

Now, mark you, Mr. Speaker, at that very time, long after the passage of the Quebec Act, we find an English Parliament declaring that it was wise to pass an Act for their gradual suppression. It goes on to say:

"That every Jesuit and every member of any other religious order, community, or society of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows, who, at the time of the commencement of this Act, shall be within the United Kingdom, shall within six calendar months after the commencement of this Act, deliver to the Clerk of the Peace of the county or place where such person shall reside, or to his deputy, a notice or statement in the form, and containing the particulars required to be set forth in the schedule to this Act annexed;

"And be it further enacted: That if any Jesuit or member of any such religious order, community, or society as aforesaid, shall, after the commencement of this Act, come into this realm, he shall be deemed and taken to be guilty of misdemeanor, and, being there lawfully convicted, shall be sentenced and ordered to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life.

"Provided always, and be it further enacted: That in case any natural-born subject of this realm, being at the time of the commencement of this Act, a Jesuit, or other member of such religious order, community, or society as aforesaid, shall, after the commencement of this Act, be out of the realm, it shall be lawful for such person to return or come into this realm; and upon such his return or coming into the realm he is hereby required, within the space of six calendar months after his first returning or coming into the United Kingdom, to deliver such notice or statement to the Clerk of the Peace of the county or place where he shall reside;

"Provided also, and be it further enacted: That, notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, it shall be lawful for any one of His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, being a Protestant, by a license in writing, signed by him, to grant permission to any Jesuit, or member of any such religious order, community, or society, as aforesaid, to come into the United Kingdom and to remain therein for such period as the said Secretary of State shall think proper, not exceeding in any case the space of six calendar months."

Now, Sir, that Act was passed to show that there was a desire on the part of the English Government to suppress the Jesuits. At this very time there were hundreds of Jesuits in England, and surely the English Parliament is as desirous of protecting the great Protestant religion, surely the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other Bishops of the Church of England are as desirous as my hon. friend, to protect the Protestant religion; and if the Jesuits are as obnoxious as they were a hundred years ago, if their precepts and doctrines are as antagonistic to the best interests of the country as my hon. friend pretends, surely the English Government would say: We will put an end to them, and drive them out of the country. Now, Sir, what do we find? We find that a notorious gentleman who has figured in English parliamentary life, Mr. Whalley, in 1875, in the English House of Commons, brought up the question of suppression of the Jesuits. After they had been barely fifty years in the mother country, after a penal clause had been passed making it a crime for them to remain in the country more than six months, this gentleman declared, on the floor of Parliament, that the Jesuits had increased in number from 447 to 1,967. He called upon the English Parliament to drive them out of the country. And what did members say? They counted out the House, they laughed at him, and they left him there making a speech upon this question: Then, in order not to be outwitted, he placed a notice in the paper asking Mr. Disraeli, at that time at the head of the Government, what he intended to do? Mr. Disraeli said:

"There is no doubt that there are in this country members of the Society of Jesus, commonly called Jesuits, and there is also no doubt that their presence in this country is, under 10 Geo. IV., known as the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, a misdemeanor. During, however, the period which has elapsed since the passing of that Act, now nearly half a century, the Government of this country has, I believe, in no instance—none, at least, known to myself—proceeded against any Jesuit for committing a misdemeanor under its provisions, and, so far as Her Majesty's present advisers are influenced by the circumstances with which they are acquainted, the same policy will continue to prevail. At the same time, I beg it to be understood that the provisions of the Act are not looked upon by Her Majesty's Government as being obsolete, but, on the contrary, are reserved provisions of law which they are prepared to avail themselves of if necessary."

Now, that does not look like the English people being opposed to the Jesuits; it does not look as if they were under-

mining the State and the Protestant religion in England; on the contrary, they are performing a good work, and they are not the mischievous people that my hon. friend says they are now. But Mr. Whalley was not going to be outgeneralled again. He moved again on July 13, 1875, a motion for a committee, as follows:—

"To enquire into and report to this House as to the residence in this country, in contravention of the Act 10 Geo. IV., of any persons being members of the Order of Jesus, commonly called Jesuits, and as to the names, present residence, and ostensible occupation of such persons; also, as to the amount and nature of any property vested in, or at the disposal of such persons for the purpose of promoting the objects of such society or order, and, so far as may be practicable, to enquire into and report as to the doctrine, discipline, canons, laws or usages under which such order is constituted, and by which it is directed and controlled"

What was the result of that motion? It was that he could not get a seconder for it. After making a speech and showing that the number of priests had increased from 447 in 1829 to 1,967 in 1875—these are exactly the figures he used at that time—notwithstanding the violent speech he made on that occasion, the people of England said: We have no fear of the Jesuits. To-day I venture to assert that if anyone will consult history, will look at the Order in England, will visit their colleges at Stoneyhurst and other places, they will find evidence of the fact that the greatest men to-day have been educated there, including Protestants, and men who are as strong in their Protestant faith as is the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). That is all I intend to say with respect to the Jesuits of England. I do not justify the acts of the Jesuits, but I do say that the men to-day are not the men of 100 years ago, that they do not possess the same feelings and intentions in regard to destruction of British power as they did in those days. To-day you will find those men are desirous of pursuing their holy work without the interference of politicians. The hon. gentleman has referred to the history of Canada. He has not, however, placed altogether a proper construction on the Act of 1774, 14 George III, c. 83. The hon. gentleman read section 5, but he might also have read section 8. Section 5, as stated by the hon. gentleman, goes on to say:

"Sec. 5 And for the more perfect security and ease of the minds of the inhabitants of the said Province, it is hereby declared that His Majesty's subjects, preferring the religion of the Church of Rome, of and in the said Province of Quebec, may have, hold and enjoy the full exercise of the religion of the Church of Rome, subject to the King's supremacy declared and established by an Act made in the 1st year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, over all the dominions and countries which then did, or thereafter should belong to the Imperial Crown of the realm; and that the clergy of the said church may hold, receive and enjoy the accustomed dues and rights, with respect to such persons only as shall profess the said religion."

Even taking that language as it stands, it appears that the Roman Catholics have a right to carry on their church affairs in the same manner as they had hitherto done, so long as they did nothing contrary to the laws of England. But section 8 goes on to say:

"Sec. 8 That His Majesty's Canadian subjects, within the Province of Quebec, the religious orders and communities only excepted, may also hold and enjoy their property and possessions, together with all customs and usages relative thereto, and all other civil rights, in as large, ample and beneficial manner as if the said proclamation had not been made and as may consist with their allegiance to His Majesty."

So while the Imperial Government would not recognise the supremacy of the Pope in England, yet at the same time they gave the Roman Catholics power to carry on the affairs of the church so long as they did not conflict with the laws of England. The hon. gentleman has referred to the petition of Lord Amherst. I am glad he has referred to that petition, because I think if the hon. gentleman had read the whole history of the question, and read the opinions of the law officers of the Crown, he would have come to the conclusion that the Government were right in passing the law giving an annuity instead of land, because the officers of the