

decision. If he wishes to appeal, the course is open to him.

Mr. PORTER. I do not desire to question your decision and not doing that, I am proceeding to urge other reasons and surely I have the right to do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Provided they are relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. PORTER. I take the position with regard to this clause 16 under discussion, that when it was introduced and came up for debate, on more than one occasion the right hon. the First Minister was interrogated by different members on this side as to whether or not he or members of his cabinet had not consulted with the Papal Ablegate regarding the educational paragraphs of this clause. As often as I heard that question asked, just so often did I see the right hon. gentleman remain silent in his seat and refuse to deny the truth of that statement. I have taken occasion to repeat that statement outside of the House, and I believe that the statement I have just made and the statement I made outside of the House is a true statement. My utterances with regard to that matter were reported to some extent in the 'Globe' newspaper in its issue of the 12th June last.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is wandering back to what I declared out of order. We are now studying one of the clauses of the Bill before us and we cannot go beyond it. If the hon. gentleman wishes to appeal from my decision, I shall report to the Speaker, and he can take the sense of the House, but at present he must confine himself to the clause under discussion and not wander to matters not relevant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is not this quite as relevant as the discussion of meetings held in Ontario and Quebec and which were taken part in by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) and the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa)?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Labelle said that what has taken place here the two days past was out of order, but no objection was raised. In this case, however, objection being raised, I have to give a ruling.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. We are discussing clause 16, which is the educational clause. A statement has been made with regard to what has taken place in this House concerning that clause. That statement was denied by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). The hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Porter) reiterated his statement. When discussing clause 16, is it not entirely in order to discuss that question of fact without any motion whatever? According to my reading

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

of the proper procedure of parliament, it is entirely in order.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. It must not be understood that anything said here to prevent this discussion has received any sanction from myself. I am only too happy to meet the hon. gentleman. I am just as ready to meet him here as I was in North Oxford. If there be any way in which he can properly bring this matter up, I shall be only too happy to reply to him.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the committee is willing that the question should be settled between the two hon. gentlemen, I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. PORTER. The hon. member having expressed himself as quite ready—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion that the committee rise.

Mr. PORTER. That is all right, Mr. Chairman. I was about to relate to the committee the circumstances under which this difference between the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) and myself arose, and I made reference to that fact that there had been an election in North Oxford, the results of which both sides have cause to remember. During that election I was invited by the Conservative party to take part in discussing the issue, or what I conceived to be the only issue before the electorate in that contest, and that was the effect of this section 16 in regard to the education or educational rights in the new provinces about to be created. I do not intend now to enter into any lengthy discussion as to my views on this question. I have already expressed those views in this House, and having listened attentively to the debate since then, as well as to that which took place before I spoke, I have not heard any arguments which have led me to change my opinion. All I desire to do is to prove the position I took in North Oxford which was disputed by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). The meeting at which the difference of opinion between us arose took place at a place called Braemar in North Oxford. The only report of that meeting that I have seen was published in the 'Globe' on June 12. This report it would seem must have been prepared, or at least inspired, by the hon. member for Cape Breton. I say that for this reason—

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. The hon. member (Mr. Porter) is entirely wrong. I had nothing to do with the report.

Mr. PORTER. That the audience at that place was composed entirely of farmers in the vicinity of Braemar, except the hon. gentleman (Mr. D. D. McKenzie), a gentleman who accompanied him, Dr. Welford, who accompanied me, and myself. There was not, I venture to say, a single man at that meeting who would have written such a