

The Head Quarters.

itself. He (Hon. Mr. Attorney General) had no objection to free Churches; but he did not want to see free Churches turned out of Churches already built and peopled; and wherein they had worshipped for sixty or seventy years. He did not want his own property taken from him; for it was the Law of the land here, that the Pew was the property of its owner; it was not like the common law of England. The more free Churches there were the better; but he did not want to see any new fangled principle introduced, to upset all the Churches in the country, and turn all the people out of their Pews, for the sake of making them all free Churches. The people could not get such free Churches; they had no means to get them; there would be no Churches at all, no, not even Dissenting Churches, nor Churches of the Kirk of Scotland, if all were to be free Churches. There would be no clergy, no preachers, no anything, because there would be no means to support them. The Hon. Attorney General concluded with some remarks, relative to the church in Carleton Place, having been formerly been a free church; but afterwards, upon finding the necessity of introducing Pews, in order to provide funds for the maintenance of the church and the clergyman, been altered by the authority of the Bishop of Nova Scotia and consecrated by him.

(To be continued in our next.)

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, February 17.
The House was engaged during the morning in receiving a large number of Petitions and transacting other business, which elicited no debate, until on motion of Mr. Simonds, the House went into Committee of the whole, on a Bill relating to the PROVINCIAL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. SIMONDS explained that the object of the Bill was to authorize the Provincial Treasurer to issue Provincial Debentures instead of Debentures issued on behalf of the City and County of Saint John, signed by the Mayor, for monies borrowed for the erection of the Penitentiary. When the Legislature created the Penitentiary into a Provincial establishment the understanding was that the Province should assume the debt; and although the Act specified the sum of £4,000 as the limit of the amount which the Province was to assume, this was merely inserted as the probable amount of Debentures then issued. It was now found that there had been debentures issued to the amount of £5,000, which surely ought to be paid by the Province. This he thought was a fair claim on the Province, and hoped it would be sustained, as no new County Debentures could be issued until the amount of Debentures issued for the Penitentiary should be liquidated. The Bill was not local but applied to the revenues of the Province.

Mr. EVO opposed the Bill, on the ground that it was a purely local Bill, and one which was intended to relieve Saint John of some £5,000, which they ought to pay, as they had all the advantages of the Penitentiary.

[A lengthened debate then took place, which ended in a motion that the Bill be postponed for three months, which was carried, and consequently the Bill was lost.]

Wednesday, February 18.
On motion of the Hon. Mr. HAZEN, the House went into a Committee of the whole, on a Bill in addition to the Act relative to the Streets and Squares of Saint John.

Mr. HAZEN explained, that his object in bringing in this Bill was to legalize the present fences enclosing the public Squares in the City of Saint John. It had been found at examination that there were encroachments on the opposite side of their street, and the Bill which was then under the consideration of the Committee did not go to legalize those encroachments, but went merely to legalize the enclosures now made by the Corporation, for the benefit of the City, and which were placed on the proper line.

[After a lengthened discussion a motion to postpone the Bill for three months was put, and carried by a large majority, and the bill was consequently lost.]

On motion of Mr. EVO, the House went into a Committee of the whole, on a Bill to continue an Act to prevent the surreptitious of a disorder now existing in parts of the Counties of Gloucester and Northumberland. Mr. Jordan in the Chair.

Mr. EVO said, that the Bill before the Committee was one which he hoped there would be little discussion about. The Loretto on Sheldrake Island had been burnt down, and it became necessary to erect another building for the accommodation of the unfortunate individuals who were afflicted with this loathsome disease. The Bill was precisely the same as the former Act, which it was meant to continue; and he trusted there would be no objection raised against its passing. The question had been fully discussed on former occasions, and he thought there would be no necessity for again going over the same ground.

[A long discussion ensued, which ended in the Chairman of the Committee reporting progress and asking leave to sit again.]

Thursday, February 19.
The House to-day were occupied in business, which elicited little debate. The only discussion of any length which arose was on the subject of establishing a Road leading from the Great Road between Fredericton and Halifax to the Bay Verte as one of the Great Roads of the Province, which was carried after a rather protracted debate.

Friday, February 20.
There was a great deal of business disposed of without any debate. In the afternoon Mr. Wilnot moved an Address to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, on matters connected with King's College. He said, that while he was up he would ask a question of the honorable member of the Government—Whether the present Registrar of King's College intended to continue to hold that appointment.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said, he was not prepared to answer the honorable member from York when it was the intention of the present Registrar to resign that office. It was necessary that he should continue to hold his office until all accounts connected with the College should be made up. He presumed when this was done the present Registrar would resign. Until then it was necessary for that gentleman to continue in office.

