

uncalled for, the minority in Quebec asking for no such support for them. I have pointed out to the satisfaction of this House, I think, that a large amount of ignorance has been displayed by public men in Ontario in discussing this question, and that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) was somewhat at fault in his history of the matter. I have also shown that the attacks on the Jesuits, that the historical references made to the past are not with a view so much to condemn the Jesuits as to stab the Roman Catholic Church. That is, at all events, my judgment. I gather that from the resolution passed at the different meetings and the course adopted, a course which in my judgment is not justifiable. I have pointed out that the Jesuits of to-day are not the Jesuits of 100 years ago, that the Province of Quebec are in sympathy with the Jesuits, and I have shown that they are not an alien corporation, and that they are not such people as they are sometimes considered to be in Canada. It is true they were suppressed in 1773, but they were restored in 1814, because the Roman Catholic Church felt that the Jesuits were not at that time the same class of men as they were before; that they did not act as others had acted according to history, but were influenced in their action simply by a desire to promote the best interests of the church. I have shown conclusively that they are entirely in accord with the Roman Catholic Church. I have also shown conclusively that according to our constitution the course taken by the Government was the only proper one, and in support of my statement I have the authority of the *Law Times* and the *Law Journal*. I have also shown conclusively that the Government was justified in voting money for ecclesiastical purposes, and had a perfect right to vote money for Laval University or any other seminary or similar institution, and that if they acted harshly towards any portion of the community it became a question of policy. I have also shown that the Province of Quebec were not bound to give \$60,000 to the Protestants which was more than their proportion of the money. It does seem to me, Sir, that it is unwise and inexpedient that this House should discuss a question such as this from the standpoint of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). I think that I have shown that from every point of view the Government was justified in taking the course they have done: that is to leave the matter to the courts to settle, whether or not it is *ultra vires* or unconstitutional. I, Sir, am going to be the last one to join in an unholy crusade against any portion of my fellow-countrymen. To-day, we are joined together for the purpose of building up this great Confederation into a magnificent nation. Is all that we have accomplished for the last twenty-one years to be set at naught? I, Sir, shall not be a party to such a course. While I feel as strong in my Protestant views as any man in this House, I recognise the foundation of Protestant principles: civil and religious liberty. As long as I occupy a seat in this House, even though I be threatened with extermination from my constituency, I shall endeavor to deal out equal justice to all my fellow-countrymen.

Mr. BARRON. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could content myself with simply giving an affirmative vote to the amendment of my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien); but, Sir, that has become impossible. Fortunately or unfortunately I do not know which, my name has been more or less intimately associated with the subject-matter of the hon. gentleman's amendment ever since the beginning of this Session, and I feel compelled to supplement the vote that I shall give with some explanation. I do that, Sir, even though my duty is a most unpleasant one and a most painful one indeed, especially so when I remember and am conscious of the fact that in voting and in speaking as I do I am weaning myself for the time being—and only for the time being I hope—from few or many, I don't say which, of the hon. gentlemen around me with whom I have been in such

Mr. RYKERT.

happy accord ever since I have had the honor of a seat in this House. Still more especially is it painful to me, Mr. Speaker, to speak as I do and to vote as I do, when I am conscious of the fact that I am separating myself from the hon. gentleman on this side of the House who leads me and who leads us, and for whom I, in common with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House as well as with many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, have feelings not only of respect but of the deepest possible affection. But, Sir, even under those circumstances I enjoy the comfort which is that I know that hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House will, at least, give me credit for acting from sincere and honest conviction. Believing that I am in the right, I hope hon. gentlemen will give me their sympathetic attention while I speak to the amendment of the hon. member for Muskoka. I may be permitted in passing to make a few references to the remarks of the hon. member for Muskoka, after which I will come to the speech of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I do not refer so much to the remarks that the hon. gentleman from Muskoka made this afternoon as I do to his remarks of a day or two ago, upon the occasion when he gave notice to this House of his intention to introduce the amendment which he has placed, Mr. Speaker, in your hands to-day. I do not wish to be understood even inside or outside of the House as complaining at all of the course of the hon. member for Muskoka. It has been suggested to me that that hon. gentleman's course was in fact forestalling me and taking from me that course which I intended to pursue; but, Sir, I can tell this House that I was gratified beyond measure when the hon. gentleman rose in his seat a day or two ago and announced his intention of doing what he has done to-day. I recognise, and no one in this House can recognise more than I do, how grave and serious this question is, not only in the present but grave and serious in its consequences in future, and I would be foolish indeed if I presumed to think that I could give the question the weight and the importance of other hon. gentlemen in this House, I, who am comparatively young and especially so in comparison with the hon. member for Muskoka. I recognise, Sir, that someone older in years, older in experience, and older in position than I am should have taken this matter up, and I, therefore, say again, and I hope hon. gentlemen will believe me, that I was pleased and gratified when the hon. gentleman from Muskoka notified the House a day or two ago of his intention to move his amendment. I do not complain even of his words when he spoke, but I may be permitted to make some reference so as to explain away the inference that his words bore. He gave as his reasons for taking the course which he did, that, inasmuch as my resolution appeared so far down on the Order Paper that likely it would not be reached this Session, he thought it was his duty, under these circumstances, to move in the matter. The very best answer to the statement of the hon. gentleman is that my motion was reached, my motion was made and the papers have since been brought down so that it will be understood. I think that the course I took was right, not as has been suggested by people outside of this House, to evade the matter altogether. In speaking on this question I must be understood as having no feelings whatever against the Jesuit body or even against the Roman Catholics, amongst whom I am happy to say I number many, many friends. I have no sympathy with the clamor which is being made outside of this House, clamor, I may say, without reason. The Jesuits have been in some quarters assailed without argument, and I have no sympathy whatever with the course pursued in those quarters against the Jesuits and against the Roman Catholic body. All that has been said may be true or false; I care not. As far as my investigation and my reading has gone, I confess to believing that much that has been said is