

The Union Advocate.

Established 1867.

NEWCASTLE, MIRAMICHI, N. B.
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7, 1889.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Royal Grants Bill has passed the Committee stage in the House of Commons.

Late cable advices inform us that the Queen intends visiting Ireland next spring, being incited thereto by the support the Parliament have given the Royal grants.

The German Emperor is at present on a visit to England. He landed at Cowes on Friday last and was welcomed by the Prince of Wales. He then proceeded to Osborne where he received and entertained by the Queen.

On Friday last the Governor General received the petition of the delegates from Ontario and Quebec for the disallowance of the Jesuits Estate Act. The petition which was signed by upwards of fifty thousand persons asked for disallowance and said that the vote in the House of Commons on O'Brien's motion did not represent the feelings of the country, that the Jesuits Society ought not to be legalised and that the interference of the Pope in temporal affairs should not be permitted.

After receiving the petitions and giving the various speakers an attentive hearing, His Excellency who had evidently given the subject his fullest consideration, answered them at length. He refused to disallow the bill, or to dissolve parliament and debated the whole subject, defended the Jesuits Act and the course of his government in reference thereto.

The Toronto Globe in a recent issue gives the following satisfactory answer to those who are fearful that the interests of the English speaking inhabitants of Canada will, in the future, be sacrificed to those of their French fellow citizens:

"It is calculated that within a hundred years English will be spoken by 800,000,000 of men, German by 124,000,000, French by 96,000,000. At present the population either speaking the English language or under the influence of English speaking people number more than 313,298,000, or one-fourth of the population of the globe. The English speaking race occupy one-fourth of the dry land of the earth, and own nearly two-thirds of the tonnage of ships. They live in all regions; they handle all articles of trade; they produce the raw materials; they command one-half of the world's gold, and silver, distribute more than two-thirds of the Bibles and Testaments, more than half of the letters mailed and carried by the postal service of the world; they are written mailed and read by the world's English speaking population. But in the face of such facts as these it is feared that English will, in the future, be sacrificed to those of their French fellow citizens."

Future Relations Between England and United States.

The future relations of the inhabitant of the British Empire and their kindred in the United States is one of the subjects which present is engaging the attention of the thinking men not only of all classes, but all political shades and opinions. In the United States, the question is being discussed not only on the platform but through the columns of the press. In the discussion, national jealousies and animosities have been laid aside and one and all are anxious to see the advocates of a closer union between the inhabitants of the two Empires. Such a union, it is advocated, would not only bring together the two most powerful and important nations that are in the world to-day, but it would unite in friendly and more intimate commercial relations two people that speak the same language and have the same blood running through their veins. In addition to this, it is asserted that such a union would be to the advantage of the world as its interests would be not only to maintain peace among the nations but to exert all the power and influence at its disposal for the attainment of it as its most desirable end.

That such a union will take place in the near future we have not the least doubt. It is simply a matter of time when the inhabitants of both Empires will be convinced that a union of the nature will be brought within the sphere of practical politics by becoming one of the most popular questions of the day; and as the inhabitants of both Empires are so sensible to the sentimental grievances of the past and the way of their future interests, it will be carried by an overwhelming majority of the English speaking race throughout the world. The consummation of this union will make the English Speaking People one of the greatest, wealthiest, most populous and freest Empires that the world has ever seen either in ancient or modern times. It will be an empire of free men exerting a paramount influence throughout the world, not by arms or fleets but by commerce and the arts of peace.

Jesuits Estates Bill Meeting.

A crowded meeting attended by all classes of the community was held in the Masonic Hall, Chatham, a week ago yesterday, and addressed by Rev. Messrs. McDonnell of Toronto and Burns of Halifax. We should presume that neither gentlemen exactly understood the character of the audience they had come to address. While we seriously question the wisdom of bringing the matter before the citizens of a town like Chatham in the form in which it was presented on the occasion referred to, at the same time we think that when a meeting is thrown open for remarks from any who holding opposite views, may wish to express them, a very respectable hearing should be given to the speakers in whose

interest the meeting is called. In the first place we think the interests of fair play demand it, and in the next place strangers are likely to carry away from such a meeting impressions of the community which are in every way prejudicial to our respectability, we say this entirely irrespective of party, or the merits of the question discussed. And we regret that in this respect at least the meeting was not what could have been desired. The introduction of the rowdy element into any gathering of this character can only be taken as an evidence of weakness on the part of those who seek to prevent a free discussion, or to suppress their cause by such means.

But we do not wish to be understood as charging all the opponents of such discussion with what even a majority of their sympathisers might see fit to do by means of interruptions. What two or three Catholic gentlemen had to say to the meeting called was exactly in the line of legitimate debate, and we doubt not very much helped to a better understanding of the question, and that to them by their opponents in which we are sure all good Catholics desire to be held. Such forbearance should always be shown on both sides that Catholics and Protestants could come together and debate questions here as they do in Fredericton or Ottawa.

