upon the conduct of the government of the day whether in Dominion or local politics on the record of the government. It was a considerable revelation to me when I met this hon. gentleman at Braemar to find that it was a hot campaign of anti-Catholicism from start to finish and not one word about the policy of this government, nothing in regard to that phase of the responsibility of the government, nothing but popery in the beginning, popery in the middle and popery in the end. That was the whole song of the hon. member who is coming here and asking you to pass judgment upon me because I crossed swords with him on that occasion. What was his first act when he arrived at the meeting? Himself and another gentleman landed there loaded with newspapers (in a carriage) the London 'Free Press' with all its blazing head lines about Sbarretti, the Pope and Hyman, that had been used in all those cartoons up there. They had their carriage loaded with these papers and the hon. gentleman, his friend the doctor and the driver started out to distribute that stuff the moment they got there. That was the first thing that I was up against. It was a new line to me and I appeal to the hon. leader of the opposition to say if in the province that I come from we carry on elections on questions of that kind. We never make an issue of that kind. The hon. member at the opening of the meeting showed his generosity by confining myself and another gentleman to forty-five minutes while giving to himself and his friends two hours. That was the very first start. If we had been intruders at that meeting, it would have been a different thing. We were invited to be there. Their posters said that discussion was invited. When we went there in response to that invitation we were told forsooth that we would get forty-five minutes between the two of us and that we could do what we liked with that time. Mr. McKay spoke for fifteen minutes and I occupied the balance of the time. I want to point out to you the syllogism or logic of this thing to show how it came about. The hon. member was not speaking ten minutes when he made the statement that it had come to a fine pass in this country when the laws of the country were dictated, written and handed to her premier by the representative of the Pope. That was the very first statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Yes; he said that clause 16, No. 1, was not drafted by Sir Wilfrid Laurier; that it was not drafted by the Minister of Justice; that it was not drafted by any other member of the government, but that it was drafted by Sbarretti and placed in the hands of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was told: Go; introduce that, and do not dare introduce anything else. I felt it was my duty to say at once to the hon. member (Mr. Porter): You belie the Prime Minister, and you falsify the facts, and I challenge you to prove your statement. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) introduced his evidence, and he said: I will prove it to you from 'Hansard'; I will show you that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was interrogated on that point, and he did not deny it. I challenge the hon. gentleman now to prove his statement with regard to the drafting of that clause. If he can prove now that the Minister of Justice did not draft that clause, but that His Excellency Monseigneur Sbarretti drafted it, I will stand by my promise and resign my seat if he will do the same. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) said he would resign his seat if he did not prove his proposition, but he never touched on his proposition at all to-night. That is the kind of a gentleman that comes before you to-night producing one half of the evidence only. When he made the statement about the party who drafted clause 16, number 1 as alleged, I said to the people of Braemar: Gentlemen, even if it were true that Sir Wilfrid Laurier did consult Monseigneur Sbarretti about this question, what is there wrong in that; this is the man beyond all men in Canada who represents the religious denomination that is particularly affected by this legislation; and if Sir Wilfrid Laurier or any other man at the head of a government in this country did consult the special representative of a church about legislation that concerns it particularly, is there anything wrong about that? I took occasion to point out that the Presbyterian General Assembly was then sitting in the city of Kingston, and I said that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier went to Kingston and spoke to the Venerable Doctor Armstrong about something that particularly concerned the Presbyterian Church, would it be fair or honourable for anybody in this country to arraign him because, forsooth, he consulted the Moderator of the General Assembly upon a subject that particularly concerned the Presbyterian Church in Canada? That is the argument I used. I said to the people that it was cowardly and contemptible—I did not mention this gentleman's name—I said it was cowardly and contemptible for any man in the midst of a Presbyterian and Protestant body, and miles away from any Catholic that could take his own part, to start a discussion on religion and denunciation of the Catholic church, I said such a man was a slanderer and a coward, and I repeat that statement now. The House will remember that I was meeting a campaign of a character I never met before, I was meeting in controversy a man of a class I never met before. I appeal to the leader of the opposition, a gentleman from my own province, if it is not true that when lawyers in Nova Scotia meet, either at the bar or on the hustings, they tell the truth as they understand it, and they tell