His Honor the SPEAKER said, that all the necessary accounts could be made up in a few days. He presumed it was nothing more than making up the Rent Roll of the College. He was not a member of the College Council, but perhaps the honorable member from Saint John (Mr. Simonds) who had been appointed ex-officio a member of that Council retains his seat still; if so, he could give some explanation relative to the time necessary to make up the accounts. He thought, however, that the office of Registrar could not be held with propriety by the present incumbent. When he resigned the honorable member (Mr. Fisher) who had told him that he was the only graduate of that institution, in the Legislature, could then present his claims for the office, and he might perhaps, be appointed on the principle of Departmental Government, or some other principle.

Mr. WILNOT said, that the offices were quite incompatible with each other. It would be derogatory to the office of a Judge of the Supreme Court to act as Registrar of the College. He hoped a distinct understanding would soon be had on the subject.

Wednesday, February 25.
ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP.

On motion of Mr. EVO, the House went into Committee of the whole, on a Bill to incorporate the Roman Catholic Bishop of New Brunswick, Mr. Taylor in the Chair.

Mr. EVO said that the Bill which he had the honor to introduce to the consideration of the Committee, was supported by a large number of Petitions, numerous and respectfully signed by the Members of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the Province, ("you had better read the Petition," from Mr. Partelow.) The Hon. Member from Saint John might read them himself, as he was pretty glib with the tongue. There were seventeen of them, and these seventeen contained the signatures of upwards of six thousand five hundred persons. The prayers of all these Petitioners were nearly the same, and had express reference to the Bill which passed the Legislature of Canada, incorporating the Roman Catholic Bishops in that Province. This Bill had been published in the Royal Gazette of the Province, and had been read by every individual in the Province who took any interest in the matter. It was not to be supposed that this large number of the Petitioners had acted without consideration; that Bill had been in print since June last, and they were not now to be told, that the new owners had been blind-folled when they put their hands to the Petition. [Here the honorable Member read the prayers of several of the Petitioners, all concurring in praying that an Act might pass, incorporating the Roman Catholic Bishop of New Brunswick, similar to that passed in Canada, incorporating the Roman Catholic Bishops of that Province.]

As this Canada Act had been so long before the public, no body could complain of being taken by surprise, they all knew its provisions, and a similar Bill had passed here last year without opposition. The Bill now before the Committee differed from the printed Canada Bill, in this particular—the powers proposed to be conferred on the Roman Catholic Bishop of this Province, were far more limited than that conferred by the Canada Bill. That Bill (the Canada Bill) gave the Corporation power to sell lands, vested in them for ecclesiastical purposes. The Bill now before them gave no such power; and this section had been omitted at the request of Dr. Dollard himself, who was anxious that nothing which could possibly be reasonably objected to, should be included in the measure. The 14th section of the Bill establishes the Corporation and its name, and was an exact transcript of the same section of the Canada Act, with the exception of the name which was altered to the Roman Catholic Corporation of the diocese of New Brunswick. The second section of the Canada Bill had omitted entirely at the request of his Lordship the Bishop, consequently no objection could be made to that section, could be objected against the Bill then before the Committee. The fears, and doubts, and objections contained in the Petitions against the Bill, were all answered by the Hon. Member from Saint John, upon the subject of their interests; he was sure there was every disposition on the part of the Committee to afford that large body of their fellow subjects every facility for procuring and enjoying their property in the most perfect manner, and in the most perfect justice. The Presbyterian Church had this privilege extended to them, and in fact almost every denomination of Christians were empowered to hold real estate either by Trustees or Vestry and Church wardens, and he would be the last Member on the floor of that House to wish to deprive their Roman Catholic brethren of the same privilege. There he Community, conveyed their lands in any way at variance with the trust under which they held them, there was a remedy by applying to the Court of Chancery which would restrain any improper conveyance, and it was to be released from the title offered to the Bill; a much more comprehensive Bill, had passed last year without opposition and he trusted that the justice of the cause, and the powerful support it had received from respectable and numerous body who had signed Petitions, from all parts of the Province, would receive at the hands of the Committee that consideration which it was his opinion the prayers were well entitled to. The present method of holding lands in name of Trustees, was a very loose method and these lands were at any moment subject to an execution to the extent, and it was to be released from the title to the property would be unsettled, and that worthy individual was anxious he should be relieved of his trust. He should say nothing further on the subject at present, but he was prepared to meet any objection which might be urged against the Bill.