But we cannot, like some of our contemporaries, regard such meetings as resulting only in unneeded evil. The lessons to be learned from the meeting we refer to were many and important. The Protestants learned that our Catholic fellow-citizens could listen most respectfully to the discussion of a theme, directly connected with the interests of their church, by such a fair and gentlemanly speaker as Mr. McDonnell. They also learned that there are two sides to such a question, and that their opponents could calmly and respectfully debate the matter even after listening to such a furiously partisan speech as that delivered by Rev. Dr. Burns. They might also have learned that there is a difference between the fair and courteous discussion of such questions is the only course likely to succeed in convincing either party, and that men of extreme views on fairly debatable matters are likely to do more harm than good. They can also learn that he who preserves his good nature has at least as much to gain as he who decides adversely.

Our Catholic friends have also learned that we have men, like Mr. McDonnell, to look at all questions affecting our relations with them, from a reasonable standpoint, who can look upon the virtues and learning of the spiritual Head of their Church with sincere admiration, and who are not afraid, as Mr. M. Adams remarked, frankly to avow it. They might also have learned that there is no desire on the part of Protestants to do anything else than discuss these questions in such places and at such times as will allow of their opponents being present and asking any fair question, or calling in question any statement which is thought unfair or incorrect. And also that any desire on their part openly expressed to live in harmony with their fellow-citizens is met with heartiest approval by all classes of the community.

If any feeling of hostility has been awakened on either side we are sure a good understanding of each other's motives will prevent its permanence.

A Brilliant Genius.

THE CHATHAM MUNCHHAUSEN'S REMARKABLE DISCOVERIES.
(From the Signal.)
The interesting genius who edits the paper misnamed the Miramichi Advance seems to possess the courage of Falstaff and the truthfulness of Eli Perkins. Give an opportunity to place his reasons for the faith that is in him before a Chatham audience, he declines, on the ground that "it is an invasion of the rights of the press." But when he thinks he is safe because his challenger has left, he can roar most valiantly to the extent of four columns, his roaring being largely against ladies from whom he deems himself safe from reply. When (in spite of the assertion by the Advance that said challenger had gone never to return) he does return, at the special invitation and request of the leading temperance workers of Northumberland County, the Advance lapses into silence or roars as gently as any sucking dove. But when the editor of the Signal leaves Northumberland Co. again, then indeed does the bravery of the champion of rum manifest itself. He who kicked a lion, having previously discovered that the lion was dead.

As for his truthfulness, well, Gen. Butler once said he could name the three greatest liars upon the continent. Being asked to do so, he named Mark Twain as one and Eli Perkins as the other two. He was evidently not acquainted with the editor of the Advance, for, if so, Eli Perkins' claim would have been left out of sight, or, at the least, would have been that of the brilliant Munchhausen of that paper.

Having stated editorially, on June 13th, that "Cardinal Gibbons is the head of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, and he is found in accord with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of that great country against Prohibition as a means of lessening the liquor traffic," and that having been shown that so far from that being the case, the General Assembly had declared for the complete suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors as a beverage, he now shows his absolute ignorance of the facts, or, else his intention to deliberately falsify, by stating editorially that "after the General Assembly had passed the amendment declaring for temperance generally in preference to its committee's report, in favor of Prohibition, the prohibitionists induced that body to pass the following—"

"That we hereby reiterate the denunciations of former Assemblies upon this whole subject, and express our warmest sympathy with the widespread popular movement now in progress in favor of the complete suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors as a beverage, and we bid all wise and popular methods to secure this issue a hearty God-speed."

Now, so far from this statement being true, the facts are that the resolution printed above was the one reported by the standing committee on temperance and

was adopted, receiving the support even of Dr. Howard Crosby. A more radical resolution was offered as a substitute, but was tabled by a vote of 210 to 105, the principal objection to it being that it would declare a political policy for the Assembly, which is purely a religious body. But the resolution reported by the Committee and adopted, was in favor of "the complete suppression of the traffic."

At the evening session, Dr. Chas. L. Thompson of New York, in order to even more fully express the opinion of the General Assembly, offered the following—

"The General Assembly, in reaffirming the denunciations of former Assemblies on the subject of temperance, calls particular attention to the deliverance of 1888, as follows—"

"That we earnestly recommend to ministers and congregations in our connection, and all others, to persevere in vigorous efforts until laws shall be enacted in every State and Territory of our beloved country prohibiting entirely a traffic which is the principal cause of the drunkenness and consequent pauperism, crime, taxation, lameness, war and rule to the bodies and souls of the people with which the country has so long been afflicted."

