

That means that in the Archdiocese of Quebec, that diocese over which the Cardinal has control, the Jesuits are not allowed any privileges. They are not allowed to establish their headquarters or schools there. As a matter of fact, they are incorporated only in a part of the Province of Quebec. What is a still stranger feature is the fact that they are incorporated in the Archdiocese of Ottawa. I do not know much about the divisions and boundaries of the dioceses of the Roman Catholic Church, but I am informed that the Archdiocese of Ottawa includes three counties in the Province of Ontario. That it includes the city of Ottawa, and, therefore, the society which was incorporated by the Province of Quebec would be incorporated only in portions of the Province of Quebec and also in portions of the Province of Ontario. That would be one reason for disallowing the Act, that it incorporates a society not only in the Province of Quebec but also in portions of the Province of Ontario. It appears to me, from the reasons I have already adduced, from the reasons recorded in the resolution in your hand, and from other reasons, that it would have been better for the peace and happiness of the various portions of this community if this society had not been incorporated and had not received this endowment. In the first place, it diverts money from its lawful object. That money, has been, I believe, faithfully administered for the purpose of superior education since the Quebec Government got it in 1831. This Act also recognises the supremacy of the Pope over the Queen and over the Quebec Government; and it is also bringing into life—illegally, as I believe—a society which was legally suppressed by the British Government in 1775. As there was no Legislature in Canada until 1791, I believe that Act, not having been repealed, is still law in Canada to-day. I am against this Act for another reason, as I have already said, that I do not believe the Confederation Act gives any such power to vote any such money for any such purpose, and, therefore, though agreeing with the Government in its great policy, which has been so successful in this country, and has made this Canada of ours a great and prosperous Dominion, I shall be compelled to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien).

Mr. COLBY. In addressing the House I shall endeavor to confine my remarks very closely to the question now before the Chair. I do not find it necessary, in the discussion of that question, from my standpoint at least, to go into the record, as other speakers have done, of that remarkable order of men, the Society of the Jesuit Fathers, of their beliefs or of their conduct a century or more ago. I do not think that 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 for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), because I think it must be decided upon other, and broader, and more liberal ideas than can be drawn from nice legal, fine-drawn, hair-spun distinctions; and I think such remarks would have been more applicable in the Quebec Legislature at the time when the Bill referred to was under discussion, than they are in this Parliament at this time. The proposition now before the House, as I understand it, carries an implied censure of the Government for not having disallowed the Act of the Quebec Legislature for the settlement of the Jesuits' estates, and a positive instruction to the Government to disallow it. I think we will all agree that the power of disallowance, which, by the Constitution is vested in the Governor General and his advisers, is a power which should be exercised with the greatest discretion; that, in the first place, it should appear, before an attempt is made to exercise that power, that the Government has the clearest possible right to exercise it; and then it should appear that there was an obvious necessity for its exercise. It is a serious matter to interfere

Mr. WALLACE.

with the deliberate will of a Local Legislature under any circumstances whatever—the clear and deliberate will of a Local Legislature. It is a more serious matter—for the gravity is vastly magnified—when the question upon which it is attempted to counteract their will and to nullify their legislation is one which touches the most sensitive feelings, the religious sympathies and convictions of the majority of the people in the Province which is to be affected. Now, there are certain things which we must recognise as existing facts. It is true that this order of the Jesuits was at one time suppressed; that is a historical fact. It is equally true—and that is a present and pregnant fact which we must recognise—that this order of the Jesuits has to-day, in the Province of Quebec, legal status, a status which is assured by the strongest legal sanctions of the Legislature, and which is assured by the highest sanction of the church and recognised by the whole body of the Roman Catholic Church. So that, an attack upon the order of the Jesuits in the Province of Quebec is an attack upon the Roman Catholic Church, upon the entire body of the Roman Catholic Church, and there should be no misapprehension upon that point. We must not delude ourselves into the belief that we are assaulting an obnoxious and a friendless power or entity that is entitled to the execration of all mankind. We must recognise the fact—and I do not know how it has come about, whether by a change in their practices or a change in their beliefs or otherwise; I have not gone into an enquiry into that point—but we must recognise it as a positive fact that they are to-day under the ægis of the Supreme Pontiff and of the church, and are fraternally recognised to-day by the entire body of the church. Consequently, we must realise that if we nullify this Act of the Provincial Legislature as is proposed, we have not only to override a sentiment in Quebec, which is stronger in that Province than in any other in this Dominion, in favor of the maintenance of provincial rights, but we have to make up our minds to attack the solid sentiments of the majority of the people of that Province in their religious convictions, and in regard to that legislation which the majority believe to be their right and duty within the lines of the Constitution. I say, then, that we must carefully revise our position and see that we make no mistake. We must see that we have a clear, and positive, and undoubted right to do this thing; then we must see that there is an obvious necessity for doing this thing, and then we must consider, in view of the integrity of our country, in view of the peace, the prosperity, the harmony and the contentment of our people, the full, the possible, the certain consequences of adopting the course which is now proposed. We have a Constitution, it is true, which binds our Provinces together in a Confederation, but that is a paper bond. The moment you destroy mutual good-will between the people of this country, the moment you array the people of this country in hostility—personal and religious hostility—one against another, you have destroyed the only bond which can permanently hold us happily together. Now, I am going to limit my argument within very narrow lines, and I maintain that if this House agrees with me in these premises, the right to disallow must be very clear and the duty obvious, before we undertake this serious responsibility, before this House goes on a step further in the direction proposed. We had the deliberately and carefully considered opinions of the Minister of Justice, and all his colleagues in the Government, that the Act of the Quebec Legislature was wholly *intra vires*, and that there is no legal or constitutional power in the Dominion Government to disallow it. Does not that of itself create a doubt? Have we not also the opinion of men of eminent ability in this House and in this country, of high authority on constitutional questions, differing from the Government in politics, differing from them on most every