Mr. PARTLEW rose and said, that it became his duty to rise in support of the Bill, and in the Committee, the arguments contained in a Petition, which he then held in his hand, signed by a number of the most respectable members of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, who were against the Bill, now before the Committee. [Here the Hon. Member read the prayer and allegations contained in the Petition.] He (Mr. Partelow) considered it his duty to support those arguments, and would there remark, that although the Petitions in favour of the Bill, were much more numerous than the one which he had presented to that House, yet the minority were most respectable and influential members of the Roman Catholic Church, and they had rights in the property of this Church, which they were anxious to protect. He would not then go into the particular merits of the question, but would give notice to the Hon. Member, that unless the Bill was amended in such a way as to remove some of the objections urged in the Petition, he had just read, he should oppose it. He would like to hear the opinions of the members of the Committee on the Bill, and would then be prepared with amendments to those Sections which he thought took away without their owners consent to the rights of the Petitioners. If he failed in this he should then move a clause to exclude the City and County of Saint John from the operation of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said, that he had no objection to the Bill, then before the Committee, becoming law, provided it was so modified, as would remove the objections of a large and most respectable portion of his Roman Catholic Constituents in Saint John. The right to hold lands for ecclesiastical purposes, was conceded to other denominations, and he was far from wishing to exclude members of the Roman Catholic Church from the privileges which were enjoyed by others differing from them in Religious belief. He confessed the question was difficult one, and ought to be carefully dealt with. Hon. Members had recently expressed their unwillingness to argue on subjects connected with Religion, and a Bill had been hurriedly passed through a Committee, for the avowed purpose of avoiding such discussions. He solemnly said this urged by Hon. Members, that when he (Mr. H.) requested the Hon. member of that

Bill, not now in his place, (Mr. Fisher), to consent to report progress that he might have an opportunity of looking over the Bill, until next morning. That Hon. Member refused him such indulgence, and the Bill was hurried through the Legislature, at a late hour. The present question he acknowledged was one attended with difficulties, and had there been no Petition against it—no difference of opinion among the Roman Catholics themselves, he should have allowed it to pass without offering any opposition. But there was a difference of opinion, and he (Mr. Hazen) felt that it was his duty fairly to represent both uncompromising parties. The Roman Catholics had no representative in that House belonging to their own Church, who could advocate the claims of either party, nor could they avail themselves on the floor of that House of such information as would guide them in passing any law respecting the Polity of that Church. Under such circumstances it appeared to him that the Committee should pause before they gave their assent to any interfering with the rights of particular churches or Parishes, as well as the rights of private individuals belonging to these Churches. In the Petitions brought in, in support of the Bill, he perceived, that an Act similar to the Canada Act should become law in this Province. The present Bill, he admitted, did not go so far as that Act, and the omission of the second Section respecting the rights of the Roman Catholics, was a serious consideration. The supporters of the measure could not deny that by the present Bill, the rights of the Church wardens and Vestry, who at present manage the Temporalities of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, would be affected by this Bill. The rights of the Roman Catholics in that Church were likewise unprotected, and he would at the proper time, move an amendment to the said section, restoring the said rights to the parties now enjoying them. There was a good deal of excitement on this question in the City of Saint John, and great difference of opinion on this subject among the Roman Catholics themselves; and under such circumstances, he for one was not disposed to take away the rights, or supposed rights of the minority, in this summary way; if those who supporting the Bill, could not be brought to see the amendment, which he should feel it his duty to propose, could not affect the Bill, if they did, it was fair and right that they should be allowed to be heard. He would not then know too little of the Polity of the Roman Catholic Church, to enable him to judge how far those rights extended to them, or he was by no means disposed to agree to any Bill, which would deprive them of property, or of the rights which they had purchased and paid for sittings in Roman Catholic places of worship, of what belonged to them. If the minority had no property, no legal right, in the present Bill, the amendment which he should propose, could do no harm.

Mr. W. H. STREET said that he had several objections to urge against the Bill then before the Committee; and although the Roman Catholics had from the City of Saint John, upon the subject of their interests; he was sure there was every disposition on the part of the Committee to afford that large body of their fellow subjects every facility for procuring and enjoying their property in the most perfect manner, and in the most perfect justice. The Presbyterian Church had this privilege extended to them, and in fact almost every denomination of Christians were empowered to hold real estate either by Trustees or Vestry and Church wardens, and he would be the last Member on the floor of that House to wish to deprive their Roman Catholic brethren of the same privilege. There he Community, conveyed their lands in any way at variance with the trust under which they held them, there was a remedy by applying to the Court of Chancery which would restrain any improper conveyance, and it was to be released from the title offered to the Bill; a much more comprehensive Bill, had passed last year without opposition and he trusted that the justice of the cause, and the powerful support it had received from respectable and numerous body who had signed Petitions, from all parts of the Province, would receive at the hands of the Committee that consideration which it was his opinion the prayers were well entitled to. The present method of holding lands in name of Trustees, was a very loose method and these lands were at any moment subject to an execution to the extent, and it was to be released from the title to the property would be unsettled, and that worthy individual was anxious he should be relieved of his trust. He should say nothing further on the subject at present, but he was prepared to meet any objection which might be urged against the Bill.

