

"As this clause does not touch the question in which I am interested to treat with the Government, I wish you would dispense with my replying thereto."

Could anything more strongly mark the almost high-handed manner in which Mr. Mercier dealt with this question? Then Mr. Turgeon claims that two million dollars are due to the Jesuits; but Mr. Mercier disposes of that at once, and says in his letter of the 4th June, 1888: If you don't take the \$400,000 you will get nothing. Yet forsooth he is dealing with a man brought in as a sovereign prince! Then, when we come to the Act what do we read:

"Whereas it is expedient to put an end to the uneasiness which exists in this province in connection with the Jesuits' Estates, by settling it in a definite manner: Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the consent of the Legislature of Quebec, enacts as follows:—"

It is not the Pope whose name is brought in, but "Her Majesty by and with the consent of the Legislature of Quebec, enacts," and in the sixth section of the bill we read:

"The Lieutenant-Governor in Council hereby is authorized to dispose, in the manner he deems most advantageous to the province, of the whole of the property, movable and immovable, interests and rights, generally whatsoever of the province upon the said property known as the Jesuits Estates."

There can be no question that Mr. Mercier will find this

A GOOD BARGAIN FOR THE PROVINCE,

and I have no doubt that the payment of that \$400,000 will be found very advantageous by taking away that cloud which rested on this property and reduced its saleable value by 50 per cent. As I used to say to some persons who discussed this question with me, in my part of the country: Suppose you had 160 acres of very valuable land, and that there was a squatter on it, and the squatter thought he had some rights, although he really might have none, but he could give you some trouble, would you not give him \$50 to get him out quietly? They always understood that argument at once. I have not spoken to a single man in this way, Orangeman or other, who did not feel that the manner in which certain honourable gentlemen have presented this question throughout the country was deceptive and misleading, and I will say that it seems to

me almost wicked. I need not waste the time of the House on the question whether the passing of this Act was within the powers of the Quebec Legislature. Who doubts that Mr. Mowat before he dissolved could have, if he secured a majority of the House, given \$400,000 to the Methodists or any other body of Christians? One of the reasons for which the hon. gentleman condemns the Jesuits is, that they being professed ecclesiastics aim indirectly at political power. Why, sir, the hon. gentleman himself stands self convicted of the most sinister offence that rightly or wrongly is attributed to the Jesuit body. (Cheers.) He makes in this Parliament a speech which will be scattered broadcast throughout the country, and which is capable of arousing the passions of the people. For what purpose does he do so? It is for the purpose of gaining political influence, for the purpose of gaining power and to swell his own importance. (Cheers.) What is that, sir, but playing a Jesuitical part? It is more than playing a Jesuitical part, because, so far as my reading goes, I have never found a single case in history, where in so barefaced a manner, men openly declared that they were playing a part for an unworthy end, and not even assuming the appearance of virtue, whether they had it or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred in his speech to "Him whose Kingdom was not of this world." I believe, sir, the hon. gentleman is a professed follower of Him whose kingdom was not of this world. I believe he is a professed follower of Him who has left us teachings which, so far as my reading goes—and it runs in a sort of way, I suppose, over five or six literatures—there is nothing in this wide world that has been written from the birth of time to compare with those writings. And what, sir, is the cardinal doctrine of it all? It is charity; love to your neighbour, pity for mankind, kindness, making people love each other, and you loving your brother. That is the doctrine which runs through the teachings of Him whose kingdom was not of this world. But here is a gentleman who makes professions which I would not presume to make, and yet, sir, though I do not make these professions, I would cut my right hand off before I would take part in an agitation, as he has done, so calculated to set man against man and to raise up among our people malignant, malicious, foolish, damaging and dangerous passions. (Loud cheers.)