

rather far afield. The question before the House is the third reading of the War-time Elections Act.

Mr. NEELY: My point is this—in this War-time Elections Act the Government have broken faith with the men on this side of the House who supported the Military Service Bill, and I am asking the reason why. I am asking whether or not these resolutions of the Winnipeg convention were the foundation for this change of front on the part of the Government. My hon. friends opposite applauded too soon. I want to tell them that before the Liberal members of this Parliament went to the Winnipeg convention they had a conference in the precincts of this House, and passed certain win-the-war resolutions, which were supposed to be the basis of a resolution that we hoped would be adopted by the Winnipeg convention. In that resolution, which was given to the press by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), there was not a single word of reference to compulsion or conscription, except that the idea was implied, just as it is implied in the win-the-war resolution passed by the Winnipeg convention. We reached that understanding by common agreement. I am sure hon. gentlemen will not question the good faith of my hon. friend from Red Deer on this point, who I am sorry is not in his seat to confirm what I say. But he was the man who in our little caucus in the precincts of this House was absolutely set and opposed to having the word compulsion or conscription in a win-the-war resolution, because he said the object should not be to emphasize the idea of compulsion or conscription, but to emphasize the idea of national service. It was because of that agreement reached by the Liberal members of this House who voted for the Military Service Bill, that the word compulsion or conscription was deliberately kept out of the resolution, although the idea was implied in it. I have the resolutions adopted by the so-called Conscriptionist Liberals in this House before the Winnipeg convention was held. On that basis the Resolutions Committee of the Winnipeg Liberal convention agreed unanimously on the win-the-war resolution, with the exception that my hon. friend from Assiniboia moved his amendment in committee. He could not find a seconder, however, because every member of that committee, every conscriptionist member of that committee, felt that the resolution covered everything that was necessary to secure Canada's maximum effort for the winning of the war.

In moving his amendment the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) deliberately—I will not say maliciously, because you would rule me out of order, Sir—broke faith with his colleagues in this House and with his colleagues on the Resolutions Committee in Winnipeg, when he went on the floor of the convention and moved his amendment to the second clause of the win-the-war resolution. His amendment could not be accepted, for the reason that we could not submit to its implication that we were passing a win-the-war resolution which did not mean everything it said. If that resolution is the reason why the men on this side of the House who voted for the Military Service Bill are to have a large number of their constituents disfranchised, then I say we have obtained a very raw deal from the present Government.

Mr. McCREA: What else could you expect?

Mr. NEELY: In my judgment, the present measure negatives the sincerity of every effort that has been made by the Prime Minister in the weeks and months gone by for the formation of a National Government in this country, because the right hon. gentleman knows that he cannot secure representative men from western Canada at all events to enter his Government and pass such a measure as this and put it on the statute books. It is true he may secure the support of certain members on this side of the House, but they are very few, and I want to say further, that if they are so secured, those men no longer represent Liberalism in this House or in the country, because they not only have voted with the Government on the Military Service Bill, but they have voted with the Government to force through Parliament by closure every autocratic measure they could devise. I say these men have ceased to be representatives of Liberalism in this House or in this country, and a Government that included them would in no sense be representative of the great Liberal party throughout Canada. To my mind the effect of this measure has negated the sincerity of the efforts of the Prime Minister to secure what he calls union or national government. The first blow he gave to that movement was when he sent Sir Clifford Sifton West to mobilize the sentiment of western Canada in favour of the proposition of a national government. I am told that that hon. gentleman had even portfolios in his pocket which he was prepared and authorized to submit to certain western leaders if they