Mr. PARTLEW rose and said, that it became his duty to rise in support of the Bill, and in the Committee, the arguments contained in a Petition, which he then held in his hand, signed by a number of the most respectable members of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, who were against the Bill, now before the Committee. [Here the Hon. Member read the prayer and allegations contained in the Petition.] He (Mr. Partelow) considered it his duty to support those arguments, and would there remark, that although the Petitions in favour of the Bill, were much more numerous than the one which he had presented to that House, yet the minority were most respectable and influential members of the Roman Catholic Church, and they had rights in the property of this Church, which they were anxious to protect. He would not then go into the particular merits of the question, but would give notice to the Hon. Member, that unless the Bill was amended in such a way as to remove some of the objections urged in the Petition, he had just read, he should oppose it. He would like to hear the opinions of the members of the Committee on the Bill, and would then be prepared with amendments to those Sections which he thought took away without their owners consent to the rights of the Petitioners. If he failed in this he should then move a clause to exclude the City and County of Saint John from the operation of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said, that he had no objection to the Bill, then before the Committee, becoming law, provided it was so modified, as would remove the objections of a large and most respectable portion of his Roman Catholic Constituents in Saint John. The right to hold lands for ecclesiastical purposes, was conceded to other denominations, and he was far from wishing to exclude members of the Roman Catholic Church from the privileges which were enjoyed by others differing from them in Religious belief. He confessed the question was difficult one, and ought to be carefully dealt with. Hon. Members had recently expressed their unwillingness to argue on subjects connected with Religion, and a Bill had been hurriedly passed through a Committee, for the avowed purpose of avoiding such discussions. He solemnly said this urged by Hon. Members, that when he (Mr. H.) requested the Hon. member of that

Bill, not now in his place, (Mr. Fisher), to consent to report progress that he might have an opportunity of looking over the Bill, until next morning. That Hon. Member refused him such indulgence, and the Bill was hurried through the Legislature, at a late hour. The present question he acknowledged was one attended with difficulties, and had there been no Petition against it—no difference of opinion among the Roman Catholics themselves, he should have allowed it to pass without offering any opposition. But there was a difference of opinion, and he (Mr. Hazen) felt that it was his duty fairly to represent both uncompromising parties. The Roman Catholics had no representative in that House belonging to their own Church, who could advocate the claims of either party, nor could they avail themselves on the floor of that House of such information as would guide them in passing any law respecting the Polity of that Church. Under such circumstances it appeared to him that the Committee should pause before they gave their assent to any interfering with the rights of particular churches or Parishes, as well as the rights of private individuals belonging to these Churches. In the Petitions brought in, in support of the Bill, he perceived, that an Act similar to the Canada Act should become law in this Province. The present Bill, he admitted, did not go so far as that Act, and the omission of the second Section respecting the rights of the Roman Catholics, was a serious consideration. The supporters of the measure could not deny that by the present Bill, the rights of the Church wardens and Vestry, who at present manage the Temporalities of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, would be affected by this Bill. The rights of the Roman Catholics in that Church were likewise unprotected, and he would at the proper time, move an amendment to the said section, restoring the said rights to the parties now enjoying them. There was a good deal of excitement on this question in the City of Saint John, and great difference of opinion on this subject among the Roman Catholics themselves; and under such circumstances, he for one was not disposed to take away the rights, or supposed rights of the minority, in this summary way; if those who supporting the Bill, could not be brought to see the amendment, which he should feel it his duty to propose, could not affect the Bill, if they did, it was fair and right that they should be allowed to be heard. He would not then know too little of the Polity of the Roman Catholic Church, to enable him to judge how far those rights extended to them, or he was by no means disposed to agree to any Bill, which would deprive them of property, or of the rights which they had purchased and paid for sittings in Roman Catholic places of worship, of what belonged to them. If the minority had no property, no legal right, in the present Bill, the amendment which he should propose, could do no harm.

Mr. W. H. STREET said that he had several objections to urge against the Bill then before the Committee; and although the Roman Catholics had from the City of Saint John, upon the subject of their interests; he was sure there was every disposition on the part of the Committee to afford that large body of their fellow subjects every facility for procuring and enjoying their property in the most perfect manner, and in the most perfect justice. The Presbyterian Church had this privilege extended to them, and in fact almost every denomination of Christians were empowered to hold real estate either by Trustees or Vestry and Church wardens, and he would be the last Member on the floor of that House to wish to deprive their Roman Catholic brethren of the same privilege. There he Community, conveyed their lands in any way at variance with the trust under which they held them, there was a remedy by applying to the Court of Chancery which would restrain any improper conveyance, and it was to be released from the title offered to the Bill; a much more comprehensive Bill, had passed last year without opposition and he trusted that the justice of the cause, and the powerful support it had received from respectable and numerous body who had signed Petitions, from all parts of the Province, would receive at the hands of the Committee that consideration which it was his opinion the prayers were well entitled to. The present method of holding lands in name of Trustees, was a very loose method and these lands were at any moment subject to an execution to the extent, and it was to be released from the title to the property would be unsettled, and that worthy individual was anxious he should be relieved of his trust. He should say nothing further on the subject at present, but he was prepared to meet any objection which might be urged against the Bill.

