

minded Catholic would agree with them in stamping out such morality as theirs. He had made these remarks to show that the history of the Jesuits and their morality proved them to be a society which ought not to hold property in any Christian community. Apart from all specific charges against the Jesuits, and the evil passages in their history, the very fundamental clause in their constitution was immoral. The constitution written by Loyola, and his letter to the Spanish Jesuits, laid it down that a member of the society must surrender himself to his superior as if he were a dead body, or a staff in the hands of an old man. So that whatever might be argued about "directing the intention," if a man voluntarily resigned his personality and conscience and will he ceased to be a moral being. He, in fact, placed himself in a position unethical and immoral. There was needed no further charge than this. When the only man who had a will was the head of the society, what guarantee could they have as to the morality of its members? Their Protestant friends in Quebec, he said, had a right to expect them to come to their assistance in this crisis. If their Protestant brethren, however, accepted the \$60,000, the case would be gone. If they stood firm in their rights, he trusted that Ontario Protestants would not fail them in a temperate way. He could not believe for a moment that the several provinces of Canada had no right to express their judgment and sentiments upon great questions of common interest. Without moral unity they would fail to found a country. In reply to the argument that a disallowance of the Jesuits' Act would be an interference with Provincial autonomy, he would say that where questions of justice and freedom were concerned, it became a matter for the whole Dominion to consider, and it was the duty of the central authority to see that these principles were respected throughout the whole country.

The Rev. Dr. Stafford, from original investigations of historical authorities, expressed the baselessness

of the claim of the Jesuits to the forfeited estates. From the beginning of the negotiations they acknowledged that they had no legal claim to the property. He protested against any legislation which opened up for everlasting discussion a question which was settled. The question would now remain open forever. The agitation was of that kind which the aggressive and never-sleeping hand of the Roman Catholic Church was always crying for more. Give us more! He objected to this legislation, because it was recognizing the name of the Pope in legislation of a British colony. He objected to a Premier of a British colony putting a matter into the hands of a foreign power, and still more when it was said that the ratification of an Act would need his approval, and after that an appeal to the British Legislature. He objected to a British representative embodying in an Act that it would not become law till sanctioned by the Pope, and would not take effect until it met his approval and that of the Legislature. This legislation was establishing a foreign power in the country—a society whose character had been shown to be such that they did not need the benefit of them. He complained that Canada, of all lands on the face of the earth, should exalt this order to a position of honour and distinction—a power which had been expelled from France in 1763 on charges which involved the expenditure of immense sums of money, and in the trial of which their whole system was brought in and exposed before the court, and upon which the French Government deemed it a matter of self-protection, and banished them from the country and confiscated their property. Yet here in Canada a British Government incorporated these people and made them respectable, and then endowed them. If the Catholics persisted in their pressure there would be a Protestant reaction, which would be a terrible thing for Romanism. At the same time he did not want Protestant denominations to follow Jesuits in a self-governed country like Canada.