

the whole truth. I told the hon. member (Mr. Porter) on that occasion that I did not know much about the judges or the courts of Ontario, but that I looked upon them as perhaps higher courts and greater judges than ours, and I said to the hon. gentleman that if he would conduct himself in his quotations of law and the handling of a case in our Nova Scotia courts as he did before that audience, in ten minutes he would be kicked out of the court. That is what I told him in Oxford, and that is what I tell him now. These are the facts, and I am not going to follow the discussion up any further. I told some of my friends up there the character of the opposition that was given by this man, and they asked me who it was, and the moment they heard his name they said: Oh, what else could you expect? Now, Mr. Chairman, they tried to steal the vote in that constituency, they tried to falsify the facts, but the result was that in that small place Braemar, the Liberal candidate came out with seventy-five of a majority. I shall be glad to go back to that place with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) and discuss the facts over again. He was in his own province, where I was an entire stranger; and if I could kick him out of court and capture the meeting, I think I was entitled to do it. He undertook to prove that section 16 was drafted by the Papal ablegate and put in the hands of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who moved it without changing a line or a word. Has the hon. member (Mr. Porter) proven that? When he proves that it will be time enough for him to interrupt the proceedings of this House with the statement that I should resign my seat.

Mr. PORTER. I do not intend to prolong the discussion between my hon. friend and myself as to our personal qualifications. I rose to bring to the attention of the House a plain and simple issue between him and me upon a public question. It will be utterly useless for me to undertake to prove the statements made either by myself or by him, except by producing the report in the public press and one other written document which I happen to have in my possession. The statement made by the hon. member (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) as to how I introduced this question at that meeting is utterly untrue. I say it is absolutely false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PORTER. I say it is not in accordance with the facts, and the written evidence proves it is not in accordance with the facts. The only report of that meeting is printed in the 'Globe' newspaper, which is a friend of the hon. gentleman, and which reports his side of the case in a friendly way. The 'Globe' defines the issue between the hon. gentleman and myself on that occasion in plain and unmistakable language, and its statement is not in ac-

cord with the statement of the hon. gentleman. The 'Globe' says:

Mr. Porter claimed that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had been interrogated on the floor of the House as to whether there had been any negotiations between him and Monseigneur Sbarretti.

The paper does not show that one single word or syllable was uttered by me to the effect that that clause had been drafted by Monseigneur Sbarretti.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. That is what you said.

Mr. PORTER. I repudiate that statement entirely. What I said at that meeting is exactly what is reported in the 'Globe,' with the single exception that I added, and it is not reported, that when the right hon. gentleman was so interrogated he had not taken occasion to deny it. The 'Globe' goes on to define the position in this way:

Mr. Porter challenged Mr. Mackenzie by saying that if he could not prove from the pages of 'Hansard' that that was so, he would resign his seat in parliament if Mr. Mackenzie would on the other hand agree to resign his seat if Mr. Porter proved that it was on the pages of 'Hansard.'

That defines the issue between us and I leave it to this House or to any one who reads this speech whether or not I have proved the statement I made, declaring it to be contained on the pages of 'Hansard,' word for word almost as I stated it. My hon. friend took issue with me on that and undertook, if I did prove it that he would resign his seat. To-night he has not attempted to make any answer; he has not attempted to deny that that was the issue between us, and he has not resigned his seat. He has tried to call attention to something else but he has not denied it and I venture to say he will not deny that the report in the 'Globe' newspaper is absolutely correct with the addition to which I have already referred. That is not the only evidence. Let me call my hon. friend's attention to another little piece of evidence which if he was so secure in the position he has stated to the committee to-night he would have taken occasion to repudiate. On June 21, when he had failed to keep his promise of arraigning me before the House as to my statement, I wrote the letter to which I referred and in that letter I distinctly and clearly defined the issue between us. I said in that letter:

As some eight or nine days have elapsed since you took occasion to say at a public meeting at Braemar in North Oxford, that you would take the first opportunity in the House to ask me to substantiate my statement—

Then I inserted in inverted commas:

—that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had been interrogated on the floor of the House as to whether there had been any consultations between him and Monseigneur Sbarretti with regard to the school clauses of the Autonomy Bill, and that