

I said a few moments ago, that other statements have already been read in this House as having appeared in 'Le Canada,' which never did appear in that paper.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not follow that because forty-nine articles may be wrongly attributed to that paper, the fiftieth article may not have appeared in it. In the absence of any information the hon. gentleman possesses, I say again that I am quoting what appeared in a responsible paper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What paper?

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot give the name just now, but I will get it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I saw the article myself, I think it was in the St. John 'Sun.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. About what date?—so that we can trace it up.

Mr. SPROULE. Speaking from memory, I think it was the St. John 'Sun.' Now then, I have just read that as an offset to some of the unkind criticisms that have been indulged in with regard to the intolerance of Ontario, and especially of the newspapers of Toronto. I have also read it to remind the First Minister that hundreds of Orangemen voted for his candidates in the last election, as they did in 1896, to my personal knowledge, hundreds of them who are as consistent reformers as any other people in this country. I want him to understand when such a diatribe as that is published against the Orangemen of this country it strikes many of his own friends as well as those represented by the hon. member for East Grey.

Mr. MILLER. Are the Orangemen mentioned in that article from the beginning to the end of it?

Mr. SPROULE. They were in the other one, and the hon. member knows it well.

Mr. MILLER. Then why does the hon. gentleman apply this article to the Orangemen when they are not mentioned in it?

Mr. SPROULE. Because it is another evidence of the epithets that have been hurled at the Orangemen for fifty years, all over this country they have been called yellow dogs, and the hon. member knows it. He should be the last to get up and interrupt me here, because he knows that in his own riding there are Orangemen who have supported him but who will resent this insult.

Mr. MILLER. I ask the hon. gentleman again—

Mr. SPROULE. I have found the name of the paper marked where I did not see it. It is the St. John 'Sun,' of June 10, 1905.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have the article of 'Le Canada' here now, and I would ask any hon. gentlemen on the other side who

are more familiar with the French language than I am, to read it. It is found in 'Le Canada' of Saturday, June 10, 1904.

Some hon. MEMBERS. En français.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (reading).

Yellow dog is a term too polite to designate the people under the command of Dr. Sproule, and who stir up the dust of sectarian passions. A dog is generally clean. The friends and henchmen of Dr. Sproule and his leader, Mr. Borden, are individuals too dirty to be compared to dogs, even yellow dogs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Pass it over here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought it was so disgusting and discreditable that it could not have appeared in 'Le Canada.' It seems to excite very much the risibilities of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) and the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa).

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I was merely congratulating the leader of the opposition on his good French.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I only ventured to read it because I was asked to do so from the other side. I do not think the article in 'Le Canada' is materially different from the translation which my hon. friend from East Grey has just read. If any hon. gentleman opposite thinks it does differ, I will pass it over that he may read it for himself.

Mr. SPROULE. Notwithstanding the denials of the Minister of Inland Revenue, that the article never appeared in 'Le Canada,' he is mistaken, and it has been fairly translated. The hon. member for Labelle has frequently designated the hon. member for East Grey in almost similar words. The Minister of Inland Revenue did not know what he was talking about and of course it was impossible that he could enlighten the House. But it seems that this is even more reliable than the hon. gentleman desired and notwithstanding the fact that supporters of the government could not have imagined for a moment that it was possible that it would appear in a government organ, it did appear in a government organ and they are obliged to admit it and cannot help it at the present time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Here is the translation of it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Labelle said that if this is to be a nation there must be one law for all. I agree with that exactly and will never dissent from it. We always stand for that—one law for all, equality before the law for all, equal rights for every religion in this country, but it is because we think there is a desire to have one law for one class, and to have it different from that which applies to all