

THE EXAMINER:

A Weekly Journal of Politics, Literature, and News.

"This is true Liberty, when Freeborn Men, having to advise the Public, may speak free."—Euripides.

Vol. VIII.

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Monday, April 27, 1863.

New Series.—No. 16.

COLONIAL LEGISLATURE.

COUNCIL CHAMBER,

MONDAY AFTERNOON, March 30, (continued.)

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—That may be his honor's intention, but I understood him to say that it would be an injustice to the proprietors, and perhaps on second consideration he thought he went too far; however, I am willing to take his honor's explanation. As to the 20 years' purchase, the price of land is not fixed at that, but that clause was inserted for the benefit of the tenants, as the arbitrators were not to exceed that amount. His honor who made that objection also spoke of the Fishery Reserves, and complained that the Award was unjust in that particular. Well, perhaps that was one of the most difficult questions the Commissioners had to contend with, and if you refer to their own words you will see that it was difficult for them to come to any other conclusion.

"Practically, as already shown, these reserves have never been respected. The reclamation by the Crown, or of persons claiming under the Crown, in case of tenure issued, of those parts of the reserves which have been actually reduced into possession, and improved and cultivated (if possible at all) could only be accomplished by means of expensive and harassing litigation, rendered still more embittered by a sense of injustice. It is difficult to get over an acquiescence of nearly a century in the enjoyment of property untrammelled by the exercise of a dormant easement reserved in the Crown, even though there be no Statute of Limitations in the Island granting the Crown. It would be equally difficult, after a lapse of 90 years, territorially to define where that reservation commenced and where it ended. The sea coast has changed, in many parts materially receded.

"In some of the grants the Crown gave the fee simple in the 500 feet over which the easement was to extend; in others the 500 feet was reserved to the Crown, but only for the same purpose for which the easement in the first case was intended; therefore the Crown itself would be stopped from granting the reserve, in the latter case, for any other purpose than that of the fishery.

"To settle complications which have sprung, and might hereafter spring, from the perpetuation of these reserves, the undersigned are clearly of opinion that in those cases where the original grants passed the entire fee of the lot or township, reserving over the 500 feet the easement only, the land constituting such reserve should henceforth be held by the legal owner thereof, and those claiming under them free from such easement or any claim thereto.

"In the case of the grants last mentioned, though the fee remained and still is in the Crown, yet the possession since the issuing of the grants has been in the grantees of the lands, of which the reserves form the sea front, or their representatives. The leases of such persons have held, improved and occupied under them as owners. To give to the original grantees, or their representatives, an unconditional fee at the present time would be gross injustice to the grantees. To give to the grantees would be equally unjust to the owners in fee, as placing a clear belt of freehold between their lands and the sea, and virtually putting them at the mercy of the tenants."

