

have the right to do what I propose doing. That is the position in which the right hon. gentleman has put this government.

Mr. SCOTT. That was what parliament did in 1870 in the case of Manitoba.

Mr. LANCASTER. I say it was not at all what parliament did in the case of Manitoba. My hon. friend had better read the statute.

Mr. SCOTT. I will give you the very clause if you will permit me.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have read it as often as the hon. gentleman has. I am not a candidate for a cabinet position, I am not anxious to take the job of my former leader, I am not trying to make myself a champion of what I do not believe, I am not trying to show that I am able to swallow a section which it gave the ex-Minister of the Interior a good deal of trouble to swallow, but which, when he did make up his mind to take the dose, he did swallow with more gusto and less of a wry face than my hon. friend. Here is the enactment we are asked to pass as a Dominion parliament:

Where the expression 'by-law' is employed in subsection 3 of the said section 93, it shall be held to mean the law as set out in said chapters 29 and 30—

Chapters 29 and 30 are ordinances of the Northwest Territories, which did not come into existence until years after the British North America Act was passed. And it will hardly be contended that that Act could have meant to apply to things that did not exist until years after it itself had come into existence.

—and where the expression 'at the union' is employed in said subsection 3—

That is, subsection 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act.

—it shall be held to mean the date at which this Act comes into force.

In other words, the date of the passage of this British North America Act by the imperial parliament shall, by the great power which this Dominion of Canada possesses under so-called Reform rule, and by a declaration such as it never undertook to make before, be carried forward until next July.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) allow me a word?

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to deal with this subject in consecutive fashion. I do not wish to be discourteous to the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux), and I am sure that he knows that I would not show him any discourtesy. If he will allow me to finish the point that I am now dealing with, I shall be glad to have him put to me any question he wishes. I want to keep myself right with the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). He has interjected the

Mr. LANCASTER.

statement that I will find the same section in regard to the Manitoba school laws.

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well, words to the same effect.

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then what could the hon. gentleman have meant by his interruption? What does he want to take back now? He said I would find the same in respect to Manitoba—

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then he had no right to interrupt me and cause me to waste five or ten minutes of the time of the House in proving to him that he was mistaken. He had better have another conference with the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) to find out where they stand on this question.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) allow me to explain?

Mr. LANCASTER. I think it is not fair for a gentleman addressing you, Mr. Speaker, to be interrupted even by an hon. member from the Northwest Territories, as I have been interrupted. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) had better have the local responsibility in this matter—for he is not yet elected for the provincial legislature—before he undertakes to have an opinion about it. Even a gentleman with cabinet aspirations ought not to stand up in this House, after the exhibition the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) made of himself, and undertake to tell an hon. member reading plain English that there was the same provision in the law relating to Manitoba schools, and, when it was proved up to the hilt that he was mistaken, explain that that is not what he meant. It is wasting the time of the House as the Postmaster General wasted it—not quite so completely, perhaps, but very near even that limit. I have been wondering, Mr. Speaker—and I am sorry that your mouth is closed and that you cannot give me the information—having seen what I have since eight o'clock, I have been wondering whether there is another cabinet crisis, and whether that is the reason why the cabinet is wasting the time of the House. The Postmaster General took up nearly two hours, and proved only one thing, and that is that a man could talk that long and say nothing. And now an aspirant to the cabinet takes up more time in the fashion I have shown. Now, the Solicitor General wished to ask me a question.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Listening to the hon. gentleman's very able argument, I understood him to say that we could not alter the terms of the British North America Act, nor give any meaning to the clauses of the Act under such a statute as that now before us.