

Governor-

should be no longer political, and as and pro-Crown, for might here-appoint, and er declared of the said, should be provisions

nctions to it died in into cor-maintain t in any er society; does not nment, at Bill, augd in some he one to s ago, on ven the hem, ad-longer in est of the erty. I over the Quebec, bee, and al:

ent that in this are the case."

porating takes no cession erty, so on the y prin- But erty was of the at the long to Crown lands; tacked ted, it

states that which is not the case, and the Federal government should not have sanctioned that misstatement of fact, but out of respect for history and especially for the reputation of the sovereign, they should at least have returned the Act to the Government of Quebec to have it amended in this particular. Now, in some pamphlets issued by gentlemen who support the Jesuit Society, I find Twiss referred to as an authority on the law of nations. A gentleman who writes a very able argument in support of the Jesuit cause, has quoted from this authority as follows:—

"A victorious nation in acquiring the sovereignty *de facto* over a country, from which it has expelled its adversary, does not acquire any other rights than those which belonged to the expelled sovereign; and to those such as they are, with all their limitations and modifications, he succeeds by right of war."

They also refer to De Vattel of the law of nations:

"The conqueror who takes a town or province from his enemy cannot justly acquire over it any other rights than such as belonged to the sovereign against whom he has taken up arms. War authorizes him to possess himself of what belongs to his enemy; if he deprives him of the sovereignty of that town or province, he acquires it such as it is, with all its limitations and modifications."

"One sovereign makes war upon another sovereign, and not against unarmed citizens. The conqueror seizes on the possessions of the state, the public property, while private individuals are allowed to retain theirs. They suffer but indirectly by the war; and the conquest only subjects them to a new master." Now, I agree with every word of that. Suppose the United States and Great Britain were to go to war—and I think hon. gentlemen in this House on the both sides would have but very little doubt as to the result—it would not be said for one moment that Great Britain obtained any rights whatsoever over private property, but she would obtain just the same rights and no more

and no less than the Executive of the United States possessed over private property. Now, at the time of the conquest this property did not vest in the Jesuits at all; it had become extinguished, it had become vacant property; therefore, when it is said outside the House, as it has been said inside, that for meritorious reasons, because the property was taken by a method of confiscation, it should be returned to the Jesuit order. I say it was not taken by confiscation, because at the time that Canada was conquered by England this property was not the property of the Jesuits, but was the property of France, having become extinct. We find the opinions of Her Majesty's Attorney General and Solicitor General for the Crown, dated 18th May 1779, stating in regard to this property:

"As a derelict or vacant estate, His Majesty became vested in it by the clearest of titles, if the right of conquest alone was not sufficient, but even upon the footing of the proceedings in France and the judicial Acts of the sovereign tribunals of that country, the estates in this Province would fall naturally to His Majesty, and be subject to his unlimited disposal, for by those decisions it was established upon good, legal and constitutional grounds, that from the nature of the first establishment or admission of the Society into France, being conditional, temporary and probational, they were at all times liable to expulsion, and having never complied with, but rejected the terms of their admission, they were not even entitled to the name of a society, therefore, they were stripped of their property and possessions, which they were ordered to quit upon ten days' notice, after having been compelled to give in a full statement of all they had, with several title deeds, and documents or proofs in support of it. Sequestrators or guardians were appointed to the management of their estates, and in course of time and with a regularity proportioned to their importance, provision was made for the application of them in the various ways that law, reason, justice and policy dictated; and all this was done at the suit of the Crown."