Now, it is evident that it would be very difficult to lay down any plan at all which would be satisfactory to the fishermen, the proprietors, and the tenants. I believe the tenants are for the most part, well satisfied with the decision of the Commissioners in this particular. They will now be quiet in the possession of those fishery reserves, which are the most valuable parts of their farms, and hold them at the same rate as the other parts. I never heard of an instance of a fisherman being prevented from prosecuting a fishery for the want of free access to the soil. His honor from St. Peter's also said that the Award, if confirmed, would do little or no good—that he himself has, within a very short time past, been offered his farm for 15s an acre. Well, I look upon that as one of the operations of the Award. Would his honor get such an offer 6 or 7 years ago? One of the great complaints of the proprietors is, that the Land Commissioners has reduced the price of land very much, and I look upon the circumstance which his honor has mentioned as a practical instance—as showing that the complaint of the proprietors is not without foundation. I do not think it is necessary at the present time to go any further into the merits of the Award. It has been so often discussed that all the arguments, both for and against it, have become stale and thread-bare. However, I congratulate your honors on the circumstance that there does not appear to be any difference of opinion in regard to the course now to be taken. Your honors appear to think that the course we are now pursuing is the only mode that can be adopted. The document should be laid before some legal tribunal; we should not be satisfied with anything else, and then be prepared to submit with loyalty and proving that the Award is illegal, if such is the case, upon the proprietors, and not allow the Colonial Minister of the day to set it aside in such a summary way. The people will not doubt be prepared to submit to the decision of a legal tribunal.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—His honor the representative of the first district of Prince County wishes to know what proportion of the tenants will be benefited by the Award if it should become law. I think a very large proportion of them will be benefited by it, for three or four of the largest proprietors have been consenting parties, and they were the greater part of the township lands. If the Award were confirmed, there is no doubt but all the proprietors would, after a short time, be placed on the same footing. One of your honors considers the arbitration clause impracticable, and that it will never receive the Royal Assent. I believe it was that clause that frightened the proprietors. But for that clause the proprietors would have acquiesced in the Award. I have no doubt but the arbitration clause could be easily worked. It has been said that the only benefit the Award would confer would be to those tenants who had means to purchase the fee simple of their farms at the rate of 20 years' purchase. I am surprised that any member of this House should express himself so. It that were the only benefit to be derived from the Award it would be better to take the Proprietor's Bill; but who is the man who would take the Proprietor's Bill in preference to the Award? No, there is not one who would venture to say so. The Proprietor's Bill is not to be compared to the Award. The Award allows the tenant to have his farm at a fair valuation, and then to have ten years to pay for the same, but by the Proprietor's Bill it is all paid at once. The Loyalists were no doubt badly dealt with, but that was not the fault of the present Government. So many years have elapsed, and the land has changed hands so often, that it is almost impossible to do anything in that matter now. As to the loan, I cannot see that it would be of any service unless we could get the land at a fixed and moderate rate, and had not the money to purchase with. When that is the case we may look for the loan; but at present it would have the effect of increasing the price of the land perhaps 100 per cent. If the £100,000 were now in the chest, the Government would have to exercise great firmness in resisting the pressure from without to purchase land at a ruinous rate. His honor the Attorney General has said in reply to his honor who was offered his land for 15s an acre, that that was the fruit of the Land Commission. The purchase of the Selkirk estate by the Government was also, in my opinion, one of the fruits of the Land Commission. There was an attempt made to purchase that estate when the liberals were in power, but Lord Selkirk would not treat with them. Some of your honors think it would be a greater benefit to have the Purchase Bill carried out. That is continually being done, and the money is found to pay for lands whenever they are offered at reasonable rates. It is certainly a breach of faith for His Grace the Duke of Newcastle to decline submitting the Bill to confirm the Award for Her Majesty's confirmation; but I hope, and have very little doubt, but this Address will be followed with good results.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—His honor who has just spoken thinks the Award has had a great deal to do with lowering the price of land, but there were large tracts of land sold at

a low rate before the Land Commission was spoken of. If I am mistaken, I hope his honor from the first district of Prince County will put me right. I think Mr. House bought the best lot of the Selkirk estate before we heard anything about the Award.

Hon. the PRESIDENT.—Yes, at nearly double the price that was paid for the rest of the estate.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY.—Is it not the Award that has now brought the Montgomery estate into the market?

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—I believe it was because the tenants could not pay their rent.

Hon. the PRESIDENT.—I have no doubt but the Award has been the means of lowering the price of land. I know a proprietor who, some years ago, was taking 24s an acre for his land, but would now take 15s. He would sooner take 15s. an acre than abide by the Award. Unfortunately, there have always been two extreme parties in this Island; but for that, I believe this question would have been settled before to-day. Had it not been for the opposition of parties in this country, I believe the Colonial Minister would have submitted the Award for Her Majesty's confirmation.

Hon. Mr. WALKER.—I think the Bills to confirm the Award, which were before this House last session, passed unanimously. And as regards the opposition of the Liberal party, if I mistake not, I have heard it said that the Liberal party had no influence with the proprietors, but now it appears that they had some influence.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON.—I have been entirely at a loss to understand the motives from which the majority of the Liberal party have acted in regard to the Land Commission. While the Commissioners were holding their court in this Island, they appeared to place full confidence in it; but at any other time they had no confidence in the Commission. Perhaps it is because I do not walk in the beaten track of politics; but I cannot understand how it is that they should come before the Commissioners' court with their delegates, and appear to take such an interest in the scheme while the Commissioners were here, and as soon as they were gone, as well as before they came, they denounced the Commission, both on the platform and through the press, as a humbug and a delusion. I do not rise to throw the apple of discord, but merely to state what I believe to be the truth. The impression on my mind is, that when His Grace the Duke of Newcastle saw the opposition of the proprietors backed up by the liberal press, which is supposed to be the exponent of the views of the people, he thought there was something ajar. And when we consider the way the Legislature was prevented from sitting last fall, I think we are in a position to be very suspicious that the Duke had aid from a quarter that the people had no right to expect.

