon the proposed amendment. I shall make my observations as concise as possible and I wish to enter my most formal protest against this piece of legislation submitted to us.

To give emphasis to the views I entertain, I may say that the present Bill is the last born of a whole family originating and conceived in the most absolute iniquity; that it is worthy of its authors and also that it does not disown its elders.

The Bill under discussion is iniquitous by the fact it grants the electoral franchise as it does. It is doubly iniquitous because it takes away that same franchise from those who now are entitled to it. Let me use the comparison which has already been instituted on several occasions in this House. It has been said that the franchise legislation laid before this Parliament would be worthy of the German Kaiser. I think it is doing an injustice to the Kaiser, to compare him to this Government.

The German Kaiser, Mr. Speaker, fights in broad daylight; he sticks to the conviction that in order to maintain his Empire, might conquers right; he does not hide himself, but fights in the open. And to show to what extent he is imbued with that doctrine, he does not fear to take the offensive. For that principle, he struggles, although the majority of his people complain that the populations are dispersed, the territories devastated, but he, the emperor of Germany, knowing that this