

than that, when the control of 'Le Soleil' passed from the hon. Minister of Justice, it passed to the very gentleman who descended from the bench of the province of Quebec in order that he might become the organizer of the Liberal party in that province in the last election. That is why I attached some responsibility to the right hon. gentleman in connection with its utterances; and I would like to know whether or not the Minister of Customs thinks that in so doing under these circumstances I took anything like the position which he did with regard to myself and the Hamilton 'Spectator.' Has the Hamilton 'Spectator' ever pretended to be my organ? Have I any control over it? The hon. gentleman knows, and he knew it when he made that quotation to-night, but he suppressed the fact, that the Hamilton 'Spectator' has most severely criticised me in connection with the very Bill which is before the House.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not know that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, the hon. gentleman ought to have known it before he spoke.

Mr. PATERSON. Why should I have known it? Am I to be expected to read the Hamilton 'Spectator' every day? I did not know that it had criticised the hon. gentleman adversely in connection with this Bill, as he states.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not seen it myself, but I have been informed that such is the case, and I believe it to be correct.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Will my hon. friend permit me to ask him a question? Will he deny that within a comparatively recent period the Hamilton 'Spectator' has declared that it is perfectly satisfied with the manner in which the hon. member for Carleton is at present leading the opposition?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether it has done so or not; but I have been informed that the Hamilton 'Spectator' some two or three weeks ago severely criticised me in connection with this very Bill; and yet the Minister of Customs seeks to place upon me the responsibility of utterances of the Hamilton 'Spectator,' and accuse me of inciting race prejudice and religious discord in this country. That is what I understood to be the hon. gentleman's charge; am I correct?

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman assumes that my remarks were all addressed to him, the remarks that had reference to many gentlemen on the other side of the House, he is assuming a good deal. My words will show for themselves what I said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, the hon. gentleman will not answer a straightforward

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

question which I put to him. Very good. I will pass from that. If he has not the courage to answer yes or no, I will leave him to the judgment of the House and of the country. But I want to know this from him, and from those who have said so much about exciting race prejudice and religious discord, whether they make that charge also against the Laurier Club of Toronto, which has uttered some protests on this subject, whether they charge that against the Indian Head Liberal Club in the Northwest which has addressed a similar protest, and whether they charge that against the hundreds of Liberals who attended a large meeting in the city of Toronto at which resolutions were passed with regard to this Bill. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs is very inquisitive, might I address the question to him and ask whether he is charging these gentlemen with exciting religious discord and race prejudice?

Mr. PATERSON. No, I am not. A great many of my remarks were intended for men whom they will fit. I did not allude very much to the leader of the opposition in the remarks I made, his remarks in this House have not been of the inflammatory nature of some others. But if he wishes to assume responsibility for all that has been said on the other side of the House, then of course I am not to blame. Individually, I did not attribute it to him. My remarks, if I must say it here, were based more especially on what has been said by the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who is not in the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I must say at once that I very much misunderstood the hon. gentleman. He was pointing his finger at me in a somewhat dramatic way, and on several occasions at least he alluded to me because he mentioned the leader of the opposition. I do not think that gentlemen throughout this country, and many of them Liberals who have protested against certain features of the Bill now under discussion—I will not discuss it at all, the hon. gentleman spent about twenty minutes or half an hour in discussing the Bill, which he had no right to do—I do not think these gentlemen can be accused of exciting religious prejudice or race discord. Nor do I think that they should be characterized, as the member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has characterized them, as renegade Liberals.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not do anything of the sort.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did not the member for Ottawa use that expression?

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, but not in the connection that the hon. gentleman states now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To whom did he apply it?