Hon. Mr. LORD.—I was not aware that we had so much influence at the Colonial Office. I hope every man will be allowed to enjoy his own opinion, Liberals not excepted. If the prayer of this Address is refused, we may expect to hear that the Liberal party and the Liberal press are to blame for it. I believe the Liberal press and the leading Liberals of the Island have a great deal of influence at the Colonial Office; but if any party can influence the Colonial Minister, it is the proprietors. I have no doubt but you will meet with disappointment, but the Liberals should not be blamed. In regard to the purchasing of lands, it has been stated that what the Government bought had been paid for, but I think his honor who made that statement has made a little mistake, for the lands are not paid for. The Colony is in debt, and purchasing land is one of the principal causes of it. On purchasing land the debt will increase. I hope the present Government will not go too far, for if they continue going in debt, I do not know what amount of taxes will have to be put on. Therefore I think the less land is purchased at present the better. It appears that the Montgomery estate is now in the offer of the Government at 5s sterling an acre; that is 6s higher than was paid for the Worrell estate. I believe £10,000 will be lost to the Government on the latter, and of course the loss on the former will be proportionally greater.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—I was not prepared to hear that the Colonial Minister would listen to any newspaper in this country, in opposition to the majority of the House of Assembly and the unanimous voice of this Council. I do not think the Liberals should be blamed.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—When I spoke of the Government purchasing land I meant to say, that they could under what the proprietor would receive as payment. If I am not mistaken, a considerable amount has actually been paid. I believe the Selkirk estate and Lot 54 are nearly all paid for. If the Government are in debt, they have the lands to show for it. I would have no objection to see the debt increased for such a purpose, for the whole amount will ultimately be repaid, and probably leave a little profit, as will be the case with the last estates purchased by the Government. The Montgomery estate is offered at 6s an acre higher than was paid for the Worrell estate, and I yet would remember that it is all good land, and I believe is all settled with the exception of about 200 acres.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY.—Is it not plain, your honors, to the most superficial observer, that in a Colony that has no resources but agriculture to create a trade, if you keep down the farmer you keep down trade, and if you support and encourage the farmer you support and encourage trade? I hope your honors will agree, and raise our united voices to remove every obstacle out of the way of the farmer; and I do hope that the day is not far distant when the tenants may celebrate their independence and unfurl the flag of freedom from under the iron rod of proprietary influence. Both in Prince Edward Island and in Downing-street, then, and not till then, will the farmers of this Island rise in the scale of improvement.

Hon. Mr. YEO moved that the Address be agreed to, and the question being put thereon, it passed unanimously. The House was then resumed, and the chairman reported the Address agreed to, without any amendment. Adjourned till to-morrow, at 10 o'clock.

TUESDAY, March 31.

The Bill relating to steam navigation with this Island, the Bill to continue certain Acts therein mentioned, and the Bill to incorporate King Hiram Lodge, No. 1123, of free and accepted Masons of St. Eleanor's in Prince Edward Island, were severally read the third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. McLaren moved that the Bill to incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of Prince Edward Island and the subordinate Lodges in connection therewith be now read the second time.

Hon. Mr. WALKER.—I intend to oppose that Bill. I think it is a strange Bill to bring before the Legislature of any Colony. I believe it will be the means of doing more mischief than your honors are aware of, and in such a place as this Island I do not know what necessity there is for it. It is an Act for the very purpose of proscribing a certain portion of the community. If there were no Roman Catholics on this Island that Bill would not have been introduced. It will exert a mischievous influence over the minds of the rising generation. The very fact of such a law being on our Statute Book will cause a spirit of animosity that will take many years to remove. All such laws are abolished in England. I move an amendment that the Bill be read the second time this day three months.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—I second the amendment. I have not heard any reason assigned for introducing this Bill, nor can I see any reason for doing so. I think we should seriously consider before we pass any Bill which would legalize a disturbance of the peace. It is well known that there is a large proportion of Roman Catholics in this Colony, and orangism is as offensive to them as ribonism is to Protestants. As a Protestant, I see no danger, and if any Protestant is so weak-minded as to think his liberties can be interfered with, I sincerely pity him. If any one is so base as to attempt to interfere with the liberties of others, I pity him too. They do not know the results that will follow the enactment of such a Bill as that now before your honors. I know that all I can say will have very little effect, but while we are at peace I do not see why we should place a stumbling block in the way, or do anything that would be likely to stir up strife and animosity. Would any person wish to disturb the peace of the community for the

every year? I swear that I am not, nor ever will be a Roman Catholic or Papist; nor will I marry a Roman Catholic or Papist, nor educate my children, nor suffer them to be educated in the Roman Catholic Faith, nor am I now, or ever will be, a member of any Society, or body of men that are enemies to Her Majesty and our Glorious Constitution; that I never was, to my knowledge or belief, rejected in, or expelled from any Orange Lodge; I further declare, that I will do my utmost to support and maintain the Loyal Orange Institution; obey all regular Summons, and pay all just dues, (if in my power) and observe and obey the Constitution and Laws of the same; and lastly, I swear that I will always conceal, and never in any way whatsoever, disclose or reveal, the whole, or any part of the signs, words, or tokens, that are now about to be privately communicated to me, unless I shall be duly authorized so to do by the proper authorities of the Orange Institution, of which I am now about to become a member. So help me God, and keep me steadfast, in this my Orangeman's Oath."

