

ever since, and mainly, too, for the promotion of the Roman Catholic faith.*

Now, in view of these facts, what, we may ask, becomes of the fictions and assumptions stated in the preamble of the Act? Whence is derived the *moral* right of the present Society of Jesus to the estates forfeited by a former one, (which was dissolved, not by the judgment of any Protestant tribunal, but by that of the Pope of Rome, its superior and infallible head.) Where is the ground for compensation? M. Mercier admits that it rests on no legal right; and as the trusts attaching to the property have been carried out, where is the equitable or moral right? And how has he met the objections to his proceedings based on the principle which his predecessors helped to establish when they voted for the secularization of the Clergy Reserves? What is there in the case of the Jesuits to exempt them from the operation of that principle? Is it that their ethics are superior to those of the Church of England, whose endowments were taken from them? Is it the superior morality of their members? Is it the fact that they own no allegiance to the sovereign of these realms—that they are, in the extremest sense of the terms, foreigners and aliens, not to say enemies, to the commonwealth? Is it that on the testimony of professors of their own creed they have been everywhere political intriguers, disturbers of the public peace, destroyers of domestic happiness and domestic ties? Is it that with all their talent for organization, the self sacrifice and self devotion of individual members, their great missionary efforts (those bright pages in their history) have been failures—failures as vast as were the efforts they made? For we know that, despite the heroism and talents of a Francois Xavier, the martyrdom of a Brebeuf or a Lallemand, and of hundreds of kindred spirits whose bones lie scattered over North and South America, India, China and Japan, the sum of their work, so far as the elevation or advancement of the human race is concerned, is everywhere and always failure—failure, absolute and complete. What justification has the Premier of Quebec shown for his illegal and possibly treasonable invitation to the Pope of Rome to exercise jurisdiction over property in this Dominion? And, finally, what right has he shown to take from the Province of Quebec, either from the Roman Catholic majority or the Protestant minority, any sum of money, great or small, to endow any religious corporation at the expense of either one or the other? The property in question is the property of the whole Province, given to it, and held by it for nearly a century, for the purpose of education. To apply it, or any portion of it, to endow any religious body, is a direct robbing of the people, and especially of the Protestant minority, even though the latter are offered a bribe for their acquiescence, to be raised by a tax laid upon themselves.

* How differently might the British Government have acted had they taken into account the past history and the previous conduct of those with whom they were dealing—had they remembered the Jesuit plots against Queen Elizabeth, the Gunpowder Plot, and the incessant intrigues of later years—had they paid heed to the dark rumors which associated the Jesuits with the assassination of Henry the Fourth, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the murder of William the Silent, and even the death of Pope Clement, by whom they had been suppressed; or even if, discarding all these as idle tales, they had judged the Society by its own maxim, the admitted rule of all its policy—"*Cum finis est licitus etiam media sunt licita*"—the frightful and horribly demoralizing principle that "the end justifies the means!"