

unpleasantness between myself and him. The speeches, however, that were made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to-night were no doubt made for a purpose. They were clearly campaign speeches; and in order to make them good, solid Orange campaign speeches, they had to contain something discreditable said by some one in authority. Therefore, they introduced into those speeches something which they alleged had been said by the Minister of Justice. But before I proceed further, I wish to point out that the Minister of Justice was somewhat bound by the agreement entered into by him and the leader of the opposition yesterday, that the discussion on this educational clause would not take place to-day. So that if the hon. gentlemen who follow the leader of the opposition had any regard for agreements made by him, this whole evening would not have been wasted in this useless discussion, the whole of which must come up again, when these hon. gentlemen will have to go over the same ground or say nothing. What was the agreement entered into yesterday between the leader of the opposition and the Minister of Justice? It was as follows:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as I am concerned, the hon. gentleman has very courteously answered everything I wish to ask at this moment, and therefore I am perfectly willing to allow section 2 to stand for the purpose of convenience until we come to discuss it in connection with section 16.

Hon. gentlemen following the leader of the opposition should have known of this agreement, and not have precipitated this discussion.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that the leader of the opposition asked the Minister of Justice to give an explanation of section 16 before we came to deal with it?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. The last words spoken by the leader of the opposition are what I have read. An agreement was therefore entered into that the two sections would be discussed together, and the leader of the opposition said that was perfectly satisfactory to him.

Mr. SPROULE. I leave it to the Minister of Justice himself to say whether what I have mentioned did not take place.

Mr. FIELDING. The leader of the opposition confirmed that agreement this evening, and said that he was quite willing that the matter should stand over until Monday.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. This whole discussion which we have just had was therefore in violation of the agreement entered into between the two hon. gentlemen in this House who should be followed by both sides respectively, and this debate was either due

to a mistake on the part of certain members of the opposition or was intended for the purpose of obstruction and waste of time. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has told us that the Minister of Justice made the statement that this Bill we are discussing would bring into force the Act of 1875, and that section 93 of the British North America Act would also bring that Act into force. But if we are to do justice to that hon. minister, if we are to correctly represent the constitutional view which he holds on this matter, we must read all he said. Had I been trained in any other school than that of the legal profession, perhaps I would not consider it so serious an offence to misquote any man's statement or make a misstatement before a court or a parliament, but there is nothing that is considered so contemptible on the part of any one belonging to the noble profession of the law as to make a mis-quotation before the court or anywhere else. Therefore, I find it difficult to tolerate any mis-quotation on the part of any gentleman, and that is the reason why I could not very well stand the mis-quotations made to-night. What the Minister of Justice said was that if section 93 is going to apply to the west, what would happen? Then we must read in that connection the statement made by him at that same moment:

My argument now is that taking section 16, read in the light of these words in section 2 'except in so far as varied by this Act'—that is to say that the provisions in the British North America Act are applicable to the new provinces, except in so far as varied by this Act—the effect of section 16 is to substitute it for the original section 93 in the British North America Act, and section 93 is not applicable at all, because that section is varied by section 16.

Where is the fairness in standing before the House and quoting what the Minister of Justice says about the effect of section 93 if it came into force, when he distinctly said it will not and cannot apply, and that the amended section 16 takes the place of it entirely, so that whatever he said as regards what might happen if section 93 were to apply has no bearing at all on the final effect of the passing of this Act. That is what I wish to put on record.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the words which the hon. member for East Grey read were a mis-quotation, or that the hon. member did not quote in full what the minister said?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I said that he did not quote the whole statement made by the minister, and that to quote a part only was misleading and unfair to the country and the House. That is the reason I wanted the hon. gentleman to read all that the hon. minister had said and there would then have been no misunderstanding. Now, Mr. Chairman, I come from the province of Nova Scotia, where this journal, the 'Chronicle,