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—Is it customary for these Orange Lodges incorporated in the other Colonies?

Hon. Mr. GOFF.—It has not been customary heretofore, but it is becoming so. It is not many years since they were established in the Colonies.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—Then I am to understand that this is to be a precedent. I have always lived in a mixed community, and I have always found Roman Catholics to be good and peaceable neighbors.

Hon. Mr. GOFF.—I did not expect that his honor from St. Peter's would support this Bill. It would be against his political interest to do so. A similar Bill was introduced into the Legislature of New Brunswick a few years ago, but it was lost by a small majority. I do not see any reason why we should wait till they carry a Bill before we would introduce and pass it here.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—Does his honor think that his popularity depends on my opposition to this Bill? If so he is mistaken. I was popular before this Bill was introduced, and I am not afraid of my popularity being effected by it.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—I will support the amendment. I will oppose the Bill on the sound and general principle that it is wrong to encourage secret societies of any kind. I believe that the only institution of the kind that is legalized is the order of Masonry. The formation of such societies as this Bill is intended to legalize, is now looked upon as not required. Laws have been passed in Britain to discourage their lodges. His honor from the second district of Queen's County said it was for the purpose of preventing war.

Hon. Mr. GOFF.—No, those were not my words. I said preparation for war was the worst way of maintaining peace.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—Then, by his honor's own confession, the incorporation of this society is a preparation for war. If this Bill is introduced for the purpose of maintaining peace, in that way it is likely to lead to war. Those societies have caused a great deal of trouble in the old country. I do not say that the constitution or declaration which has been read is very objectionable; but it is not to be supposed that any body of men applying to the Legislature for an Act of Incorporation would send in a constitution that would not be likely to meet the views of the members. In Canada those Lodges have already led to serious disturbance. It was the only place that the Prince of Wales met with anything like an insult during his tour through the Colonies, and that was from the Orange Institution. Some years ago when a man would be asked if he belonged to the Orange society he would deny it, but now men in respectable society boast of being Orangemen. We have not seen or heard anything to show the necessity for such a measure, and believing, as I do, that it will lead to trouble, I will oppose the Bill. The very circumstance that Orangemen are bound to meet on the 12th of July in each year to celebrate the battle of the Boyne will give offence to those whose forefathers served in that battle. If we were to meet and make a demonstration on the anniversary of every day on which a battle has been fought by our forefathers, what would be the result? Would it not be hurtful to the feelings of many of our fellow-colonists and lead to trouble? I might go back to the time when the Orange society was organized, and show what trouble it has led to; but I oppose the Bill on the ground that it is intended to legalize a secret and political institution. It is setting up an institution that may at any time exert a powerful influence against the Government of the day. This, I think, is a sound principle on which to oppose it.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—I would like to say a few words on the subject, and I must confess that I am sorry it should have been considered necessary to apply for this Act; but since it has been brought forward, I feel it my duty to support it, and I shall do so. I believe some hundreds of my constituents are Orangemen, and I feel a little sensitive in regard to them, on account of their being so often most shamefully abused and misrepresented, by a portion of the Press, and by some of the members of the other branch of the Legislature; I believe they are among the most industrious and thriving inhabitants of the Colony. They are the very bone and sinew of the country. If ever the Island become prosperous, it must be, in a great measure, by the energy of those very Orangemen; for they are more numerous than perhaps your honors are aware of. True, the Protestants are not all Orangemen. There are many exceptions. I myself am one of the exceptions. The subject has come before the Legislature by petition, and I do not know any reason why we should refuse to pass this Bill, when it has been asked for. We will only be giving to Orangemen the same privileges that we grant to Freemasons and Sons of Temperance. If I could believe all I have heard in this and the other end of this building respecting Orangemen, I should certainly oppose the Bill to the utmost of my power; but I am satisfied that there is no ground for the accusations that have been brought against them. They are true conservators of the peace and of British Protestant liberty, and I believe never assail any one unless they are first assailed. We must not admit that our elections are now conducted much more peaceably than they used to be ten or fifteen years ago. I myself have been assailed and abused for saying, not long since, in one of my public addresses, that our civil and religious liberties are in danger. Your honors, I am still of that opinion. If not, what mean the foreign correspondents of Roman Catholic Journals, published in England, when they speak of "the great struggle shortly to take place on English soil." Roman Catholics enjoy all the privileges that Protestants enjoy under the British constitution, and I would be very sorry to curtail their constitutional liberties in any way. I myself in my younger days, signed a petition to the British Parliament, praying for the passing of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill, and I would do so again, if necessary. Previous to the passing of that Bill, they did not enjoy the same liberties as Protestants, but now they do.

