

dexterity in arms, the foes adverse to the absolute ascendancy of the Papal system."

Let any person who knows anything about their history quarrel with that definition of the Order of Jesus. I should be glad to know wherein that definition is incorrect. They take a vow of implicit obedience to their chief. He says go, and they go; come, and they come. They are educated so as to have no will, and, to use the language of the Spiritual Exercises of the founder of the order himself, they ought to be:

"Like a corpse who has neither will nor understanding, or like a small crucifix which is turned about at the will of him who holds it, or like a staff in the hands of an old man, who uses it as may best assist or please him."

I believe I am citing nothing which is not reliable. I take this from the authorised version of the constitutions, as they are called, and it is to be found among the Spiritual Exercises determined by the founder. Let me give one extract upon this subject:

"It is so complete and entire that while every member of the society is obliged to obey the General as implicitly and blindly as if he were Jesus Christ, in all things whatsoever, without reserve, without exception, without question or examination, or even mental hesitation, to carry into execution anything he may prescribe with the same fullness of consent and submission that they feel in the belief of the dogmas of the Catholic faith itself, to be in his hands as passive as a corpse, or as a staff in the hands of an old man, or as Abraham when under the command of God, he was ordered to sacrifice his son, he must persuade himself on principle that all that he has ordered to do is right, and above all personal feeling and volition."

I am quoting from the decree of the Parliament of Paris. Much more might be adduced to the same effect. Those who have thought of this subject, those who have given it any consideration, have, no doubt, made up their mind one way or the other on it. Nothing, perhaps, is more true than the statement that is made in the report of the Attorney General of Paris, who was called upon to investigate the position of this body. Looking at them as one set of people are anxious to do, and they appear to be all right; look at them from the other side, and they hardly appear to the same advantage. I think it is only fair to say—I do not desire at all to be misunderstood—that the individual men are, perhaps, the *élite* of their order, highly educated, better educated, better men upon the whole, for their system of drill. The long probationary period they have to undergo, necessarily weeds out the weak ones and leaves only the strong and robust—intellectually as well as physically—and, I suppose, that amongst no equal number of men will the compeers of the Jesuits be found. I will read a note showing the view of the Attorney General of the Parliament of Paris, in his report:

"The constitutions have two faces—"

That reminds me of the shield of the hon. gentleman opposite, one side of which he presented on his visit to England to float our bonds, and the other side of which he shows to us when he comes back.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Both sides were perfectly correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. I accept that illustration also; that applies still more forcibly to what I am going to read—both sides here appear to be perfectly correct also:

"The constitutions have two faces, because they were formed into two intentions—on the one side, for the glory of God and the salvation of souls; and on the other side, for the glory of the society and its future extension. This causes the difference of opinion concerning them. Their admirers look only at the first aspect, and their detractors see only the second."

Now, I think that statement was one that I was bound to make, because I am not at all here as a Protestant bigot. I do not pretend to make any statement here as a Protestant. I was astonished to hear the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) speak as a Protestant. I do not speak as a Protestant, I speak as a representative of my constituency,

entitled to discuss all subjects that are presented here, and without offence, as I trust I am doing on this occasion, to the feelings of any hon. member of this House. Now, let me give a slight idea of their organisation, of the vows which they take, of the obedience which their constitution inculcates, and which they are always willing to render. I will show what is said of them in modern times, because I have been told, and I admit the fact, that it is not fair to judge any order or body of men by their history of two or three hundred years ago. But I think I will be able to show that, down to a very recent period, there is in this body no change nor shadow of turning, that it is their boast that they are, and will continue, as long as they exist, to be under the same rules that the founder of the order, now the sainted Ignatius, established for them. Now, let us see what is said of them by comparatively recent writers. I regret that our library does not afford a very full catalogue of works in regard to this subject, and I have been compelled to rely upon authorities written 20 or 25 years ago. I will read such as I have, and the House will be able to judge of their pertinence to the order at present. Garnier-Pagé says:

"They know but one law, one faith, and one morality. That law, faith, and morality, they call authority. To a superior they submit life and conscience. To their order they sacrifice individuality. They are neither Frenchmen, Italians, Germans, nor Spaniards. They are not citizens of any country. They are Jesuits only. They have but one family, one fortune and one end; and all these are included in the word community."

Mr. LANDERKIN. A regular Tory Order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Very much like that: that is the only reason you do not belong to them, I am afraid. I am now quoting from the *Quarterly Review*, and if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to read that article, and it is a fair criticism, so far as I am capable of judging, of the works of the Jesuits and the Jesuit writings which were under review, I think they will be satisfied. In the *Quarterly Review* of 1874 I was very glad to find that the popular delusion as to the poisoning of the Pope who dissolved the order, was exploded by the writer. Down to a very recent period, indeed, this had been believed on the authority of a high and distinguished German doctor, who wrote in 1872, and stated on undoubted authority that Pope Clement the Thirteenth had been poisoned by that order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCARTHY. I say that a German doctor said so; and that this English authority in 1874 exploded that doctrine and showed that it did not rest on any solid foundation. I was very glad, and I am sure any hon. gentleman will be glad to find that that is so. But the author who dealt with the Jesuits in that impartial spirit may be perhaps entitled to some credence when he depicts, as he does in the following year, some doctrines held by the order. He endeavors to establish, and, in my humble judgment, he does establish, that the three principles upon which the order is established are justified, a Probabalism, Mental reservation, and that the end justifies the means. To argue that, would involve an enquiry foreign perhaps to this discussion. I am merely stating the conclusion at which the writer arrived, and every hon. member can form his own opinion as to whether that opinion is well or ill-founded. But, in practical matters, let us see what this order lays down. First, as to the duties of a judge, the writer says:

"We are told, also, it is by no means decided that a judge is bound never to accept money gifts from a party to a suit before him. If the gift were proffered with the view of influencing a prospective judgment, contrary to justice, the judge should, indeed, sternly refuse acceptance; 'but, the sentence having been already pronounced, it is a matter of controversy' whether he may not retain what might then seem a mere offering of gratitude from one benefited by the delivered sentence, even when this had been contrary to justice. Decisions of this character subvert fundamental notions as to right and wrong. Let us take the case of a person knowing all about a theft and accepting hush-money from the