

gistration board of Manitoba, a board of judges, and one Alexander Macleod, a partisan of the minister, was appointed sole revising board. And every registration clerk was a partisan of Mr. Sifton, and the whole registration and revision was done in defiance of the law of Manitoba, done by this government and by the various partisans of the minister who was running the election. If they do this under a less full legal authorization, what will they do when they get all they want in the shape of legislation?

Now, take the West Algoma case. An election was called in the unorganized districts. The writ was issued on the 25th of August. On the 27th of August your men had received telegram No. 1 from Hon. Richard W. Scott, Secretary of State, and on that day the enumerators started out to make up nine polls. And on the 2nd of September every one of those polls was made up and the enumerators were back and ready to have their lists printed. Did they follow out the law of Ontario? The law of Ontario was absolutely smashed into atoms by the mere telegram of the secretary of my right hon. friend's government. Does he deny it? Where was the notice that was given? Before the candidate of the Liberal Conservative party knew anything about the electors being registered what was shown him? Five hundred and forty-three names made out, absolutely settled with the exception of revision, shoved under his nose and this enumeration was done in less than six days. Did they tell him that there was going to be a registration at such and such and such a place? They absolutely concealed it, and concealed it from every Liberal-Conservative. The candidate of the government was the man who appointed the enumerators, was the man who appointed the revising judge and was the man who, as clerk of the peace, held the lists and had them in his possession after they were made. Are these fair methods? Is that honourable treatment? Does my right hon. friend wonder that the Liberal-Conservatives in this House, with those two examples before them of the work of my right hon. friend and his ministry, view with suspicion and with dread this legislation? Take the Manitoba case of 1904: The lists were made; they were printed; they were complete; they were sent out to the returning officers, the returning officer under the law was to look after and distribute the voters in the overlapping and intersected polling divisions. What took place, Sir? With every Liberal-Conservative that could possibly be kept in the dark, kept in the dark—for there is Mr. Leach's oath, and Mr. Leach is an eminently respectable and heroic figure, the right hon. gentleman declares it—I believe his oath, and on his oath he declared that he doctored nearly all the polling divisions in the province of Manitoba and that he took mighty

Mr. FOSTER.

good care that the other fellows did not know what was going on. I appeal to any man on that side whether that is playing the game fair? Now, is it? I have every hope that if the hon. member for British Columbia, who is smiling at me, were to get up and in his manly fashion say exactly what he thinks he would say that is not playing the game fairly. My right hon. friend was at a press dinner and by his side was the present Speaker. Mr. Speaker gave us a noble recitation and the refrain of every verse of that recitation was 'Play up, play up and play the game.' I would like to have Mr. Speaker's view, honestly and unreservedly given, as to whether this was playing the game. There was Duggan, your returning officer in Selkirk. Under the law the instruction to Duggan was to see that overlapping voters were properly parcelled out. He was not to see that any other polls were touched. What did Duggan do? He put the list into the hands of Leach, the Liberal organizer, had it doctored by him, got it back when it was ready, and dozens and scores of people had their names erased, yet the Minister of Justice euphonically named that transference of electors. When this was all done, Mr. Duggan took the risk and on his oath, which I believe, he declared he never gave it a glance and that there might have been on it a hundred men or five hundred disfranchised for all he knew. He took the revision made by the organizer of the Liberal party by which Conservatives were left off and disfranchised, and a member sits in this House to-night who would not sit here if it had not been for that. I ask my right hon. friend if that is playing the game fair?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I would like to know how the hon. member can prove anything of that kind. I am the hon. member who is sitting here.

Mr. FOSTER. You are?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, go ahead.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I would like to ask what foundation you have for that statement? Not a tittle.

Mr. FOSTER. The foundation I have—

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I characterize that as a false and misleading statement.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all very well, if my hon. friend will stop bobbing up I will give the foundation.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Give it then

Mr. FOSTER. The foundation I have for the statement I have just made is Duggan's own sworn statement.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Give the quotation from his evidence.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend may deny it till he is black in the face, but it will not