Mr. PARTLEW rose and said, that it became his duty to rise in support of the Bill, and in the Committee, the arguments contained in a Petition, which he then held in his hand, signed by a number of the most respectable members of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, who were against the Bill, now before the Committee. [Here the Hon. Member read the prayer and allegations contained in the Petition.] He (Mr. Partelow) considered it his duty to support those arguments, and would there remark, that although the Petitions in favour of the Bill, were much more numerous than the one which he had presented to that House, yet the minority were most respectable and influential members of the Roman Catholic Church, and they had rights in the property of this Church, which they were anxious to protect. He would not then go into the particular merits of the question, but would give notice to the Hon. Member, that unless the Bill was amended in such a way as to remove some of the objections urged in the Petition, he had just read, he should oppose it. He would like to hear the opinions of the members of the Committee on the Bill, and would then be prepared with amendments to those Sections which he thought took away without their owners consent to the rights of the Petitioners. If he failed in this he should then move a clause to exclude the City and County of Saint John from the operation of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said, that he had no objection to the Bill, then before the Committee, becoming law, provided it was so modified, as would remove the objections of a large and most respectable portion of his Roman Catholic Constituents in Saint John. The right to hold lands for ecclesiastical purposes, was conceded to other denominations, and he was far from wishing to exclude members of the Roman Catholic Church from the privileges which were enjoyed by others differing from them in Religious belief. He confessed the question was difficult one, and ought to be carefully dealt with. Hon. Members had recently expressed their unwillingness to argue on subjects connected with Religion, and a Bill had been hurriedly passed through a Committee, for the avowed purpose of avoiding such discussions. He solemnly said this urged by Hon. Members, that when he (Mr. H.) requested the Hon. member of that

Bill, not now in his place, (Mr. Fisher), to consent to report progress that he might have an opportunity of looking over the Bill, until next morning. That Hon. Member refused him such indulgence, and the Bill was hurried through the Legislature, at a late hour. The present question he acknowledged was one attended with difficulties, and had there been no Petition against it—no difference of opinion among the Roman Catholics themselves, he should have allowed it to pass without offering any opposition. But there was a difference of opinion, and he (Mr. Hazen) felt that it was his duty fairly to represent both uncompromising parties. The Roman Catholics had no representative in that House belonging to their own Church, who could advocate the claims of either party, nor could they avail themselves on the floor of that House of such information as would guide them in passing any law respecting the Polity of that Church. Under such circumstances it appeared to him that the Committee should pause before they gave their assent to any interfering with the rights of particular churches or Parishes, as well as the rights of private individuals belonging to these Churches. In the Petitions brought in, in support of the Bill, he perceived, that an Act similar to the Canada Act should become law in this Province. The present Bill, he admitted, did not go so far as that Act, and the omission of the second Section respecting the rights of the Roman Catholics, was a serious consideration. The supporters of the measure could not deny that by the present Bill, the rights of the Church wardens and Vestry, who at present manage the Temporalities of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, would be affected by this Bill. The rights of the Roman Catholics in that Church were likewise unprotected, and he would at the proper time, move an amendment to the said section, restoring the said rights to the parties now enjoying them. There was a good deal of excitement on this question in the City of Saint John, and great difference of opinion on this subject among the Roman Catholics themselves; and under such circumstances, he for one was not disposed to take away the rights, or supposed rights of the minority, in this summary way; if those who supporting the Bill, could not be brought to see the amendment, which he should feel it his duty to propose, could not affect the Bill, if they did, it was fair and right that they should be allowed to be heard. He would not then know too little of the Polity of the Roman Catholic Church, to enable him to judge how far those rights extended to them, or he was by no means disposed to agree to any Bill, which would deprive them of property, or of the rights which they had purchased and paid for sittings in Roman Catholic places of worship, of what belonged to them. If the minority had no property, no legal right, in the present Bill, the amendment which he should propose, could do no harm.

