

gathering strength to-day. It has another duty to perform. It exposes the policy or lack of policy of the party in power. It uncovers their misdeeds, it shows their maladministration, it brings the people face to face with their corrupt acts and in these two ways the party out of power marches gradually up till it becomes the party in power. We have fought an open fight, we have fought a straight fight, we are gaining in the country and we are close upon the time when the country will place the Liberal-Conservative party in power. When we have gained by our work and our policy and when hon. gentlemen opposite have lost by their work and lack of policy and it is coming to be near the deciding time the Liberal-Conservative party refuses to prejudice the future of its party by allowing the government to seize the franchise and by that means to gain a support in the country which it would otherwise not have. That is the purpose of this clause as it has been placed in the Bill and as it has been advocated by hon. gentlemen behind the right hon. first minister. Therefore the country will see, all fair-minded men will see that there come times when the opposition is bound to be true to itself, to its party, to use its utmost endeavour and to make its greatest self-sacrifice in order to prevent an injustice being done. I say that a repetition of the acts perpetrated in 1901, of the West Algoma case and of the Manitoba case of 1904 would be simply the robbery of the Liberal-Conservative party as to its future if it allowed these acts to be again perpetrated or if it gave a chance for the perpetration of them in the broad constituencies of Manitoba and British Columbia. Therefore, we are bound to stand against it and we are bound to stand against that legislation until its provisions are ameliorated. It is our duty and we propose to do it.

The right hon. first minister said that in 1885 they did not stop supplies and use that as a weapon. They could not do it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why?

Mr. FOSTER. But I know a time when the right hon. gentleman did stop supplies and used it as a weapon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. No? In 1896 we brought Supply into this House, our period of existence legally terminated at a certain time and I can point to page after page of 'Hansard' of 1896, in the month of April, showing that they absolutely shut down on supplies for the payment of wages due, for the payment of contracts completed, for the payment of services which had been performed and for which the credit of the country had been pledged and for all services in the main which contemplated anything to be carried over during the succeeding

Mr. FOSTER.

year. I, myself, owing to the fact that the elections must be held and that it would be impossible for any government to get back and in harness before the first of July and that consequently the treasury would be absolutely bare, made the proposition that these gentlemen, who were then in opposition, grant two months' Supply in order that the country's interests might be conserved whichever party came into power and in order that the necessity for recourse to illegal and wrong methods by the issue of Governor General's warrants for unforeseen expenditures should not exist. I met with the absolute refusal of the right hon. gentleman. I met the same refusal of Sir Richard Cartwright and I heard man after man on this side of the House simply get up and say: This item shall not pass; drop it—and it was dropped. Never used Supply as a weapon? That was the one burnished weapon in the first session of 1896. It is fair to use it sometimes and there are periods when it is absolutely necessary to use it.

Now the right hon. gentleman made some statement in reference to this particular clause but I cannot understand what he meant. It was very hurriedly done as he himself will acknowledge. I have therefore treated the clause exactly as it stands here and as the Minister of Justice pleaded for it in the House. I would suppose that the Minister of Justice has the mind of the Prime Minister when he introduces and pleads for a Bill in this House. I have treated it as every member on that side of the House has argued and pleaded for it. I should imagine they did not commit themselves until they knew the mind of the government. I have argued it upon the language as it is in the Bill and on the arguments which have been presented by the other side of the House in favour of it, and I leave it at that.

I now come to another phase of the question. There has been something said with reference to the inconsistency of parties and as to the principles upon which each party worked for or against the Franchise Bill of 1898. These principles have not been fairly represented by the Minister of Justice and perhaps they were not quite fairly represented by the Prime Minister. It is true, as he says, that you cannot take any one sentence out of a speech on a subject and define from it absolutely the views of the speaker. That is often the case; but sometimes it is not. But in view of the discussions upon the Franchise Act from 1885 to 1898, I venture to say that the Prime Minister had his opinions pretty well in hand in 1898 when he crystallized them time after time into expressed language. Am I not right in saying that my right hon. friend, in the position which he took from 1885 to 1898 and in the legislation which he introduced in 1898, based himself absolutely on