

report as this except one of these four; and neither Dr. Welford nor myself have been in the habit of writing political articles for the 'Globe' newspaper. The report of that meeting in the 'Globe' is as follows:

(Special despatch to the 'Globe'.)

Woodstock, June 10.—The Liberals succeeded in capturing a Conservative meeting at Braemar, North Oxford, last night, and the proceedings at times were unusually lively. The Tory speakers were Dr. Welford, of Woodstock, and E. Gus Porter, M.P., while Mr. D. D. McKenzie, M.P., of Cape Breton, and Mr. J. S. Mackay, of Woodstock, went out on behalf of the opposition. There was some quibbling at the outset as to the order of speaking, and the time to be occupied. Ultimately Dr. Welford spoke for about ten minutes. Messrs. Mackay and McKenzie occupied three-quarters of an hour between them, and Mr. Porter addressed the meeting for an hour and a half. Mr. McKenzie made a very forcible speech and quite carried the audience with him, and after Mr. Porter had spoken asked for two minutes in which to answer him. The Conservatives objected, but a Liberal stalwart named John Mackay said the audience wanted to hear the matter out, even if they had to remain till morning. The Liberals obtained the upper hand, and Mr. McKenzie was able to speak for another three-quarters of an hour.

There were some warm passages in the course of the proceedings, notably when 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 Mons. Sbarretti. Mr. McKenzie explained that when Mr. Porter said that he said what he knew was untrue, and he added: I brand as a slanderer and a coward the man who would make such a statement as that.

Mr. Porter challenged Mr. McKenzie 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. McKenzie would, on the other hand, agree to resign his seat if Mr. Porter proved that it was on the pages of 'Hansard.' Mr. McKenzie asserted that if Mr. Porter could prove his point he would resign his seat the next moment, and he added that he would take the first opportunity in the House of Commons to ask Mr. Porter to substantiate his statement.

The occurrence of which this purports to be an account took place on June 9 inst. It is now the 29th. That is to say that twenty days have elapsed since the hon. gentleman (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) undertook at the first opportunity to arraign me in this House to prove the statement that I made on that occasion. I leave it to the hon. gentlemen and this committee to say whether I have been arraigned or not. However, fearing that the hon. gentlemen might forget his undertaking with the audience at Braemar I wrote the hon. gentleman a letter, as I thought I had a right to do, having sat in this House waiting for him to bring the question up. This is the letter I wrote:

House of Commons,

June 21, 1905.

Dear Sir,—As some eight or nine days have elapsed since you took occasion to say at a public meeting held at Braemar, North Oxford

270

that you would take the first opportunity in the House of Commons to ask me to substantiate my statement 'that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had been interrogated on the floor of the House as to whether there had been any consultations between him and Monsigneur Sbarretti in regard to the school clauses of the Autonomy Bill and that Sir Wilfrid had not when so interrogated denied having such consultations and that you would resign your seat if I could show from 'Hansard' that my statement was true.' I feel it to be my privilege and duty since I have regularly attended the House since then by affording you the opportunity to carry out your promise which you have failed to do although you have been in the House—to now bring the matter to the attention of the House myself and beg to advise you that I shall do so at the first favourable opportunity presented when I am in the House.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) E. GUSS PORTER.

D. D. McKenzie, Esq., M.P.,

House of Commons.

So, notwithstanding the promise and the bold statement made by the hon. gentlemen at that time that he would arraign me in this House on that question, he has not seen fit to do so. Therefore, as I wrote the hon. gentleman, I take the first opportunity to mention this matter. I do not propose to deal with this article so far as it reports the effect of the meeting, the capturing of the meeting or how it was captured. I could do so, perhaps, not to the advantage of the hon. member. That is all beside the question. But there is a straight issue between the hon. gentleman and myself as to whether the statement I made at that meeting is justified by the record of 'Hansard' or not. Let me refer to the speech made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on April 6 and reported in 'Hansard' at page 4414 and 4415. The hon. member for North Toronto said:

There were certain things that my right hon. friend, however, did not say and they are quite as remarkable as the things that he did say. He has been told times without number to his face in this House and he has not once risen to deny it, it has been very courteously brought to his attention to-day and he has thoroughly ignored it, that before he brought down his educational clause on February 21, 1905, there had been numerous conferences between himself and Monseigneur Sbarretti with reference to the provisions of that Bill. There is no denial yet. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, I ask this House, I ask the people of this country if it has come to this that in Canada the representative of any church I dont care what it is—

Then follows an interruption by an hon. member and the hon. member for North Toronto continues:

Through its accredited highest head must be visited by the premier of this country before he dares to bring down the policy—

Another interruption.

The right hon. gentleman has not denied it yet. Then I wish to ask one other question to aid this thoughtfulness that I am sure is present in this country at the present day. Is it