

telegraphed to the United States and to European countries in order to create the impression that if people come to Canada they will not find freedom here. There is nothing to justify such a statement from the hon. gentleman. I had hoped that some of his own friends would take him to task for it; I had hoped that representatives of the Conservative party would correct the impression that might have been made by his statement, occupying as he does the prominent position in that party. I hope they will yet avail themselves of the earliest opportunity to say that so far as they are concerned they are not willing that the impression should go forth that this is the opinion of the Conservative party. That is not the opinion of the Liberal party. Long before the Liberal party came to power in Canada they were striving to bring about freedom of the very best kind, and the best order in this great country. But how is it with the Conservative party? In their press from end to end of Canada, prominent newspapers have undertaken to preach the same doctrine propounded by the member for Victoria and Haliburton. If he is desirous that peace and harmony should reign in Canada, let him address himself to the newspapers of his own party, and ask them to take the lesson that he attempts to preach to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. There are many other things that have been spoken during the course of this debate that I would like to comment upon, but I will not detain the House longer. I did not intend to say all that I have said. I rose for the sole purpose of doing justice to my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) who spoke before six o'clock, and I have done so. I have now to ask the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton to say if he can that he never authorized this interview with the 'Montreal Gazette,' and if he can say that, he will do much to remove an unfortunate impression that has been caused by that interview.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) generally contents himself when he rises to ask a question. But to-night he is playing a different role. As a general thing this House recognizes the fact that no man requires information worse than he does, and the House takes him good naturedly and endeavours to satisfy his curiosity. But sometimes he gets beyond bounds, as he has done to-night in attacking my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes). It is not my purpose to defend my hon. friend, he is quite capable of taking care of himself. I would not have risen to speak at all were it not that the hon. member for Cape Breton unnecessarily, unreasonably, improperly, and I was going to say, untruthfully, made a statement with regard to myself that I had endeavoured to arouse passion among the people of this

country, that I appealed to a certain class of people.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the hon. gentleman that said hear, hear? It is the cigarette smoker. Of course he is entitled to special consideration. He requires that we give him two kinds of pardon—I will not tell him what they are.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. He does not write circulars to the papers.

Mr. SPROULE. Since the hon. gentleman has come into this House he has received courtesy from this side of the House, though his conduct at times has not invited courtesy; but if he does not conduct himself with a little more decorum, he will not receive as much in the future as he has done in the past. Now, with regard to the question before the House, the hon. member for Cape Breton says that the member for East Grey has endeavoured to arouse passions and create discord. Upon what authority does he make that statement? Is it upon the authority of the petition that I sent out to the general community in accordance with the right of every British subject to petition parliament to do a certain thing that he thought was right? Is that not my right and the right of every British subject under the Crown? It is recognized in parliament and out of parliament to be the highest right of a British subject. I was availing myself of that right, and I was quite within my right. I shall read the letter so that there may be no mistake as to what it contains, and if the careful examiner finds that I have done a very improper thing I shall be greatly surprised. In view of this important question that was coming up and was likely to create discord—and let me remind the hon. gentleman that it was his leader who brought it into the arena and not mine, and that upon this question one of the most important ministers resigned, and in doing so he was quite within his rights—it was in the endeavour to prevent the calamity and the political trouble that I foresaw that I adopted the measures that I did. What did I do? I addressed to a society to which I belonged, which is a law-abiding society, no matter what part of the country it is in, composed of tolerant, respectable citizens.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. Tolerant?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, tolerant. I addressed them in the following language:

Ottawa, February 16th, 1905.

Dear Sir and Brother,—

We believe an effort is about to be made to impose separate schools for all time on the people of the new provinces, now being established in the Northwest Territories. It behooves every lover of liberty, and especially every Orangeman, to lend a helping hand, to prevent this injustice being perpetrated on a liberty-