Hon. Mr. WALKER.—Are they not content with them?

Hon. Mr. BEER.—No, they are not content. I believe the lay members of the Roman Catholic Church are content, or rather would be so, if left to themselves; but the dignitaries of that Church will be content with nothing less than the utter extirpation of Protestantism from the British dominions. Their own authorized and approved writings abundantly prove this fact. But preparatory to that "great struggle to take place on English soil," it is necessary to pave the way by first getting the political power into their own hands. Sound Protestants will always have to be on the alert, if they wish to transmit to their children the sacred rights of conscience. Further to prove that they are not content, you find it frequently said by a portion of the Orange press, that Roman Catholics are proscribed. I deny it. I believe that those among them who support the Government receive their full share of Government patronage. I would be sorry to see them proscribed in any respect, and I would claim for them all the liberties that I would claim for myself. (Hon. Mr. Henderson.—Hear.) Hat what liberties do Protestants, or even the lay members of the Roman Catholic Church, enjoy in Roman Catholic countries? What liberties do they enjoy in Spain?

Hon. Mr. WALKER.—Are there any Protestants there?

Hon. Mr. BEER.—Yes, thousands of them; but if they attempt to exercise any of the rights of freemen, or to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, they are immediately imprisoned in dungeons. I think Protos-

tant do well to see that the foundations of their liberties are not sapped. I am sorry to say that there are many unprincipled politicians, in various parts of the British empire, who, for the sake of place and power, would allow our civil and religious liberties to go to the winds. But I will not wink at anything of that sort. I believe the object of the Orange institution is to uphold and protect our civil and religious liberties. In no part of the world are those liberties enjoyed to such an extent as they are in the British dominions; and in no part of the world is the Roman Catholic Church striving so hard for the mastery. If we wish to maintain our liberties we must see that the Government remains in the hands of men thoroughly conservative of British Protestant freedom. I am no proscriptionist; but I believe that sound Protestants, in a Protestant country, should hold the reins of Government, in order that our liberties should be held sacred. I have no doubt but the Bill before us will have a beneficial influence on the Colony at large, and I do not fear that it will give more offence than has already been given to Catholics. The only thing that Roman Catholics have to fear from Orangemen is this, that they will not allow themselves, if they can help it, to be governed by Roman Catholics or their Protestant tools.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON.—It will be readily admitted that the Bill which is now before this House is a very important measure—a measure that would require candor and care in its discussion. To incorporate the Orange Lodges of this Island would be considered, by many, as a direct insult to the Roman Catholic community, and calculated to destroy the peace and harmony which have hitherto so happily subsisted amongst us. For my own part I have hitherto lived on friendly terms with my Roman Catholic neighbors—they have trusted me, and I have trusted them; and I am desirous that there should be no change in that respect. But if, in consequence of doing conscientiously what I believe to be my duty as a member of this Honourable House, I should displease those who differ from me in politics, I am not too anxious as to consequence. I will endeavour to do my duty, believing that to be the path of safety. What then, is it asked, is Orangism? I answer, that if we are to judge of it by the constitution which has just now been read, in so far as that constitution extends, Orangism and Protestantism are synonymous. It has been intimated by one of your honors, that there must be something in the rules of Orangemen of a more objectionable nature than that which lies on this Table. For my part, I believe there is nothing in its constitution of a more objectionable nature than is to be found in Freemasonry—in fact, that there is nothing in either of them at variance with the best interests of society. It is no new thing for Roman Catholics to compare Protestantism to a "Kope of Sand;" but Orangism is intended to make it practically something tougher than that. Protestantism is neither proscriptive nor persecuting. It has nothing in its principles or practice that requires concealment. It invites the light of day; and, opening its inmost recesses, it challenges public inspection by the highest authority in the land. One of its motives is, "prove all things, hold fast that which is good." Some parties profess to believe that if this Bill were to become law, it would lead to unprecedented strife between opposing classes in this Colony. I admit that a certain spirit of strife may be always looked for. Why, light and darkness are necessarily at war: the one never recedes one inch beyond the point to which it is driven by its victorious foe. And so it shall be, more or less, with the war of opinions and of principles to the end of time. But Protestantism is defensive, and not aggressive, in its principles. It lays no claim to a "Divine Right" to propagate its principles by physical power. It follows then, as a natural consequence, that it must be ever watchful and vigilant; more especially against the movements of such a cry "peace, peace," when danger is making steady progress. I am no alarmist, but as I believe that "history is to mankind what experience is to the individual," I would be acting contrary to both, were I to