

Government moved by Dr. MacVicar, and seconded by Rev. Mr. Campbell, that these gentlemen think that if a certified copy of a Provincial Act is forwarded to her Majesty, it can be disallowed in England. They do not understand that such a bill cannot be sent to England to be disallowed. I do not propose to defend the Jesuits, but I think it can be shown that they are not in this country so bad as they have been represented to be. My hon. friend says he does not desire to refer to their acts in this country but in Europe. I say I do not intend to defend them, but I do know that writers declare with one accord that the Jesuits of to-day are not the Jesuits of a hundred years ago. My hon. friend points to charges against them a century old. He should have had the fairness to have quoted the opinions of persons who take another view of the matter. I find that Parkham says:—"The works of these early Canadian Jesuits attest the eagerness of their faith and the intensity of their zeal. But it was a zeal bridled, curbed, and ruled by a guiding hand. Their marvellous training, in equal measures kindled enthusiasm and controlled it, raised into action a mighty power, and made it as subservient as those great material forces which modern science has learned to awaken and to govern." We read also in Macaulay how that they worked hard in the cause of religion how that they laboured as missionaries throughout the world, and how that they published whole libraries on all conceivable subjects. All this is entirely in opposition to the views of my hon. friend in regard to their practices. With reference to their operations here, I find in the *Montreal Gazette* that there is no country in which they have received a larger share of good will than in Canada; that their work has been marked by humanity and courage, and that the story of their trials and triumphs on this continent, and especially within the limits of our own land, is one of the most remarkable and instructive on the records of missionary labour. I care not to go into history here but I quote these things to show that they have some virtues, and that they are not open here to the same objections as are brought against them elsewhere.

(Mr. Rykert then entered upon a minute review of the position of the Order in Canada and concluded as follows:)

I have endeavoured to show that the rights of the minority in Quebec have not been interfered with; that the feeling aroused in Ontario is entirely uncalled for; that the minority in Quebec ask for no such sympathy; that there is a large amount of ignorance amongst the public men in Ontario on this question, and that the Jesuits of to-day are not the same class of men that comprised the Order in earlier days. I am unwilling to join in an unholy conspiracy against any class or creed. We are sent here to help to build up this great Confederation, and while I am a strong Protestant, it seems to me that the grand Protestant principles of civil and religious liberty and equality should be extended equally to all.

MR. COLBY'S SPEECH.

I shall endeavour to confine my remarks very closely to the question before the chair as I understand it. I do not find it necessary in the discussion of the question, from my standpoint, to go into the record, as others have done, of that remarkable order of men, the Society of Jesuit Fathers. Of their beliefs, of their conduct a century or more ago, I do not think necessary to a proper determination of the question now before the House, nor shall I go into any close legal consideration of the case, as did the hon. member from North Victoria, because I think this question must be decided upon other and broader and more liberal ideas than can be drawn from nice, legal, fine-drawn, hair-splitting speeches. I think those speeches would have been more applicable in the Quebec Legislature at the time this Bill was under discussion than they are before this House at this time. (Hear, hear.) The proposition, as I understand it, now before the House is an implied censure of the Government for not having disallowed this Act of the Legislature and an instruction to the Government to disallow it. Now, I think we will all agree that this power of disallowance, which by the constitution of this country is vested in the Governor-General and his advisers, is a power which should be exercised with the greatest consideration.

In the first place it should appear before an attempt is made to exercise that power, that the Government have the

clearest possible right to exercise that power. Then it should appear that there is an obvious necessity for an exercise of that power. It is a serious matter to interfere with the deliberate will of a Local Legislature under any circumstances whatever. It is a more serious matter, for the gravity of the situation is vastly magnified, when the question upon which it is proposed to counteract their will and to nullify their legislation is one which touches the dearest feelings, the religious sympathies, the most sensitive portion of the majority of the people of the Province affected. Now, there are certain things that we must recognize as existing facts. It is true that this Order of Jesuits was at one time suppressed. That is an historical fact. It is equally true, and this is a pregnant fact, that this Order of Jesuits has to-day in the Province of Quebec a legal status, a status which is assured by the strongest legal sanction of the Legislature, and by the highest authorities of the Church, and which is further recognized by the whole body of the Catholic Church. So that an attack upon the Order of Jesuits in Quebec is an attack upon the entire body of the Roman Catholic Church. (Hear, hear.) There seems to be some misapprehension upon this point, but we must not delude ourselves with the belief that we are assailing an obnoxious and friendless power or society, that is deserving the execration of all mankind. We must recognize the fact, I do not know how it has come about, whether by a change in their practices or in their beliefs, we must recognize it as a fact that they are under theegis to-day of the supreme Pontiff of the Church and are recognized by entire body of the Church. We must recognize that if we disallow this legislation we not only override the sentiment in Quebec, which is stronger in that Province than in any other, in favour of upholding provincial rights, but we attack the people in their religious convictions. We must therefore be careful to see that we are in the right in doing this thing, and that there is a necessity to do it.

Then we must consider the integrity, the peace the prosperity, and harmony of this country. We must realize to the full the possible, indeed, the certain consequences of an act of this kind. We have a constitution which binds our provinces in one Confederation. It is a paper bond. The moment you destroy the mutual good will existing between the people of this country, the moment you place the people in hostility one against the other, that moment you destroy the bond which must hold us happily together, if it can hold us together at all. Now, I maintain that if this House agrees with me in these premises, the right to disallow must be clear and undoubted. It must be an unquestionable right and an obvious duty before we undertake such a serious responsibility. In this case there is grave and serious doubt as to our right to disallowance. We have the carefully considered declaration of the Minister of Justice that this Act was wholly *intra vires*. There is no right in the Dominion Government to disallow it. Is not that in itself sufficient to create a doubt? We have in the records of this Parliament a case, I would almost say a closely parallel case, to this, in many respects a stronger case, in which Parliament has recorded its deliberate opinion. I refer to that question which was precipitated upon Parliament within the memory of those of us who were in the House at that time, at a very inconvenient period, just on the eve of the general election of 1872, and when a degree of anxiety and alarm was created in the House at large, which in my parliamentary experience of 21 years I have never seen equalled. I refer to the New Brunswick School Bill. Then a minority, and a Catholic minority in a province of this Dominion, came to Parliament, not with an abstract proposition, but with a clear and positive grievance. They made out a case which aroused the sympathies of the House to an extent that I had never seen aroused before, and as the records show there was not on the floor of this House a single member, Protestant or Catholic, who did not record his vote of censure against the authorities of New Brunswick by an expression of regret and hope that the cause of discontent would be removed, except those members who wanted to go further and apply a positive remedy.

What was that case? The Catholic minority came to us and said that before Confederation they had a right to maintain their schools with government assistance, that they were not compelled to send their children to a school or to assist in maintaining a school, the teachings of which they thought