

west members when every one of them followed the Minister of the Interior was overcome and they were satisfied by whatever private information was given them regarding the proposed amendment and they came back with the ex-Minister of the Interior. Surely the House ought to know that if it is so effectual that it satisfied all the people of the district the amendment ought to be given to the other members of parliament to satisfy them as well.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Minister of Justice has seen fit to invoke the rules of this House as a reason for not giving this long deferred and much expected explanation. I wonder he did not ask the Prime Minister and discuss it with him before the Bill was given a second reading. We know that every gentleman on that side supported the second reading because he was satisfied owing to the introduction of the substituted clauses. The Prime Minister did not attempt to read this Bill the second time until he placed the amendment before the House so that they would know what the amended clause 16 would be. Now what are the merits of the matter? The second reading was carried because of different constructions to suit each particular case which were put upon clause 16, not as originally drawn and as before the committee to-day, but because it had been said that the clause was going to be amended and a notice of the amendment was given. Every hon. gentleman who defended, generally in a lame way, from the government side of the House, his getting into line upon this Bill, his interference with provincial rights in this parliament, tried to make out that with the amended clause it was not nearly so bad as it would have been if the original clause had gone through. Now what are the rules of the House? Are the rules of the House to be construed and acted upon by the Minister of Justice to perpetrate a trick on the members of this House?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What do you mean by a trick? You had better be careful what you say.

Mr. LANCASTER. In inducing them to vote for the second reading of the Bill on the understanding that a certain section was to be replaced by another section of which notice was given of the intention so to substitute the amended clause, and when hon. gentlemen justified as they did one after another their voting in support of the second reading of the Bill, on this very important—for inspite of the fault-finding of the Minister of Justice with the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) for saying so, I will repeat that in my humble judgment it is a very important—amendment, not only because it involves an educational and religious question, but because it interferes with the provincial rights of the new provinces, involving a very im-

Mr. SPROULE.

portant question, notice of an amendment having been submitted to the House the second reading of the Bill was carried by saying that this amendment would be explained when the House was in committee.

Then the hon. gentlemen upon the government side of the House got up and justified their votes for the second reading of the Bill because they thought the amendment, as it was going to be brought before the committee, would be harmless. I remember the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) talking on that line. Did he not say that he considered the amendment that was going to be brought into the committee of such a character that he was justified in getting back and voting with his former colleagues of the government in support of this measure? Did he not say as plainly as a man can say who does not use the exact words that he would not have got back into line and supported the government on this measure if they had not given notice of what they were going to substitute in place of section 16 which caused him to resign? We all remember that the present hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) also made a speech upon this Bill. After modifying as far as he could all his former views on this matter he brought it down to this that he was satisfied that this amended clause would not do very much harm, and he distinctly gave us to understand as plainly as any man can who does not use plain words that he would not otherwise have supported the government in regard to section 16. These hon. gentlemen all justified their votes in support of the principle of the Bill each being allowed to put his own peculiar interpretation upon it and to state what in his view it meant. These votes were cast in favour of the Bill each hon. gentleman justifying himself according to his own peculiar idea of what that section would amount to. Now, the second reading of the Bill was carried and we are in committee upon it. I should have thought that the right hon. Prime Minister himself, the very first thing after we got into committee and before we began to discuss section 1 at all would have said, not because this is an educational clause, not because it involves a religious question or a question of provincial rights, but because he had told the House that after the vote upon the second reading of the Bill and on section 16 which was controversial and which had caused the resignation of one of the members of his cabinet and for which was going to be substituted a new and amended clause that he would explain what it meant—I say, that I should have thought that he would have carried out that promise and explained what it meant. I do not think he should have asked us to wait until we got to section 16 taking the sections in their numerical order. I should have thought, that, in view of the statement the Prime Minister made on the second reading of the Bill, and having