

to receive a glorious consummation, when, with the sword for his talisman and liberty for his spell-word, Garibaldi was to chase, by the mere magic of his name, everything that darkened over the prospects of Italy. (Cheers.) Now, what analogy was there between that revolutionary state of things and a constitutional country such as ours, with liberty safe guarded, such a country, I believe, for freedom, as does not exist anywhere else in the world? What analogy is there between disturbed states like those, and a country like this? Yet the hon. gentleman comes here and flings down his barren dates. In 1860, again, Garibaldi expelled the Jesuits from Sicily, and why did he expel them? He had made himself dictator; he defeated the royal troops at Calatafimi; he stormed Palermo; he won Melazzo; he gave Sicily a new constitution, and in such a state of things the expulsion of the Jesuits may have been a necessity. It might be necessary under certain circumstances, even to expel the Knights of Labour; it might be necessary to expel all the lawyers; it might be necessary to expel any body of men in certain critical circumstances of the State, who were likely to menace the object that statesmen, having charge of it, had in view. But what analogy can there be between such a state of things and the state of things in Canada? Now, we were laughing a moment ago, but I think it is a great crime for a man occupying the high position of member of Parliament to go through the country, and, without ever enquiring into the circumstances in which these expulsions took place, to hold events about which he knows nothing, up before the heated fancies of ignorant men—good-hearted men, noble men in their way, but still not having sufficient time to test these things. He goes and reads out that the Jesuits were expelled here; were expelled there; they were expelled elsewhere, and he leads people to infer that they are a danger to every State, whatever its condition, and that they were always in the wrong, whereas in most cases they were expelled by despotic Governments. We know very well that in the history of the world there have been men who would exercise tyrannical power themselves, but would not allow anyone else to be tyrannical to the people; and the Jesuits, as the history of Europe shows, have, animated it may be by ecclesiastical motives, sometimes interfered on the side of popular liberty against the tyrannical con-

duct of tyrannical men. There are cases in which the Jesuits have been expelled for no other reason than protesting to the King against the number of his mistresses. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton), I hope, does not mean to deceive the people, but I say, if he knows what he is doing, that he is guilty of a very great crime and very great misdemeanor. (Cheers.) I will ask the House to bear with me a few moments, because the hon. gentleman raised the question of

THE JESUITS' ESTATES ACT.

The hon. gentleman is a Protestant, and I am a Protestant, and if the hon. gentleman has a right, or thinks he has a right, to sympathize with the men who are most alarmed by the cry of "Jesuit," it must be remembered that I am an Irish Protestant, and hon. gentlemen well know that Irishmen feel strongly on most subjects, and especially on religion. If I had been in Mercier's place I would have been glad to have made the arrangement he effected. It was a good arrangement. Here was a property on which a cloud was cast—a cloud which lowered its saleable value fifty per cent. I know they had no right to cast a cloud upon it. What did Mr. Mercier say? I will read his words, because they have not been read by the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and have not been read by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but I will read them to-night, and I say I have reason in the interests of the people of Canada to complain that when this Act has been flouted in the popular face, those parts of it that would have shown its true character have been kept back and only those parts thrust forward that were

CALCULATED TO INFLAME PASSIONS.

We will suppose I meet an Orangeman in my constituency, who approaches me and says: "Well, we did not think you would do that." "What have I done?" I reply. "Voted for that Jesuit bill," he says. "Have you read the Act?" I ask. He replies, "No." I then say: "If you would like to read it, sit down and we will read it together." I then indicate the various points and show that a cloud had been cast on that property, as Mr. Mercier says, in his letter dated Rome, 17th February, 1838. I start out by saying that the Jesuits had no right whatever to that property. But there were eminent persons capable of casting a cloud on its title; the Province wants to sell it and to remove that cloud. Now, what would a practical man do, under