

change the record, for there is Duggan's sworn testimony.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. No such evidence is there.

Mr. FOSTER. His evidence has been read in this House by myself and others.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The hon. gentleman ought to be ashamed to make a statement like that in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is not ashamed to quote from the records, the sworn testimony—

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Quote from the records.

Mr. FOSTER. —of even the men appointed by this government to carry out their behests.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Quote from the records or else take it back. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is not entitled to take that back when he makes a statement that is not true.

Mr. FOSTER. Shall I go a little further?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Cannot you explain that first?

Mr. FOSTER. I have explained everything that is necessary.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. You have not.

Mr. FOSTER. And if my hon. friend wants more explanation let him go and look for it in the records.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That from an old parliamentarian—

Mr. FOSTER. That is an answer that is perfectly suited to my hon. friend.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister this afternoon and up to this afternoon was absolutely unaware that Leach and the returning officers in Manitoba had carried on their operations of erasing and transferring from one polling list to another in a large number of the non-overlapping polling divisions in the province of Manitoba, and to-day he denied from his own knowledge, or lack of knowledge, that anything of that kind had been done at all. We go to the word and the testimony and it is plain, as I told him this afternoon, that that was done.

Mr. BURROWS. Is the hon. member aware that in the local election just previous to that, in 17 out of 40 counties, polling subdivisions were subdivided by the provincial authorities with no more shadow of law than there was in this case, just for the convenience of the public?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that that contravenes my statement. These are the three examples that I give of the way the government has acted in cases where they have had this work of revision and registration to do under their own Act. Have we, or have we not, the right to believe that what they have done in the past they will do in the future if they get fuller legislation? The same ministers, the same men, greater power—have we any reason to believe that they will not exercise it in the same way? The attempt has been made and will be made to put the Liberal-Conservative party in the wrong for opposing this legislation. It is an attempt which will fail because the people are honest and the people are intelligent. Is it the dictum of constitutional or parliamentary government that His Majesty's loyal opposition is bound to let pass in time every measure that the government may propose? It certainly is not. If the House of Commons holds the purse strings and can demand that grievances be remedied before it gives an appropriation we have the same right to consider a piece of ill conceived and tyrannical legislation, when proposed, as being a grievance and refuse supply until that grievance has been removed. There is no difference between the two. They are the exercise of the same generic power. The representatives on this side of the House are the representatives of a great party with a history, a party with a policy, a party with a future. I make there three assertions. We must do what is best for the party and we have sometimes to submit to a great deal of inconvenience and trouble which we would not personally submit to if it were not that the interests of the party and the cause we represent demand that sacrifice at our hands.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What about the country?

Mr. FOSTER. The country is served by one party or the other and it is a sample of the fine statesmanlike sense of my hon. friend that he separates one from the other. He can separate his own party interest from the good of the country if he pleases, but the fact is that with party government one party or the other is always in power and always administering theoretically and, generally, in the main, for the good of the country. Now, what happens? The Liberal-Conservative party was thrown out of office in 1896. It gathered itself up and commenced its march again to power. Is there any man in this House who denies that sooner or later the Liberal-Conservative party will get into power? It has a policy, it has a history, it has traditions, it has theories and these theories it proposes to put into practical working. It advertises these to the country, it makes an impression upon the country, it gathers strength and is