believe that we are not in danger. One of your honors has said that the Orangemen of Canada were the only class in British North America that insulted the Prince of Wales during his visit to this continent. I deny the assertion in toto; and on the authority of the public press of Canada, I affirm that the Duke of Newcastle insulted the Protestants of Canada in that affair. The Prince, it would appear, shed tears in abundance on that occasion, and would have passed through the Arch very cheerfully, if his adviser had given consent. And I am the more confirmed in this view of the matter because of the very marked change of tone manifested by the Duke's own organs in England, as soon as the indignant expression of opinion by the Canadian press reached that country. This, however, is only speaking of Orangemen by report. But I can speak of them by experience; for during the rebellion in Canada in the year 1838, many of them left their homes and families very poorly protected and accompanied the regular army, of which I was one, shoulder to shoulder, through mud and through storm, by night and by day, over land and water, till the rebellion was crushed and order restored! Such then were Orangemen, as conservators of order and constitutional liberties in Canada, and such they would be in this Island, if their services in the cause of true freedom should be required. Adding to the foregoing, the fact that a large, and influential number of my constituents are Orangemen, who are earnestly desirous to obtain such a measure as this, and believing, as I do that their principles always lead them to respect the rights and privileges of all classes, I will give my hearty support to the Bill.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Before the question is put, your honors, I wish to say a few words on this subject; and I shall begin by saying that I know more about Orange principles now than ever I did. I must say that I am rather sorry that there has arisen a necessity, in the estimation of a certain party, to introduce a Bill of this character. I do not know that I should have brought such a Bill into the Legislature, but as it has been passed by the popular branch—passed too by a large majority—every member of the Government in that branch of the Legislature voting for it—I am not disposed to incur the responsibility of rejecting it. It may be supposed by some that any responsibility connected with the passing of this Bill would concentrate upon me, as being supposed to be a leading member in this end of the building, and perhaps possessing, owing to my long legislative experience, more influence than some other members of this House. I believe there will be less responsibility incurred by passing than by rejecting it. I believe the Orange Institution of this Island as well as of other countries is worse in name than in character and deed. There is nothing in the constitution to create alarm in the minds of any class of the community. We might refuse to incorporate the Orangemen, but we could not prevent their existence. The effect of throwing out this Bill might be to engender worse feelings than the passing of it will do. There is one clause in the constitution which appears to be a little restrictive, though perhaps it is not an insuperable objection. I mean that clause which prohibits any Orangeman from marrying a Roman Catholic woman. Any young fellow, I presume, falling in love with a pretty and rich young maid, would sooner withdraw from the Orange society than withdraw from his engagement and break his heart. That is the only illiberal part of the constitution; but I do not think it is sufficient to condemn it. I have been assured that the copy of the constitution laid before this House contains the whole—that there is no part of the constitution kept back—and I believe it is the case. If Orangemen in this Island conduct themselves in future as they have done heretofore, we need not be afraid of any evil consequences resulting from the operation of this Bill. I think it will be harmless in its operation. I would not be the first to introduce such a measure because a certain class are strongly prejudiced against the Orange society, which prejudice has doubtless been engendered by some unjustifiable conduct of Orangemen in other countries at some particular times of excitement; but if they conduct themselves according to their constitution there is no cause for alarm. I believe there are a number of Lodges on the Island, but if they overstep their rules, or go beyond the bounds of their constitution, I would be among the first to introduce and support an Act to restrain them. There is one clause in the Bill which I consider unnecessary and even unconstitutional. I mean the suspending clause, which says this Act shall not

every year; I swear that I am not, nor ever will be a Roman Catholic or Papist; nor will I marry a Roman Catholic or Papist, nor educate my children, nor suffer them to be educated in the Roman Catholic Faith, nor am I now, or ever will be, a member of any Society, or body of men that are enemies to Her Majesty and our Glorious Constitution; that I never was, to my knowledge or belief, rejected in, or expelled from any Orange Lodge; I further declare, that I will do my utmost to support and maintain the Loyal Orange Institution; obey all regular Summons, and pay all just dues, (if in my power) and observe and obey the Constitution and Laws of the same; and lastly, I swear that I will always conceal, and never in any way whatsoever, disclose or reveal, the whole, or any part of the signs, words, or tokens, that are now about to be privately communicated to me, unless I shall be duly authorized so to do by the proper authorities of the Orange Institution, of which I am now about to become a member. So help me God, and keep me steadfast, in this my Orangeman's Oath."

