

for to hold real estate. All countries had exercised great care in granting such powers as were asked for in the fifth clause of this Bill. The Society asked for power to hold real estate to the value of \$20,000 per annum. Now that was a very large sum, but in addition to that, they asked to be allowed to take any land or real estate by devise to the clear annual value of \$10,000 without any restriction as to the period which must elapse between making such a will and the death of the testator, a provision which is constantly found in English Bills. This provision is regarded with great favor by persons who have considered the question, and are anxious to take care that persons in a dying state are not induced by weakness to make devises which, in good health and with strong powers of mind, they would not be induced to do. Therefore, he thought this power should be restricted in the same manner as in similar Bills in England, so that no devise should be legal unless made at so long a period before the death of the testator as to preclude any surmise that he was in a position to be influenced in such a manner as he would not have been if he had been in good health. Then in the last clause, the power was taken to transfer to this Society any property held in trust for them—there was no limit to the amount. First, power was taken to hold property to the annual value of \$20,000 by purchase or voluntary conveyance. Then, this additional power was taken to hold property that might, at the present time, be held in trust for the estate; it might amount to any sum—\$40,000 or \$50,000. He hoped the Bill would be amended in both these particulars, but thought no objection should be taken to the second reading. It would be better to read it the second time and refer it to a committee, and he was persuaded the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMaster) would be disposed to take care the Society was limited in respect to the powers to which he had called attention.

Hon. Mr. McMASTER said there was no necessity at all for hon. gentlemen having any delicacy in discussing this Bill. Although he was ardently attached to this denomination, he should not feel aggrieved if the Bill was rejected on principle; but as other denominations had

Hon. Mr. Campbell.

acts of a similar character he thought there should be no objections raised against this one. However, if it were sent to the Private Bills Committee there were several eminent lawyers there who could bring their professional knowledge to bear on it and make it as perfect as possible. If it was considered contrary to the rules of this House to legislate on such a Bill he would not by any means press it.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the reference of the hon. gentleman from Kingston (Mr. Campbell) to the necessary limitations by way of devise was evidence that this Bill properly pertained to the local legislatures inasmuch as the laws relating to *mort main* were different in the several Provinces. The enactments in Ontario having reference to devises were extremely strict, and a clause had been settled by the Ontario Legislature which must be inserted in all of this character, debarring the society from receiving gifts in *mort main* unless under very strict conditions.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE asked the hon. gentleman from Kingston if he did not believe that the second section of this Bill gave power to the Society to establish Christian schools in different parts of the Dominion?

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said he had no doubt that the instruction which the Christian Brothers designated "Christian Knowledge" could be taught by this Society, but the former asked for powers to disseminate secular knowledge as well, and certainly that would not be, under the ordinary acceptation of the term, "Christian Knowledge." No person would say that the Christian Brothers were not disseminating Christian knowledge, but they wanted also the power to teach secular education.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE said, that under this Bill, the missionaries might open a school, and that school might be called a Christian School, though in it might be taught arithmetic, grammar and every other branch of secular education. It would be a Christian school, but it would be a secular school also, and if there was an objection to the Bill of the Christian Brothers on that ground there should be an objection to this Bill also. Although the terms in which it was stated in this Bill might be different, the end sought for would be the same, and this was the best proof that the Bill was one that.