

crete case where the judge felt in duty bound to revise that list and adjourn his court and completed the revision next day, but the 38 names then added were struck off by the Manitoba government, and those people were deprived of the right to vote, although the registration clerk and returning officer declared that they were entitled to vote. Surely the hon. gentleman will not tell me that is fair. I regret very much that the government saw fit to abandon the provision they asked for in the province of Manitoba. What did they ask for? They asked that the lists should be prepared in Manitoba under a board of judges. That is the grievance the hon. gentleman refers to. Has he no confidence in the judges? The government did not ask to have partisans appointed to do this work. They said the judges should do the work.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I only discussed the original clause as prepared, where it was utterly impossible for the lists to be revised by the judges. It was owing to that unreasonable provision that the government should appoint their own officers to revise the lists.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—No, the judges had to revise the list. Does the hon. gentleman contend there would not be time? Then he must condemn the election law of Manitoba, because I will give the House evidence they had not time under their law to revise the list. I know it was suggested by the Manitoba government, when this particular clause in the Bill was dropped, that the government would give ample time to revise the lists. Gentlemen in the House of Commons were not trying to defeat that Bill, but were obstructing supplies, and they would not allow \$100 worth of supplies to go through unless the Bill were amended.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I thought the opposition would have occupied a better position if they had obstructed the Bill instead of obstructing Supply.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The Bill was kept back by the government.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—No. In 1888, the Liberal opposition did not attempt to hold up supplies.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—They did in 1896.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I beg pardon, they did not in 1885 or 1895; they said that the Bill should not go through in its then condition, when the Premier said that the Indians of the Northwest, who were actually in rebellion at the time, would be entitled to vote if they qualified. They did not hold up the supply, but they held up the Bill. I took part in it, and for eight weeks the opposition held up the government upon the Franchise Bill of 1885. In 1896 the opposition did not hold up supplies.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Yes.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—They did not. They held up the Remedial Bill, but not supplies.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Both.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—No, they held the House on the Remedial Bill.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—They obstructed supply.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—The hon. gentleman must know—and it is the best possible evidence that I can give any hon. gentleman in this House—that some time in April when the life of parliament expired, the opposition having talked them out, about the 20th of April, supply had been voted. They gave the government supply that carried them until July. Parliament went out in April. This session, the supplies were obstructed to such an extent that the mails were very nearly closed, and public work stopped until the Premier saw fit to compromise on this Bill. I think it was a mistake to do so, but in his judgment it was the best thing to do, but with the understanding that ample time should be given to revise the lists in Manitoba. You cannot by order in council or by any regulation, interfere with an Act of Parliament, and the Act of the province provided that all the lists should be closed up and completed by the 1st day of July, so that it was impossible to extend the time for a Court of Revision and give ample time. Conservatives as well as Reformers have been left off the lists in Manitoba on account of the fact that there was not ample time to revise the lists. No persons