

front, and to maintain Canada's part in the war? The article in the Orange Sentinel, with the Prime Minister's endorsement, supplies the answer to that question.

I have illustrated the attitude of the Unionist party towards the Catholics of Canada for daring to oppose them. Let me now show you that a Catholic who supported them met with no better or different treatment. Reading again from the article in the Orange Sentinel of December 20th, 1917. I quote the following:

It is unfortunate that throughout the English-speaking province, the one element which stood solidly behind the Laurier party is composed of men who belong to the Roman Catholic Church. That was the backbone of the Laurier organization in Ontario. Apart from Bishop Fallon none of the higher Clergy of this province gave any indication of friendship for the Unionist Government.

There is every reason to believe, however, that his motive in supporting Union Government was largely a desire to punish those who have pursued him for twenty-five years.

Therefore his action cannot be taken as an indication of the sentiment either of his brother Bishops or of the faithful among their flock.

It would be a thousand pities, Mr. Speaker, to spoil by any superfluous comment such warm-hearted appreciation by a leader of Unionism of the help proffered by His Lordship of London to the Unionist party. I will therefore merely repeat my previous observation that the article was written by the Prime Minister's personally endorsed candidate, and the Prime Minister's approving silence for three months shows that he also endorses the article itself.

As it is my desire to place on record for the information not only of Canadians of to-day, but of Canadians of the future as well, all the data requisite for an understanding of the Union Government and the character of its election campaign, I realize that my task would be only half done, so far as Ontario was concerned, if I did not give the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell) full credit for his share in the attacks made on the leader of the Liberal party and on the Catholics of this country. To fully appreciate that hon. gentleman's contribution it will be necessary to go back a few years to get the proper setting for a correct view of his more recent performances.

Let me premise, Sir, by saying that there was a time when, through lack of information, I regarded the hon. member for Durham as an unselfish servant of the public. To-day, in the light of information supplied from a hundred sources, I desire to make reparation to those whom I laboured to convert to my mistaken opinion by exposing,

as briefly as possible, the facts relating to the hon. gentleman's public career as I now know them. Desiring at the same time to be fair to the hon. gentleman, I propose to take as the standard of judgment that ought to be applied in his case a standard that has been supplied by himself. Let me explain where that standard is to be found.

Speaking at North Bay on the 6th December last, the hon. gentleman arraigned the leader of the Liberal party and the people of Quebec for their alleged attitude towards the war, and for the moment I do not intend to make any further use of his speech than to cite the basis on which he laid his charge. I will return to the speech later on. The basis of his charge on the occasion to which I refer was the lack of sacrifice on the part of the people of Quebec. A man who will make such a charge as that should stand on very firm ground with regard to his own record in the matter of sacrifice, and if he does not so stand then it were better for him to have remained silent. Now let us see what the hon. gentleman's record is with regard to sacrifice.

Briefly stated, Sir, it is this: that while he preaches the gospel of sacrifice for others, he has consistently garnered and pocketed the fruits of selfishness for himself. As you are doubtless aware, Sir, the cult of commercialized Christianity, in Ontario at least, has been placed on the basis of an exact science. The three great exponents of that cult are John Wesley Allison, Joseph Wesley Flavelle and Newton Wesley Rowell. Ego is their god, autos their creed and moi-même their practice. In point of fact, Sir, they are the three great Canadian Sinn Feiners. In our political annals an infamous immortality was conferred on John Wesley Allison by my friend the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) in connection with fuses and shells. A like service was performed for Joseph Wesley Flavelle by Food Commissioner O'Connor and Mr. George W. Kyte, late member for Richmond, N.S., in connection with bacon and eggs. And, Sir, it is my purpose to convince you and the country that Newton Wesley Rowell is well worthy of the place the public has assigned him as the third member of that delectable trinity.

Not to go further back than the days of the Ross Government in Ontario, it may be recalled that the hon. gentleman was very active in his support of that administration, but his support entailed no sacrifice; quite the reverse. Through it he managed to secure an appointment as solicitor