

hear)—and it then appeared that sooner than allow the Minister of Justice—it was not necessarily the Minister of Justice, but any Minister of the Crown, because they were all responsible, and many of them are able speakers—sooner than allow their statement to be made before he had an opportunity of addressing the House, the Government were prepared to allow the matter to go without defence from the Treasury benches. Well, the result was this: We had not sufficient men to put up. We put all our thirteen up one after the other. (Laughter.) They were quite certain to be able in the end to just speak exactly in the manner they pleased; but so soon as he (the speaker) had delivered a few observations he had to make, the Minister of Justice rose to his feet. And what was his defence as to this particular accusation which he was here now repeating? He said this was not a matter of courtesy. He said it was known that he (the speaker) was to be the one that would make the attack on the policy of the Administration, and as he on his part was the one who had been charged especially with the duty of considering the question, it was therefore necessary in the interests of the Government that the attack should be made before the defence was called for. That may be so. He did not desire to deal unfairly with him; but there were other members of the Administration who could have spoken and explained in general terms, if not in technical phraseology, why it was, and what the reasons were which had induced the Government to adopt the course that they had taken. And what was the result? The result was that if his hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), with whom he does not usually agree in political matters, but with whom he united on this occasion, at all events, to speak and vote—(cheers)—had not come to the rescue, practically the debate would have ended with the speech which the speaker, and the others on his side, had made on behalf of the cause they represented. Under the circumstances, therefore, he might be excused if they had not got—if it be so—the best of the argument. He submitted with confidence that the answers made were not very satisfactory, but nevertheless, first there was the Minister of Justice, then Mr. David Mills, then Mr. Muirock, then Mr. Laurier, then Sir John Macdonald himself—(hisses)—and finally there was Sir Richard Cartwright—(hisses)—all together without any possible answer being made from our side. The subject should be divided into two separate and distinct considerations so as to be clearly understood. If the Bill was what lawyers called *ultra vires* it could be assailed in court at any time, and if so assailed would be pronounced void. (Applause.) If it be void on legal grounds it certainly should have been declared so by the Government of the Dominion. (Applause.) He believed that in the action he took in the House he represented the feelings of the majority of his fellow-countrymen. It was, however, not a question of dry law—it was a question of policy. If the law allowed such a thing, the enactment should be wiped from the statute books. Before the matter could be clearly understood, it would be necessary to look into a little history, and see whether the Jesuits, the hierarchy, or His Holiness the Pope were to control this country. When this country was ceded by the Government of France to the Crown of Great Britain, the Jesuits were dissolved so far as France was concerned. The Society of Jesus had been denounced as a body whose existence in that country, as well as in every other country where they had established themselves, was against the best interests of the people. They were dissolved and expelled from France. Had this country continued part of France, the Jesuits would have been expelled from Quebec as they had been from France herself, and from every other country in which they set foot. It was claimed that the Kings of England took from the Jesuits the estates with which they had been endowed from time to time while under the King of France. Nothing could be further from