This was carried by the decisive vote of 193 yeas to 83 nays. So much for the reliability of the Advance. In the same issue of June 13th, the ignorance of the editor is fully displayed. Quoting an article from the May number of the North American Review, he says it is "from the pen of Rev. Dr. E. H. Crosby, one of the divines above quoted." Poor ignorance! He does not know that E. H. Crosby is not a divine but a lawyer, and that so far from being a Dr. of Divinity or Medicine, he has no aspiration that way. He will do doubt feel grateful to the Advance for dignifying him with the title of Rev. Dr.

And now, in order to break the force of the damaging exposure of his misdeeds, he says in the Signal, he says it is "a little sheet, edited and published in Montreal, by one Nicholas, a second-hand furniture dealer of Lowell, Mass., and that 'his mission is to attack and misrepresent the Advance,' and that 'the Yankee who edits the Signal seems to be a keen, money-making fellow,' and that 'a part of one of his pages is occupied by a flattering picture of him.'"

These are terrible crimes, of course, and yet we forgive him.

In his next attack he will probably declare that the Signal editor is the murderer of Dr. Croan, or the famous Jack the Ripper. But as long as he does not charge us with being the editor of the Chatham Advance we can forgive him. But at that we draw the line. It is the editor of the Signal who is in Montreal, and not in Lowell, that he is a dealer in furniture of any kind, new or second-hand; and that far from being a Yankee he is an Englishman. But little things like this ought not to stand in the way of the vivid imagination of the Gulliver of Chatham. Evidently troubled with softening of the brain, he must not be held responsible for his actions. His prying into the world a forcible illustration of the truth of the saying, "Whom the Gods destroy they first make mad."

As for the flattering picture, if he will only forward one of himself, we shall take pleasure in presenting to the large circle of readers of the Signal the classic features of one who, as the assailant of women, the defender of rum-shops, the patronizer of illegal bar-rooms, the publisher of swindling lottery advertisements, has earned for himself the justly deserved titles of "The North Shore Squid," and "The Annals of Provincial Journalists."

The Presbyterian's Anti-Jesuit Meeting.

SPEECHES BY MCDONNELL, BURNS AND POSTMASTER ADAMS.

The fact of action having been taken by the Presbytery of Miramichi in opposition to the Jesuits Estates bill, and the appointing of a committee to hold public meetings on the subject, was kept profoundly secret, no mention of it so far as we have seen, having been made in the reports given to the press, until the publication of the advertisement announcing the coming of Rev. Mr. McDonnell and Rev. Dr. Burns.

A large audience, including a party from Newcastle, responded to the call, Tuesday evening. Rev. N. McKay called the meeting to order and moved Rev. Mr. Aiken into the chair. Rev. Mr. Hamilton prayed. Rev. Mr. Aiken stated the object of the meeting—to protest against the Jesuits Estates act. It was of great importance, though it had attracted very little attention here. Some had branded these meetings as political and objected to ministers taking part in them for that reason. But had politics nothing to do with religion and religion nothing to do with politics? Politics concerned everything relating to the good of the community. How, then, could it be separated from religion? Politics had much to do with Christianity and Christianity with politics. It was because that Christianity and politics had been separated that the Dominion had fallen into such confusion as to render the necessary. If religion had nothing to do with politics, God had nothing to do with nations, or with individuals, or with the world. Without religion in politics we were driven on the stormy waves of selfishness and infidelity. We must have religion intervene with politics, and politics intervene with religion, or we will forfeit the character of a religious people. He closed by introducing Rev. D. J. McDonnell as an earnest and enthusiastic advocate of the right and the true.

Mr. McDonnell said he did not appear as an Ontario but as a New Brunswick—not as a lion from the West but as a Bluenose. It was, perhaps, because he had been born in Bathurst, and his mother in Picton, that he was spending part of his holidays in this way—not because he thought it delightful, but from a simple sense of duty—to his country—and because he wanted fair play for all. This was not a matter of political partnership, as both of the great parties in the Commons were equally responsible for endorsing the

legislation against which he protested. His object was not to stir up religious strife and bigotry. He could appeal to his Roman Catholic brethren of Toronto to say that he was a man of peace. He desired to preserve for both Roman Catholics and Protestants that measure of civil and religious freedom which had been received from our British ancestors and which he hoped would be handed down to our children. Because of this he aimed to secure reversal of legislation which strikes at the root of our liberties.

What is it all about? Two acts of the Quebec Legislature, one incorporating the Jesuits, and the Jesuits Estates act. The Jesuits had been possessed of certain estates in Canada, granted them by the King of France for educational purposes. In the treaty of 1763, France made no stipulation in favor of the Jesuits retaining this property. And for a good reason: the King of France had, in 1763, banished them from his European dominions in self defence. The British law officers gave an opinion against allowing the Jesuits to retain their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by giving the Jesuit Fathers in Canada a life interest in their estates, as the virtual owner of all the property of the Order was a foreigner and an alien, and the Order itself unlawful in the British dominions. But the Crown treated the Jesuits liberally. It recognized and satisfied the moral rights which they had by