

"To the calumnious hypocrites who represent him as the personification of religious fanaticism."

Sir John replied by saying:

"That he had never in his life set foot in an Orange lodge. * * * I am accused, said Sir John, of being a Protestant, and even of being a bad Protestant. In like manner I have been accused of being an Orangeman, although I have never set foot in a lodge.

I do not know whether to believe that or to believe the statement of one of his *protégés* regarding our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, that he, or a member of his Government "had no confidence whatever in the breed." I have satisfied myself, at all events, that my conclusions are correct, that this Bill should have been disallowed, and, if possible, that it should be still disallowed, for the reason that it is strictly unconstitutional. Now that I see the Minister of Customs in his seat, I hope that he, occupying the prominent position he does in a certain order which has been mentioned by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), will not allow this opportunity to pass without giving to some hon. members on this side of the House who think as I do, the benefit of his views. I hope, Sir, they will be in accord with many of those who belong to the society of which I believe he is such—

Mr. BOWELL. An ornament.

Mr. BARRON. Yes; such a great ornament.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sure, Sir, that every member in this House must sympathise with the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) when he declared how exceedingly painful it was for him to separate himself even for a few moments only from his beloved colleagues, and still more beloved leader. We can all sympathise with the hon. gentleman, and we can all sympathise with the party that is so painfully distracted at the present moment. I want to refer at the outset to a remark made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) in the opening of his speech. He stated that a newspaper published in the interests of the Orange Order threatened any member of that order who will dare vote for the allowance of this Bill. I would say to the member for Lincoln, what perhaps he knows himself, that the Orange Order has only one organ in the Dominion, and, Sir, I defy him, and I defy any hon. member of this House to point to any such article in that organ of the Orange Association in Canada. I say, Sir, that that organ has, during this discussion which has agitated the public, the press and public meetings, and which agitation has assumed a pretty violent form in many places—I say that that organ of the Orange Association has set an example of moderation that might well be emulated by other organs, and also by some of the members of the sacred profession in their pulpits. I fancy, Sir, that the hon. gentleman instead of reading an article from the *Sentinel* was reading the *Globe* when it was thundering out its anathemas against the hon. gentlemen opposite if they dared to vote against disallowance. For myself, I propose to be able to discuss the very important amendment moved by the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) without any race or religious prejudices or feelings, and purely from a Canadian standpoint. As a Canadian who has the strongest faith in the future of our country and who has watched with pride its rapid march in material progress—the united work of all races and of all religions—I hope that this question may be investigated on its merits and entirely apart from any religious feeling. We came to Canada from different countries, or we are the descendants of those who have come here to enjoy and exercise fully our religious convictions. We have flourished under our free institutions in Canada, and in order to do so we must be prepared to respect not only the rights of others, but also their feelings and, to a certain extent, their prejudices as well. Now, Mr. Speaker, two very important Acts have recently been passed by the Quebec Legislature. The first was the incorporation of the

Mr. BARRON.

Society of Jesus in the year 1887, and in the following year the "Act respecting the Settlement of the Jesuits' Estates." These two Acts bring up the whole question of the Jesuit Order in Canada, as well, perhaps, as the Jesuit Order in other countries. Previous to the Conquest, in 1759, the Jesuits held property which they had received from various sources in trust, for two purposes: for the training and education of the French youth of the country, and also of the aboriginal inhabitants. Now, Sir, their position under the English régime depended upon the terms, first, of the capitulation to Lord Amherst in 1760, and, secondly, upon the terms of the cession to the English Crown by the Treaty of Paris in 1763. Article 32 of the Capitulation reads as follows:—

"The communities of nuns shall be preserved in their constitutions and privileges. They shall continue to observe their rules. They shall be exempted from lodging any military, and it shall be forbidden to trouble them in their religious exercises."

The reply of General Amherst to this request was "Granted." Then, article 33, of the Terms of Capitulation, was as follows:—

"The preceding article shall likewise be executed with regard to the communities of Jesuits and Recollets and of the House of St. Sulpice at Montreal. This last and the Jesuits shall preserve their right to nominate to certain curacies and missions as heretofore."

The answer of General Amherst was:

"Refused till the King's pleasure be known."

Now, it will be observed from these facts that the Recollets and the Jesuits received no particular or special rights under the Terms of Capitulation of 1760. The next place where these matters were negotiated and regulated was in the Treaty of Paris in 1763. The only stipulation in that treaty bearing on this question was as follows:—

"His Britannic Majesty agrees to grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada; he will consequently give the most effectual orders that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion according to the rites of the Roman Church, as far as the laws of Great Britain permit. His Britannic Majesty also agrees that the French inhabitants, or others who had been the subjects of the most Christian King in Canada, may retire with all safety and freedom whenever they think proper, and may sell their estates, provided it be to subjects of His Britannic Majesty, and bring away their effects as well as their persons, without being restrained in their emigration under any pretence whatever, except that of debts or of criminal prosecutions; the term limited for this emigration shall be fixed for the space of eighteen months, to be computed from the day of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty."

Therefore, it is plain that the right secured by the Treaty of Paris to the French Canadians was the liberty to worship according to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church, and the limit of the English law as it then stood. They received no further rights under that treaty. Then, Mr. Speaker, there is a great and important distinction between the Jesuits and the Recollets, Sulpicians and other orders established in Canada. The Recollets and Sulpicians were organised by French subjects in France. The Jesuit Order originated in Spain; it is of no nationality, and it has no law but the will of its General. The next change that took place with reference to the Order of Jesuits was under the Quebec Act of 1774, the result of which was given in the royal instructions to the Governor of Quebec in the year 1775. This made a new departure in the rules governing the Jesuits, and made a very wide distinction between the Recollets and the Sulpicians on the one hand and the Jesuits on the other. For instance, the orders to the Governor in 1775 stated:

"That the society of Bomish priests, called the Seminaries of Quebec and Montreal, shall continue to possess and occupy their houses of residence and all other houses and lands to which they were lawfully entitled on the 31st September, 1759, and it shall be lawful for those societies to fill up vacancies and admit new members according to the rules of their foundation."

That was the regulation with regard to the other orders of the Roman Catholic Church. But, Sir, what do we find in reference to the Jesuit Order? An entirely different regulation was meted out to them, and it was as follows:—