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—Is it customary for these Orange Lodges incorporated in the other Colonies?

Hon. Mr. GOFF.—It has not been customary heretofore, but it is becoming so. It is not many years since they were established in the Colonies.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—Then I am to understand that this is to be a precedent. I have always lived in a mixed community, and I have always found Roman Catholics to be good and peaceable neighbors.

Hon. Mr. GOFF.—I did not expect that his honor from St. Peter's would support this Bill. It would be against his political interest to do so. A similar Bill was introduced into the Legislature of New Brunswick a few years ago, but it was lost by a small majority. I do not see any reason why we should wait till they carry a Bill before we would introduce and pass it here.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—Does his honor think that his popularity depends on my opposition to this Bill? If so he is mistaken. I was popular before this Bill was introduced, and I am not afraid of my popularity being effected by it.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—I will support the amendment. I will oppose the Bill on the sound and general principle that it is wrong to encourage secret societies of any kind. I believe that the only institution of the kind that is legalized is the order of Masonry. The formation of such societies as this Bill is intended to legalize, is now looked upon as not required. Laws have been passed in Britain to discourage their lodges. His honor from the second district of Queen's County said it was for the purpose of preventing war.

Hon. Mr. GOFF.—No, those were not my words. I said preparation for war was the worst way of maintaining peace.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—Then, by his honor's own confession, the incorporation of this society is a preparation for war. If this Bill is introduced for the purpose of maintaining peace, in that way it is likely to lead to war. Those societies have caused a great deal of trouble in the old country. I do not say that the constitution or declaration which has been read is very objectionable; but it is not to be supposed that any body of men applying to the Legislature for an Act of Incorporation would send in a constitution that would not be likely to meet the views of the members. In Canada those Lodges have already led to serious disturbance. It was the only place that the Prince of Wales met with anything like an insult during his tour through the Colonies, and that was from the Orange Institution. Some years ago when a man would be asked if he belonged to the Orange society he would deny it, but now men in respectable society boast of being Orangemen. We have not seen or heard anything to show the necessity for such a measure, and believing, as I do, that it will lead to trouble, I will oppose the Bill. The very circumstance that Orangemen are bound to meet on the 12th of July in each year to celebrate the battle of the Boyne will give offence to those whose forefathers served in that battle. If we were to meet and make a demonstration on the anniversary of every day on which a battle has been fought by our forefathers, what would be the result? Would it not be hurtful to the feelings of many of our fellow-colonists and lead to trouble? I might go back to the time when the Orange society was organized, and show what trouble it has led to; but I oppose the Bill on the ground that it is intended to legalize a secret and political institution. It is setting up an institution that may at any time exert a powerful influence against the Government of the day. This, I think, is a sound principle on which to oppose it.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—I would like to say a few words on the subject, and I must confess that I am sorry it should have been considered necessary to apply for this Act; but since it has been brought forward, I feel it my duty to support it, and I shall do so. I believe some hundreds of my constituents are Orangemen, and I feel a little sensitive in regard to them, on account of their being so often most shamefully abused and misrepresented, by a portion of the Press, and by some of the members of the other branch of the Legislature; I believe they are among the most industrious and thriving inhabitants of the Colony. They are the very bone and sinew of the country. If ever the Island become prosperous, it must be, in a great measure, by the energy of those very Orangemen; for they are more numerous than perhaps your honors are aware of. True, the Protestants are not all Orangemen. There are many exceptions. I myself am one of the exceptions. The subject has come before the Legislature by petition, and I do not know any reason why we should refuse to pass this Bill, when it has been asked for. We will only be giving to Orangemen the same privileges that we grant to Freemasons and Sons of Temperance. If I could believe all I have heard in this and the other end of this building respecting Orangemen, I should certainly oppose the Bill to the utmost of my power; but I am satisfied that there is no ground for the accusations that have been brought against them. They are true conservators of the peace and of British Protestant liberty, and I believe never assail any one unless they are first assailed. We must not admit that our elections are now conducted much more peaceably than they used to be ten or fifteen years ago. I myself have been assailed and abused for saying, not long since, in one of my public addresses, that our civil and religious liberties are in danger. Your honors, I am still of that opinion. If not, what mean the foreign correspondents of Roman Catholic Journals, published in England, when they speak of "the great struggle shortly to take place on English soil." Roman Catholics enjoy all the privileges that Protestants enjoy under the British constitution, and I would be very sorry to curtail their constitutional liberties in any way. I myself in my younger days, signed a petition to the British Parliament, praying for the passing of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill, and I would do so again, if necessary. Previous to the passing of that Bill, they did not enjoy the same liberties as Protestants, but now they do.

