

time after the expiration of the said delays to frequent the said schools, boarding houses, colleges, seminaries, noviciates and instructions of the said persons styling themselves Jesuits, in whatever place they may be, incapable of taking or receiving any degrees in universities, or any civil or municipal offices, or of discharging any such public functions. The said court reserving to itself to deliberate on Friday, the 8th day of January next, upon the presentations which it shall judge necessary to take "non the subject of the offenders, if any there be."

Then the society, having been dissolved by the same Parliament that brought it into existence, appears to have got a respite for a short time. But the letters patent were re-registered, and provided:

"Subject, nevertheless to this: That the respite contained in the said letters patent shall take place only to the first of April next, upon which day the provisional decree of the court of the sixth August last shall be executed 'ipso jure,' and also without that the necessary proceedings to enable the court to render judgment on the 'appel comme d'abus,' instituted by His Majesty's Attorney General, prove the bulls, briefs, constitutions, forms of vows, and other regulations relating to the said society, can be suspended, and like manner without prejudice to the provisional execution of the said 'appel comme d'abus.'

"And also subject to this: That the public or private lectures on theology, philosophy or the humanities, held and given by the priests or scholars in all the towns or places within the jurisdiction of the court, without distinction, cannot be provisionally continued after the expiration of the said respite, the whole under the pains contained in the provisional decree of the sixth August last."

Thus I maintain that the same Parliament which brought the Jesuit Society, as a corporate society, into existence, by its decree, dissolved the society. Then we find that His Holiness the Pope, on the 20th July, 1773, dissolved the society by his celebrated brief *Dominus ac Redemptor*. I shall not ask the House to listen to the reading of that brief, which is not necessary for any purpose, and in any event it is familiar to the ears of most honorable gentlemen in this House. A year later, this society was suppressed

by general instructions to the Governor-General as follows:—

"That the Society of Jesuits should be suppressed and dissolved, and no longer continue a body corporate and politic, and that all their rights, privileges and property should be vested in the Crown, for such purposes as the Crown might hereafter think fit to direct and appoint, and the royal intention was further declared to be that the present members of the said society as established at Quebec, should be allowed sufficient stipends and provisions during their natural lives."

In 1791 there are Royal Instructions to the same effect. The last Jesuit died in 1800, the present society came into corporate existence in 1887, so I maintain that the present society is not in any way connected with the former society; and the principle of restitution does not and cannot apply; this Government, at least, should have returned the Bill, suggesting that it should be altered in some respects, and amongst others, the one to which I referred a few moments ago, on the point of restitution. Even the bishops of Quebec, or some of them, admitted that the Jesuits were no longer in existence, and they, at the request of the Jesuits, made a claim to the property. I find the following in a petition over the signatures of Joseph, Bishop of Quebec, P. T. Tugeon, Coadjutor of Quebec, and J. S. Lartigue, Bishop of Montreal:

"Your petitioners humbly represent that the Order of Jesuits being extinct in this country, their natural successors are the Roman Catholic bishops of the diocese."

Then the very Act itself incorporating the Society of Jesuits in 1887 makes no claim whatsoever by right of succession as owners of this particular property, so I think it cannot be maintained on the merits that they are entitled on any principle of restitution to this property. But it has been said that this property was taken from the Jesuits at the time of the conquest. I deny that, because, at the time of the conquest it did not belong to the Jesuits. It had become Crown property, like any other Crown lands; therefore when the statute now attacked says that the property was confiscated, it