

2, 1904. This organization had just been perfected, and is throwing itself into the arena of politics. In this same work, this Roman Catholic priest says:

I love my church, and for this reason I am fighting these organizations in it.

This gentleman comes to the front and boldly proclaims the object of this movement—the same movement I presume that we find in Canada, with a similar object in view.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. That is what the hon. gentleman does not demonstrate.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (reading):

The fact is that priests and prelates hope to establish in the United States a Catholic party modelled after the Centre party in the German Reichstag, and to make the Catholic societies the nucleus of such a party.

And he points out:

They think they can work it out in this way: Set afoot a movement for a division of the school fund. That movement to mean anything must exert itself in securing pledges from candidates for the legislature. Neither Republican nor Democratic candidates will give such pledges.

I will not go into details, but I will say that these gentlemen are openly—

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. That is in the United States.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, the same game is going on here.

There is an open, notorious and virulent hostility of priests and prelates at home and abroad towards the public school.

Then he goes on and shows what their tactics are.

1. Bringing of the public school into contempt by characterizing it as 'Godless,' 'vicious,' 'a sink of corruption.'

Have we heard any arguments like that in this House? I think we have.

2. The securing for the Catholic parochial schools the largest possible share of the public school tax funds.

Have we heard anything of that kind in this House? I think we have.

3. The encouragement of other sects to start sectarian schools and to demand public moneys in payment for the secular education of the children.

4. The securing of a Catholic majority on public school boards and on the teaching staff of the public schools in the hope of being able thereby to lower the tone of instruction and discipline in the public schools and thus bring the public schools into disfavour.

5. Securing the employment of nuns and monks as public school teachers.

And so on, page after page. I commend the book to hon. gentlemen opposite. It is written by Rev. Mr. Crowley, of Chicago, and if our hon. friends will send for it he

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

will be delighted to send it to them. He says:

A hurricane of hate is brewing. I love the Catholic church, and to save her from destruction in America I write this book.

This is from the pen of Mr. Crowley himself.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman is in very good company. The man he is quoting has no authority whatever to speak for any one but himself. It is not worth while to take much notice of what the hon. gentleman says, but he is really making statements that have no foundation in fact when he says that that man has authority to speak for anybody.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am merely telling what this gentleman says, and I challenge my hon. friend, and he may hunt from now till the morning of the resurrection, to point out one solitary objection to this gentleman, either to his personal or his ecclesiastical position, which will reflect upon his character. Now, we are told that in Canada this does not apply. I will read an article from the Bobcaygeon 'Independent,' whose editor is a Roman Catholic, and who says:

Mr. Laurier, in forcing the separate schools on the northwest, cannot be thoroughly aware of what he is doing. The moment that Bill passes a movement will be inaugurated for the annexation of the Northwest to the States. A break-up of confederation, and annexation means an end of French domination and a clean sweep of separate schools.

This is from a Liberal and a Roman Catholic, the editor of the Bobcaygeon 'Independent,' in the province of Ontario.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is that an authority for the hon. gentleman?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He is a very good authority.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am informed that he is a pro-Boer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, he is in good company. I am told that my hon. friend the Solicitor General was a pro-Boer. I am told that my hon. friend the member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne) also expressed himself in very strong terms against the action of the British government in the South African war; and other hon. gentlemen opposite have very strong views in favour of the Boers—anything so long as they can hit the British empire. Now, Sir, I stated to-day, as one of the offences of these gentlemen against the Dominion of Canada, that they had destroyed all respect for public principles in this Dominion. We have seen them on the trade question, we have seen them on every question, box the compass to suit their own purpose, in various ways they have proved themselves true opportunists, with the result that the public