Mr. W. H. STREET said that he had several objections to urge against the Bill then before the Committee; and although the Roman Catholics had from the City of Saint John, upon the subject of their interests; he was sure there was every disposition on the part of the Committee to afford that large body of their fellow subjects every facility for procuring and enjoying their property in the most perfect manner, and in the most perfect justice. The Presbyterian Church had this privilege extended to them, and in fact almost every denomination of Christians were empowered to hold real estate either by Trustees or Vestry and Church wardens, and he would be the last Member on the floor of that House to wish to deprive their Roman Catholic brethren of the same privilege. There he Community, conveyed their lands in any way at variance with the trust under which they held them, there was a remedy by applying to the Court of Chancery which would restrain any improper conveyance, and it was to be released from the title offered to the Bill; a much more comprehensive Bill, had passed last year without opposition and he trusted that the justice of the cause, and the powerful support it had received from respectable and numerous body who had signed Petitions, from all parts of the Province, would receive at the hands of the Committee that consideration which it was his opinion the prayers were well entitled to. The present method of holding lands in name of Trustees, was a very loose method and these lands were at any moment subject to an execution to the extent, and it was to be released from the title to the property would be unsettled, and that worthy individual was anxious he should be relieved of his trust. He should say nothing further on the subject at present, but he was prepared to meet any objection which might be urged against the Bill.

Mr. PARTLEW rose and said, that it became his duty to rise in support of the Bill, and in the Committee, the arguments contained in a Petition, which he then held in his hand, signed by a number of the most respectable members of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, who were against the Bill, now before the Committee. [Here the Hon. Member read the prayer and allegations contained in the Petition.] He (Mr. Partelow) considered it his duty to support those arguments, and would there remark, that although the Petitions in favour of the Bill, were much more numerous than the one which he had presented to that House, yet the minority were most respectable and influential members of the Roman Catholic Church, and they had rights in the property of this Church, which they were anxious to protect. He would not then go into the particular merits of the question, but would give notice to the Hon. Member, that unless the Bill was amended in such a way as to remove some of the objections urged in the Petition, he had just read, he should oppose it. He would like to hear the opinions of the members of the Committee on the Bill, and would then be prepared with amendments to those Sections which he thought took away without their owners consent to the rights of the Petitioners. If he failed in this he should then move a clause to exclude the City and County of Saint John from the operation of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said, that he had no objection to the Bill, then before the Committee, becoming law, provided it was so modified, as would remove the objections of a large and most respectable portion of his Roman Catholic Constituents in Saint John. The right to hold lands for ecclesiastical purposes, was conceded to other denominations, and he was far from wishing to exclude members of the Roman Catholic Church from the privileges which were enjoyed by others differing from them in Religious belief. He confessed the question was difficult one, and ought to be carefully dealt with. Hon. Members had recently expressed their unwillingness to argue on subjects connected with Religion, and a Bill had been hurriedly passed through a Committee, for the avowed purpose of avoiding such discussions. He solemnly said this urged by Hon. Members, that when he (Mr. H.) requested the Hon. member of that

Bill, not now in his place, (Mr. Fisher), to consent to report progress that he might have an opportunity of looking over the Bill, until next morning. That Hon. Member refused him such indulgence, and the Bill was hurried through the Legislature, at a late hour. The present question he acknowledged was one attended with difficulties, and had there been no Petition against it—no difference of opinion among the Roman Catholics themselves, he should have allowed it to pass without offering any opposition. But there was a difference of opinion, and he (Mr. Hazen) felt that it was his duty fairly to represent both uncompromising parties. The Roman Catholics had no representative in that House belonging to their own Church, who could advocate the claims of either party, nor could they avail themselves on the floor of that House of such information as would guide them in passing any law respecting the Polity of that Church. Under such circumstances it appeared to him that the Committee should pause before they gave their assent to any interfering with the rights of particular churches or Parishes, as well as the rights of private individuals belonging to these Churches. In the Petitions brought in, in support of the Bill, he perceived, that an Act similar to the Canada Act should become law in this Province. The present Bill, he admitted, did not go so far as that Act, and the omission of the second Section respecting the rights of the Roman Catholics, was a serious consideration. The supporters of the measure could not deny that by the present Bill, the rights of the Church wardens and Vestry, who at present manage the Temporalities of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, would be affected by this Bill. The rights of the Roman Catholics in that Church were likewise unprotected, and he would at the proper time, move an amendment to the said section, restoring the said rights to the parties now enjoying them. There was a good deal of excitement on this question in the City of Saint John, and great difference of opinion on this subject among the Roman Catholics themselves; and under such circumstances, he for one was not disposed to take away the rights, or supposed rights of the minority, in this summary way; if those who supporting the Bill, could not be brought to see the amendment, which he should feel it his duty to propose, could not affect the Bill, if they did, it was fair and right that they should be allowed to be heard. He would not then know too little of the Polity of the Roman Catholic Church, to enable him to judge how far those rights extended to them, or he was by no means disposed to agree to any Bill, which would deprive them of property, or of the rights which they had purchased and paid for sittings in Roman Catholic places of worship, of what belonged to them. If the minority had no property, no legal right, in the present Bill, the amendment which he should propose, could do no harm.

