

cy here which deprived younger children of a subsistence. He hoped the House would agree to the bill's being read, to put them in possession of its contents, and not vote against a measure which they knew nothing of.

Mr. Hagerman said, it was unnecessary to read the bill. It was intended to take the right of inheritance from the elder Son, and distribute it amongst the younger. If the hon. gentleman said the present bill was not a departure from the British Constitution, he, (Mr. H.) would say he was ignorant of the constitution. (Mr. Rogers said, across the table, he had not said so.) Mr. H. said, if they passed the present bill, they would be departing from every thing venerable, noble, and honorable: he should be sorry that a bill of so dangerous a tendency would pass. Democracy was, like a serpent, twisting round us by degrees, it should be crushed in the first instance; for if that bill passed, it would not leave them the British Constitution but a mere shadow. A division took place—For Mr. Bidwell's motion, Messrs. Pattie, James Wilson, Clark, Randal, Peterson, Casey, Walsh, VanKoughnet, Bidwell, and Rogers.—10.

Against it, Messrs. Peter Robinson, Bostwick, Burwell, Attorney General, Hagerman, Baldwin, Wilnot, Baby, Morris, McMartin, Kerr, Gates, Jones, Chisholm, R. Hamilton, and McDonell, 16. Majority against the motion.—8.

[So that the usual courtesy was denied Mr. Bidwell, thro' the convincing arguments of Messrs. Attorney General, Baldwin, and Hagerman; and his bill was not even permitted to be read. A number of the members, it would appear, not only in this but in many other divisions, went below the bar.]

In the assembly, on the 10th Decr. 1823, the OPPOSERS of a similar salutary measure, were Messrs. Gordon, Burwell, Baldwin, Attorney General, Rutten, Kerr, Jonas Jones, Hagerman, Nichol, McDonell, Robert Hamilton, McMartin, Archibald McLean, Morris, Shaver, and Bostwick.

In reply to Mr. John Willson, who had introduced the measure for an equal division, among the family, of the estates of persons dying without wills, Doctor Baldwin, amongst other things, remarked, that "the hon. mover said this bill would improve the condition of the country; he would beg leave to deny such a result, and to direct the attention of the hon. member to the state of England, where under this law agriculture has highly flourished, where a respectable farmer can give his daughter £10,000 or £20,000 fortune; was there any Country more respectable in commercial and agricultural prosperity?—No Country equalled it—where then was the evil of the present law?—instead of improving the Country it would retard it's improvement; it would rather lessen the value of real estate and therefore check the spirit of improvement—it would in a measure tend to convert landed estate into paper currency, as the young expectants of the division would anticipate their shares, and waste and squander to speculators before they obtained their property."

No. 27.

Mr. Bidwell, senior's bill for enabling Religious Societies to hold land for parsonages, burying grounds, &c.

[Here again Doctor Baldwin's contracted spirit manifests itself. He had carried thro' the law society act, which allows that formidable and dangerous association to hold as much land as they please, and to enjoy lands bequeathed to them, without limit or restriction as to quantity, and also to sell land, &c. The doctor's narrow prudence always forsook him when the law or lawyers were in the way, but in order to guard against improvident grants to religious societies, he wished that not more than 4 or 6 acres might be allowed to them.]

Mr. Bidwell said, all that was required by the bill was ground for a Parsonage, a Church and burying ground, and as there was no limit to the lands for the accommodation of the Law Society, he had not thought it necessary to introduce a clause for that purpose into the present bill.

Dr. Baldwin said there was a great difference between this bill, and the bill regulating the Law Society.—That bill was for supporting the Law Society of this Province, which SHOULD NOT BE LIMITED: the present bill was to grant privileges to Religious Societies, of various denominations: and the house should not, by vesting them with unlimited powers, lay the foundation for accumulating property. It was the feeling of the public to support Religious Societies, there might be large estates bequeathed to them; but there was no danger of bequests being made in favour of the Law Society, yet great danger might arise by bequests to Religious Societies.

See Statutes, 1822, chap. 5, page 39.—Law Society.