

guilty party. According to received ideas, the compact would be criminal. Father Gury, however, decides that, provided the person bribed be not *ex-officio* bound to give information, the bargain would be quite lawful, 'as without injustice he might keep silence about the thief, in deference to his entreaties * * * therefore, *esparsi*, without injustice, silence might be observed in deference to gifts given or promised.'

I need not tell hon. gentlemen who have paid any attention to the subject, that Father Gury is a comparatively modern writer, that his works were published under the Propaganda, and therefore under the highest authority, and his works are for morals, for teaching in the schools, and for the guidance of those who desire instruction of this kind. So far in regard to the judges. But there is also a law for witnesses, and the law for witnesses is even more dangerous than the law laid down for the judges. The writer says:

"The first point laid down is, that no obligation to make reparation can attach to any one who has given false witness from invincible ignorance, inadvertence, or delusion, a proposition which, though not wholly free from objections, we will not canvass. But Father Gury proceeds to consider the case of one who, with the view of supplying deeds that have been lost, and of promoting the success of indisputable right (the indisputableness of such right being left to the subjective test of individual appreciation), either reproduces, that is, forges, or tampers with a writing, a chirograph, or a deed of acknowledgment; and he concludes that, though a person acting thus 'would, indeed, sin venially on the score of a lie, the document produced not being the authentic one, on the strength of which judgement should rest; and though he might possibly incur a grave sin against charity toward himself by exposing his person to imminent peril of very severe penalties in the likely event of detection; nevertheless, he would be wholly free from all sin against mutual justice, and would consequently stand absolved from all obligations to make restitution.'"

Mr. CURRAN. Will the hon. gentleman give the authority?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am quoting from the *Quarterly Review* of 1875.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Who is the writer?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot tell.

Mr. CURRAN. Has the hon. gentleman consulted Father Gury in the original?

Mr. McCARTHY. I leave that for the hon. gentleman to do. I do not suppose a writer in a great magazine like the *Quarterly Review* misrepresents Father Gury; if the hon. gentleman thinks so, I rather imagine he will find himself mistaken. If he will take the trouble to read the article, which was not written in a spirit of hostility but rather of enquiry for the truth, I shall be glad. I have now done with that part of the subject. But I think there are people in this country, the fair sex, who ought to be protected. It seems there is a rule, a law for them also, and that breach of promise is not an improper act in certain events and in certain cases. The writer says:

"In the matter of plighted troth we learn from Gury, 'that he who has sworn it to a girl, rich and healthy * * * is not bound by his oath should she happen to have become poor or fallen into bad health.' Again we are informed that a probable opinion, countenanced by St. Liguori, would allow an engagement to be broken off if a 'fat inheritance' should accrue, seriously modifying the status as to fortune of either party, and the case is thus illustrated: 'Edmund had betrothed himself to Helen, a girl of the same station and fortune as his own. As he was on the very point of celebrating his wedding, he acquired a fat inheritance from a deceased uncle. Wherefore, he repudiates Helen, that he may marry another with a fortune to match. It seems that Edmund should not be disturbed for this. Jilting is no unfrequent practice, but it is striking to find it justified in a handbook of morals, whenever 'faith could be kept only by the surrender of a big advantage which would be tantamount to great loss.'"

That is a comfortable doctrine for one side, but rather uncomfortable for the other.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is hard on the girls.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, as my hon. friend says, it is hard on the girls. I will pass over the next extract in consideration for the galleries. If this is anything like a proper statement of the moral teaching of the order, I

Mr. McCARTHY.

hardly think it is one that ought not to be bonussed, to use a familiar term, by any of our Local Legislatures. But what as regards the history of this order? Is it disputed as an historical fact that they are responsible for the expulsion of the Huguenots? I trow not.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). It is disputed.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am astonished to learn it; I thought it would not be disputed. Is it doubted that they brought about the revocation of the Edict of Nantes? Is it doubted that they were responsible for the causing the Thirty Years' War? Is it seriously open to question that they had much to do with precipitating the Franco-German war? Of course, those hon. gentlemen who will not believe anything against the Jesuits will not believe that, but there is weighty evidence to show that they were concerned in precipitating that war, which, as we all know, occurred in comparatively modern times.

Mr. BERGERON. In whose interest?

Mr. McCARTHY. In the interest of the order and body to which they belong, in the interest of the church, of which they are the light horse—the Cossacks, the advanced guard. Now, I suppose Cardinal Manning's statement with regard to them will not be denied to be, at all events, an authentic statement; and Cardinal Manning, in his book of sermons published by Duffy of Paternoster Row, at page 187, says writing of the Jesuit Order:

"That it embodies the character of its founder, the same energy, perseverance and endurance, it is his own presence still prolonged, the same perpetuated order, even in the spirit and manner of its working, fixed, uniform and changeless."

That is within the life of the distinguished prelate who speaks of them as being the same as they were 300 years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. We do not deny that.

Mr. McCARTHY. No person will deny that. Then, it is useless to continue the argument, it is useless to make citations; but I do think that their expulsion from France in 1880 would be of interest to my hon. friends, and that it would not have been altogether treated as of no consequence. It is strictly true that France is now a Republic, enjoying a free Government, but it is perfectly clear that the Jesuits were expelled, and the gentleman who had charge of the educational department in France put forward those grounds for the reason for their expulsion. If I cite from past history I will be told: "Oh, the order may have changed;" and if I cite from modern days I dare say that there will be some other answer, but I do say this, and I think we ought all to be willing to accept it, that everybody else cannot always have been in the wrong, and the Jesuits always in the right. They have been expelled from every country time and time again.

Mr. BERGERON. But they are back again.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, they are back again.

Mr. AMYOT. They were not then expelled from Russia.

Mr. McCARTHY. They were, and I will give the hon. gentleman the date of their expulsion. Having been expelled from the Catholic countries, they found a harbor of refuge in Russia and Prussia, after being suppressed by the Sovereign Pontiff, and, having lived there under the protection of that Government, their education and training of those whom they brought up were found incompatible, as they were found elsewhere, and must always be found, according to their teachings, incompatible to any State Government or to any organised condition of society. These are the reasons which made not only the expulsion of the Jesuits from Russia necessary, but also brought about, as we find, the putting an end to "the concordat"