Mr. W. H. STREET said that he had several objections to urge against the Bill then before the Committee; and although the Roman Catholics had from the City of Saint John, upon the subject of their interests; he was sure there was every disposition on the part of the Committee to afford that large body of their fellow subjects every facility for procuring and enjoying their property in the most perfect manner, and in the most perfect justice. The Presbyterian Church had this privilege extended to them, and in fact almost every denomination of Christians were empowered to hold real estate either by Trustees or Vestry and Church wardens, and he would be the last Member on the floor of that House to wish to deprive their Roman Catholic brethren of the same privilege. There he Community, conveyed their lands in any way at variance with the trust under which they held them, there was a remedy by applying to the Court of Chancery which would restrain any improper conveyance, and it was to be released from the title offered to the Bill; a much more comprehensive Bill, had passed last year without opposition and he trusted that the justice of the cause, and the powerful support it had received from respectable and numerous body who had signed Petitions, from all parts of the Province, would receive at the hands of the Committee that consideration which it was his opinion the prayers were well entitled to. The present method of holding lands in name of Trustees, was a very loose method and these lands were at any moment subject to an execution to the extent, and it was to be released from the title to the property would be unsettled, and that worthy individual was anxious he should be relieved of his trust. He should say nothing further on the subject at present, but he was prepared to meet any objection which might be urged against the Bill.

Mr. PARTLEW rose and said, that it became his duty to rise in support of the Bill, and in the Committee, the arguments contained in a Petition, which he then held in his hand, signed by a number of the most respectable members of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, who were against the Bill, now before the Committee. [Here the Hon. Member read the prayer and allegations contained in the Petition.] He (Mr. Partelow) considered it his duty to support those arguments, and would there remark, that although the Petitions in favour of the Bill, were much more numerous than the one which he had presented to that House, yet the minority were most respectable and influential members of the Roman Catholic Church, and they had rights in the property of this Church, which they were anxious to protect. He would not then go into the particular merits of the question, but would give notice to the Hon. Member, that unless the Bill was amended in such a way as to remove some of the objections urged in the Petition, he had just read, he should oppose it. He would like to hear the opinions of the members of the Committee on the Bill, and would then be prepared with amendments to those Sections which he thought took away without their owners consent to the rights of the Petitioners. If he failed in this he should then move a clause to exclude the City and County of Saint John from the operation of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said, that he had no objection to the Bill, then before the Committee, becoming law, provided it was so modified, as would remove the objections of a large and most respectable portion of his Roman Catholic Constituents in Saint John. The right to hold lands for ecclesiastical purposes, was conceded to other denominations, and he was far from wishing to exclude members of the Roman Catholic Church from the privileges which were enjoyed by others differing from them in Religious belief. He confessed the question was difficult one, and ought to be carefully dealt with. Hon. Members had recently expressed their unwillingness to argue on subjects connected with Religion, and a Bill had been hurriedly passed through a Committee, for the avowed purpose of avoiding such discussions. He solemnly said this urged by Hon. Members, that when he (Mr. H.) requested the Hon. member of that

Bill, not now in his place, (Mr. Fisher), to consent to report progress that he might have an opportunity of looking over the Bill, until next morning. That Hon. Member refused him such indulgence, and the Bill was hurried through the Legislature, at a late hour. The present question he acknowledged was one attended with difficulties, and had there been no Petition against it—no difference of opinion among the Roman Catholics themselves, he should have allowed it to pass without offering any opposition. But there was a difference of opinion, and he (Mr. Hazen) felt that it was his duty fairly to represent both uncompromising parties. The Roman Catholics had no representative in that House belonging to their own Church, who could advocate the claims of either party, nor could they avail themselves on the floor of that House of such information as would guide them in passing any law respecting the Polity of that Church. Under such circumstances it appeared to him that the Committee should pause before they gave their assent to any interfering with the rights of particular churches or Parishes, as well as the rights of private individuals belonging to these Churches. In the Petitions brought in, in support of the Bill, he perceived, that an Act similar to the Canada Act should become law in this Province. The present Bill, he admitted, did not go so far as that Act, and the omission of the second Section respecting the rights of the Roman Catholics, was a serious consideration. The supporters of the measure could not deny that by the present Bill, the rights of the Church wardens and Vestry, who at present manage the Temporalities of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, would be affected by this Bill. The rights of the Roman Catholics in that Church were likewise unprotected, and he would at the proper time, move an amendment to the said section, restoring the said rights to the parties now enjoying them. There was a good deal of excitement on this question in the City of Saint John, and great difference of opinion on this subject among the Roman Catholics themselves; and under such circumstances, he for one was not disposed to take away the rights, or supposed rights of the minority, in this summary way; if those who supporting the Bill, could not be brought to see the amendment, which he should feel it his duty to propose, could not affect the Bill, if they did, it was fair and right that they should be allowed to be heard. He would not then know too little of the Polity of the Roman Catholic Church, to enable him to judge how far those rights extended to them, or he was by no means disposed to agree to any Bill, which would deprive them of property, or of the rights which they had purchased and paid for sittings in Roman Catholic places of worship, of what belonged to them. If the minority had no property, no legal right, in the present Bill, the amendment which he should propose, could do no harm.