Hon. Mr. WALKER.—Are they not content with them?

Hon. Mr. BEER.—No, they are not content. I believe the lay members of the Roman Catholic Church are content, or rather would be so, if left to themselves; but the dignitaries of that Church will be content with nothing less than the utter extirpation of Protestantism from the British dominions. Their own authorized and approved writings abundantly prove this fact. But preparatory to that "great struggle to take place on English soil," it is necessary to pave the way by first getting the political power into their own hands. Sound Protestants will always have to be on the alert, if they wish to transmit to their children the sacred rights of conscience. Further to prove that they are not content, you find it frequently said by a portion of the Orange press, that Roman Catholics are proscribed. I deny it. I believe that those among them who support the Government receive their full share of Government patronage. I would be sorry to see them proscribed in any respect, and I would claim for them all the liberties that I would claim for myself. (Hon. Mr. Henderson.—Hear.) Hat what liberties do Protestants, or even the lay members of the Roman Catholic Church, enjoy in Roman Catholic countries? What liberties do they enjoy in Spain?

Hon. Mr. WALKER.—Are there any Protestants there?

Hon. Mr. BEER.—Yes, thousands of them; but if they attempt to exercise any of the rights of freemen, or to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, they are immediately imprisoned in dungeons. I think Protos-

tant do well to see that the foundations of their liberties are not sapped. I am sorry to say that there are many unprincipled politicians, in various parts of the British empire, who, for the sake of place and power, would allow our civil and religious liberties to go to the winds. But I will not wink at anything of that sort. I believe the object of the Orange institution is to uphold and protect our civil and religious liberties. In no part of the world are those liberties enjoyed to such an extent as they are in the British dominions; and in no part of the world is the Roman Catholic Church striving so hard for the mastery. If we wish to maintain our liberties we must see that the Government remains in the hands of men thoroughly conservative of British Protestant freedom. I am no proscriptionist; but I believe that sound Protestants, in a Protestant country, should hold the reins of Government, in order that our liberties should be held sacred. I have no doubt but the Bill before us will have a beneficial influence on the Colony at large, and I do not fear that it will give more offence than has already been given to Catholics. The only thing that Roman Catholics have to fear from Orangemen is this, that they will not allow themselves, if they can help it, to be governed by Roman Catholics or their Protestant tools.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON.—It will be readily admitted that the Bill which is now before this House is a very important measure—a measure that would require candor and care in its discussion. To incorporate the Orange Lodges of this Island would be considered, by many, as a direct insult to the Roman Catholic community, and calculated to destroy the peace and harmony which have hitherto so happily subsisted amongst us. For my own part I have hitherto lived on friendly terms with my Roman Catholic neighbors—they have trusted me, and I have trusted them; and I am desirous that there should be no change in that respect. But if, in consequence of doing conscientiously what I believe to be my duty as a member of this Honourable House, I should displease those who differ from me in politics, I am not too anxious as to consequence. I will endeavour to do my duty, believing that to be the path of safety. What then, is it asked, is Orangism? I answer, that if we are to judge of it by the constitution which has just now been read, in so far as that constitution extends, Orangism and Protestantism are synonymous. It has been intimated by one of your honors, that there must be something in the rules of Orangemen of a more objectionable nature than that which lies on this Table. For my part, I believe there is nothing in its constitution of a more objectionable nature than is to be found in Freemasonry—in fact, that there is nothing in either of them at variance with the best interests of society. It is no new thing for Roman Catholics to compare Protestantism to a "Kope of Sand;" but Orangism is intended to make it practically something tougher than that. Protestantism is neither proscriptive nor persecuting. It has nothing in its principles or practice that requires concealment. It invites the light of day; and, opening its inmost recesses, it challenges public inspection by the highest authority in the land. One of its motives is, "prove all things, hold fast that which is good." Some parties profess to believe that if this Bill were to become law, it would lead to unprecedented strife between opposing classes in this Colony. I admit