

master General done? He has occupied the time of this House from nine o'clock until twenty minutes to eleven. And evidently he has tried to say something. Several times he has said: 'What is the question before the House?' But he never told us what that question was. I do not know whether he was discussing the Manitoba remedial legislation of 1896—whether he was dreaming that he was out in the province of Ontario abusing Sir Charles Tupper for granting that remedial legislation,—or whether he was trying to offer some plea for interfering with the autonomy of the Northwest. He did say at the opening of his speech, that there was a Bill before the House. But he did not read a single section of it. He evidently does not know the provisions of the British North America Act. He has never read that Act or he would not have made the wrong statements about it that he has made. He has simply wasted the time of the House for an hour and forty minutes—I say this with all deference; but I have as much respect for the members of this House as I have for the Postmaster General, and I think that some one ought to apologize. So, as one of the members constituting this House, as the Postmaster General does not apologize for wasting our time, I can only hope that the House will accept the apology I offer. The House has as much right to accept my apology as the Postmaster General has to propose, in the name of autonomy, a throttling piece of legislation for the Northwest Territories. This House has as much and more right to say that the member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) should apologize for the Postmaster General as to say that the provincial parliament of the Northwest shall not control its own affairs. At nine o'clock the Postmaster General began to address this House. I have kept track, as well as I could, of his wanderings about the question—if it can be said he was so near the question as to be wandering about it—and the discussion—if you can call it discussion—that he has inflicted upon the House. He spent half an hour in abusing the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster.)

Mr. LENNOX. He apologized.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have no doubt he will apologize if somebody makes him do so, but he will not apologize out of the goodness of his heart;—he might to save a libel suit if a libel suit could be taken against him. Then for forty minutes he was supposed to discuss this Bill, if you can call it a discussion of the Bill to tell us over and over again that the British North America Act had dealt differently with different provinces—and I am in the judgment of the House when I say that that is all this discussion amounted to. Then, for the next thirty minutes he gave kind advice to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)

about his duty in regard to toleration. He talked about intolerant speeches in this House and about vehemence. And what was the other word he used?—I have a note of it here;—some word that, I think, we hardly understand as coming from the Postmaster General. He spoke once of brotherly love. He spoke also of inflammatory and impassioned speeches—but he did not tell us at which side of the House he was directing his lecture. I have been in this House throughout this debate, and I am not in the habit of sitting here and not listening. I have not heard one impassioned sentence in this debate coming from this side of the House, and neither has any other hon. member. The Postmaster General seems to think he has heard that kind of thing from this side. I heard the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), before the Bill was read the second time, make what I suppose the Postmaster General would call a speech of brotherly love. The Minister of Justice said in effect: If my brothers of the Dominion of Canada will not give me something to which I have no constitutional right; if they will not give me justice and let me be the judge of what is to be considered justice, there shall be no peace in this country. That is the style of speech we get from the King's chosen representative of justice in this House, the occupant of what ought to be the highest and grandest of cabinet positions. He told us that forty-one per cent of our people demanded this legislation. I take issue with him there. All the Roman Catholics in this country are not in favour of this legislation.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANCASTER. But I tell my young friend from Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne), who has interrupted every speaker in this House since this question began, that he has got a lot of things to learn yet, and some things to learn about his own race in the province of Quebec. I will tell my young friend that if he wants to get any standing in this House, if he wants anybody to listen to him, he must be more tolerant, he must not take his lessons of tolerance from the Postmaster General and he must make less inflammatory speeches, and exercise more courtesy to hon. gentlemen who have just as much right to their opinions as he has.

Now, Sir, I say to all these gentlemen that in the county of Lincoln, which I have the honour to represent, I do not believe there is a single Roman Catholic who wants any thing done that is unconstitutional or contrary to the spirit of the constitution. When the Minister of Finance spoke on this question he sneered at the constitution. The Minister of Finance, acknowledging, I suppose, that the constitution was dead against him, tried to make out that the constitutional aspect of this legislation was of no