

that we are to allow attacks of that kind to be made and not draw attention to them? If they are right what are they ashamed of? If they are justified what are they ashamed of? If they are not right why do they not repudiate them? Why do they not deny any complicity with any such doings or any desire to benefit by such a course of action?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as I am concerned—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I except my hon. friend—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want to assure my hon. friend that I never heard of the article until the Minister of Customs read it here in the House to-night. I most unhesitatingly say that I do not approve of it. I most unhesitatingly say that, and I thought it would be gathered from what I said before.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I accept, of course, the repudiation of my hon. friend and I want to add that this is only a sample of a thousand other paragraphs that are published daily in the press of Ontario. That is only a sample of the articles and the cartoons inspired by the same spirit that are published every day in the Toronto 'World' and the Toronto 'News.'

Mr. BARKER. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question. Does he attribute that article to any other person on this side of the House?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not attribute it to any person on that side of the House; I attribute the article to the gentleman who wrote it whoever he may be, who published it in the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite and I attribute the result of the article to the gentlemen who tolerate the publication of such articles.

Mr. BARKER. What I would like to know is whether in his own mind, in his own suspicion, he means that any person on this side of the House had anything to do with that article. He used language that implied that. He ought to withdraw that language if he does not mean it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not as a rule deal in suspicions or inferences; I try to make statements. I stated that the article was published in an important paper connected with the Conservative party of Ontario. I say that that article is only a sample of other articles that are constantly being published in the same press by the result of which hon. gentlemen opposite hope to benefit. The leader of the opposition refers to an article published in 'Le Soleil' of 17th February, 1904. You can take almost any article in any newspaper and make extracts from the article which can be made to mean almost anything, but now I want to quote for the benefit of the House the text in the original, of the reference read

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

by my hon. friend with the surrounding sentences and I can say this that that article does not bear the construction based upon it. You must begin with the article somewhat further up than the quotation is made and you will find that among other things after having discussed the question of the division of provinces the article goes on to say:

Proportionately to the great sister provinces, Manitoba will not be of much more import than a large county.

That is one of the reasons urged by the Manitoba delegates why they should be granted an increase of territory.

There is another reason. Quebec and Ontario have extended their boundaries, one westward, the other eastward, in order to reach towards the north, the shores of James' bay.

Manitoba wishes to get to the shores of Hudson bay towards the north-east. To attain that object, it would be necessary for her to extend her boundaries several hundred miles northward, cutting through Saskatchewan and Athabaska and taking in Keewatin.

All this has never been quoted before and this is the introduction to what follows:

Manitoba wants an increase three times its present area. Such an extension could hardly be granted. The district of Saskatchewan, at least that part which is directly interested, is opposed to it.

The finances of Manitoba, in their present state, are not in such a condition as to attract the free inhabitants of the districts. Manitoba's debt aggregates \$4,000,000. The school legislation of the small province is not of a nature to attract the settlers in the districts. The northwest has its separate schools. Manitoba has wiped out those that existed within its limits.

Every good act has its reward; every evil act its penalty.

Now for those who understand the French language, what does that paragraph mean? I shall endeavour to translate it off hand:

This extension is hardly possible. The district of Saskatchewan is opposed to it, at least that part of the district that is directly interested.

Now they give the reasons why they are opposed to it:

The finances of Manitoba in their present state are not in such a condition as to attract the free inhabitants of the district.

That is the first question, the financial question.

Then they are giving us the school legislation of a little province which is not of a nature to tempt the immigration of people into the districts adjoining. The Northwest Territories have separate schools. Manitoba has abolished them. All good acts have their rewards; all bad acts have their punishments. Manitoba shall remain small because she has pernicious schools.

There is the text; there is the whole article. Now, what does that mean? Does