

a free province introduce legislation in amendment to that legislation. But it may be said that their efforts would be unavailing, because the party suffering would not control the legislature. That may be so at the present time. But when any grievance exists in any legislature governed under British institutions, the minority is never slow to avail itself of any opportunity to offer amendments to remove it, although the minority may be sure that its efforts may not succeed, but be rejected. A minority will never fail to bring grievances to the attention of a legislature though they are satisfied their efforts will be frustrated, because the minority will do so simply for the purpose of affecting public opinion and affecting it in its own direction. I am forced, therefore, to the conclusion that as no efforts have been made either in the legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in the direction indicated by my hon. friend, the law has been found satisfactory to the people of these provinces.

Let me apply the same reasoning and say I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that as no efforts have been made in the legislature of Manitoba or of British Columbia in the direction indicated by my right hon. friend, the law has been found satisfactory in the province of British Columbia and in the province of Manitoba. Will my right hon. friend take his own reasoning? It is absolute; it is conclusive. But he went still further through his Minister of Justice. What happened to that legislation? The Senate put on an amendment—but my hon. friend did not accept the amendment, and it was moved to be disagreed to, for the following reasons:

Because the amendments made by the hon. the Senate to the Bill excepting from its operation the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and providing for a special revision of the voters' list in those provinces for elections to this House, is inconsistent with and subversive of the general principle of this Bill.

I think I can leave the position of my right hon. friend and the two parties with this single remark. You say Liberal-Conservatives are inconsistent because they stand for a Dominion franchise and a Dominion list throughout the whole Dominion, when you propose to single out two special provinces, in which you have lost the majority you had, and apply to them the principle which you thundered and volleyed against from 1885 to 1898. I make this proposition to my right hon. friend: Let him bring in a Bill to establish a Dominion franchise, with lists made up by this government, and the boundaries of the constituencies marked out by this government, and put the whole thing into the hands of non-partisan and judicial authority, and you will find the party on this side at your back in support of it. But we are not chargeable with inconsistency when we stand for a uniform Dominion registration

Mr. FOSTER.

and voters' lists; we are not inconsistent when we oppose an effort to seize the thing that they hated in the general with reference to two provinces where they propose to get a party advantage by so doing. That is the position with reference to the two parties.

Now, I come to the last part of the subject that I propose to deal with to-night. My right hon. friend says that a position has arisen in Manitoba which imperatively demands interference. That is in justification of the position which he says he took, and incidentally he did, that something might happen at some time in some province which would make it necessary for the Dominion to assert its rights. No one denies that something might happen. And so he says: That condition has now arisen and I am not inconsistent when I come to this parliament and propose a remedy. It all depends on the basis of your demand, the reality of the grievance. I will take my right hon. friend's own definition—a condition has arisen in Manitoba which imperatively demands Dominion interference. He goes on to explain two elements. One is the overlapping of constituencies. We admitted that from the first; we admit it still; it was a grave difficulty. The lawless and partisan manner in which it was attempted in 1904 to do the business was absolutely unauthorized by law and absolutely unauthorized by the fair rules of the game. But it was a difficulty which demanded the fullest and best legislation, and we hit upon the expedient, upon which both sides are agreed, and the overlapping difficulty therefore drops out of sight in this discussion. What is the other? The other is the vital point of the lists. The grievance was the overlapping, but in bringing about the remedy for that, the bright thought instilled itself into the mind of the Minister of Justice, and found its expression in section 1 of that Bill, that they would go a step further and actually seize the lists. They broke it to us gently and to the country gently. It was as though the Minister of Justice should go to a servant of his and say: 'Bob, I am going to give you a different kind of a hat; it will be a good hat, and it will keep off the sun and the rain. I am going to change your style of coat, but I will give you a good, serviceable coat. The cut of your pants is a little out of date; I am going to give you new pants, and they will be good pants. The shoes you are now wearing are obsolete; I am going to give you a brand new pair of a new style.' And Bob says: 'I have no particular objection to that; I like my old clothes, but if you give me nice new clothes of an approved pattern I do not know that I can raise any objection.' A day or two after that the Minister of Justice comes along and says: 'Bob, there is just one little thing that I omitted; I told you what I was going to do, but I