

obtained the second reading by virtue of the statement that clause 16 which was controversial and which had caused the resignation of the hon. Minister of the Interior, was going to be amended in accordance with the notice he had given, would have risen at once to tell this House and the country what was the difference between this amendment and the original section which had caused him to get his supporters into line and to induce them to vote this Bill through. But, as my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said a while ago, we have to be patient. We are learning patience at the hands of the government, particularly these of us who are just as anxious as the hon. Minister of Justice is to get this legislation into practical shape if it must pass. We are kept in the House day after day and evening after evening waiting for the long deferred explanation, and I think it is time that it came. I have a word to say, if the hon. gentleman will not get angry with me for saying it, in regard to the position of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont). I would like him to tell me, if, when he voted for the second reading of the Bill, he voted for the original clause or for the clause that has been substituted for section 16? I do not think that the hon. gentleman knows. I do not think that any hon. member in the House knows what he was voting for according to the statement of the hon. Minister of Justice. We are not supposed to know what we are voting for and yet we have carried the second reading of this Bill. We have now come to the discussion of the controversial clause of this Bill which caused the resignation of the late hon. Minister of the Interior and very nearly caused the resignation of other members of the cabinet, and we have not yet been afforded that information which was promised us at the time the motion for the second reading of the Bill was made. Yet, week after week during the discussion in this House hon. members, particularly on the government side, justified themselves for voting for the second reading by the fact that this section had been amended. What is the hon. Minister of Justice going to do with those hon. gentlemen sitting behind him? We do not expect him to inform us on this side to any great extent but he ought surely to inform those hon. gentlemen who took their political lives in their hands for him in their constituencies and voted this through. Surely they ought to know. Perhaps they are too mild mannered in regard to the Minister of Justice. Perhaps they are quite anxious not to offend him, or they are not as willing to take the risk of offending him, as those of us on this side of the House. But, I ask him on behalf of hon. gentlemen opposite who are brother members of the House, to give them this information. They are entitled to it after having been induced to vote for the second

reading of the Bill on the understanding that section 16 did not carry out what it was supposed to mean. I think in all fairness these hon. gentlemen should not be required to write letters and make more speeches to square themselves with their constituents for voting for what was understood to be an amended clause, as it was called by the Prime Minister, and which was carried by the vote so given notwithstanding the fact that the hon. Minister of Justice says that by the technical rules of the House we are not entitled to this information yet. I think it is time some of us got a little indignant here. It is all very well to be courteous. It is all very well to try and get along in a harmonious way, but patience ceases to be a virtue sometimes. This House has been sitting and dealing with this Bill for several weeks. Representation after representation has been made by some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, sometimes by a prospective cabinet minister and sometimes by a would-be cabinet minister without any prospect in view, by hon. gentlemen opposite getting up and claiming to know what the section means, telling us what their views are and asking us to accept their conclusions, as to what the difference is between the clause as originally drawn and as amended. I want to say to the right hon. Prime Minister, to the hon. Minister of Justice and to the hon. Minister of Finance that it is due to them collectively to tell the House if they can what the difference is between these two clauses. The hon. Minister of Justice, who expressed a strong opinion on the subject at one time and who had to modify it since, not because he is a lawyer, but because he is a man of common sense, ought to tell us what he says now as a man of common sense and not as a lawyer.

Mr. FIELDING. The distinction which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) sharply draws between a lawyer and a man of common sense might have been well illustrated by the hon. gentleman's own remarks. But, the depressing information which is given to the House that the hon. gentlemen opposite cannot read is received with great pain and regret over here. Ordinarily speaking it is considered enough for a Bill to be presented to the House in good English or in excellent French, and if an amendment be submitted in the same terms and in the same excellent languages it is generally considered that we are expected to read and understand it for ourselves. Though my hon. friend has had this amendment before him for days and weeks he now asks what it means, but he had no hesitation in voting what it meant.

Mr. LANCASTER. I did not say I did not know what it meant; I said the Minister of Finance and his supporters evidently do not know what it means.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) need not concern himself about