Mr. W. H. STREET said that he had several objections to urge against the Bill then before the Committee; and although the Roman Catholics had from the City of Saint John, upon the subject of their interests; he was sure there was every disposition on the part of the Committee to afford that large body of their fellow subjects every facility for procuring and enjoying their property in the most perfect manner, and in the most perfect justice. The Presbyterian Church had this privilege extended to them, and in fact almost every denomination of Christians were empowered to hold real estate either by Trustees or Vestry and Church wardens, and he would be the last Member on the floor of that House to wish to deprive their Roman Catholic brethren of the same privilege. There he Community, conveyed their lands in any way at variance with the trust under which they held them, there was a remedy by applying to the Court of Chancery which would restrain any improper conveyance, and it was to be released from the title offered to the Bill; a much more comprehensive Bill, had passed last year without opposition and he trusted that the justice of the cause, and the powerful support it had received from respectable and numerous body who had signed Petitions, from all parts of the Province, would receive at the hands of the Committee that consideration which it was his opinion the prayers were well entitled to. The present method of holding lands in name of Trustees, was a very loose method and these lands were at any moment subject to an execution to the extent, and it was to be released from the title to the property would be unsettled, and that worthy individual was anxious he should be relieved of his trust. He should say nothing further on the subject at present, but he was prepared to meet any objection which might be urged against the Bill.

Mr. PARTLEW rose and said, that it became his duty to rise in support of the Bill, and in the Committee, the arguments contained in a Petition, which he then held in his hand, signed by a number of the most respectable members of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, who were against the Bill, now before the Committee. [Here the Hon. Member read the prayer and allegations contained in the Petition.] He (Mr. Partelow) considered it his duty to support those arguments, and would there remark, that although the Petitions in favour of the Bill, were much more numerous than the one which he had presented to that House, yet the minority were most respectable and influential members of the Roman Catholic Church, and they had rights in the property of this Church, which they were anxious to protect. He would not then go into the particular merits of the question, but would give notice to the Hon. Member, that unless the Bill was amended in such a way as to remove some of the objections urged in the Petition, he had just read, he should oppose it. He would like to hear the opinions of the members of the Committee on the Bill, and would then be prepared with amendments to those Sections which he thought took away without their owners consent to the rights of the Petitioners. If he failed in this he should then move a clause to exclude the City and County of Saint John from the operation of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said, that he had no objection to the Bill, then before the Committee, becoming law, provided it was so modified, as would remove the objections of a large and most respectable portion of his Roman Catholic Constituents in Saint John. The right to hold lands for ecclesiastical purposes, was conceded to other denominations, and he was far from wishing to exclude members of the Roman Catholic Church from the privileges which were enjoyed by others differing from them in Religious belief. He confessed the question was difficult one, and ought to be carefully dealt with. Hon. Members had recently expressed their unwillingness to argue on subjects connected with Religion, and a Bill had been hurriedly passed through a Committee, for the avowed purpose of avoiding such discussions. He solemnly said this urged by Hon. Members, that when he (Mr. H.) requested the Hon. member of that

Bill, not now in his place, (Mr. Fisher), to consent to report progress that he might have an opportunity of looking over the Bill, until next morning. That Hon. Member refused him such indulgence, and the Bill was hurried through the Legislature, at a late hour. The present question he acknowledged was one attended with difficulties, and had there been no Petition against it—no difference of opinion among the Roman Catholics themselves, he should have allowed it to pass without offering any opposition. But there was a difference of opinion, and he (Mr. Hazen) felt that it was his duty fairly to represent both uncompromising parties. The Roman Catholics had no representative in that House belonging to their own Church, who could advocate the claims of either party, nor could they avail themselves on the floor of that House of such information as would guide them in passing any law respecting the Polity of that Church. Under such circumstances it appeared to him that the Committee should pause before they gave their assent to any interfering with the rights of particular churches or Parishes, as well as the rights of private individuals belonging to these Churches. In the Petitions brought in, in support of the Bill, he perceived, that an Act similar to the Canada Act should become law in this Province. The present Bill, he admitted, did not go so far as that Act, and the omission of the second Section respecting the rights of the Roman Catholics, was a serious consideration. The supporters of the measure could not deny that by the present Bill, the rights of the Church wardens and Vestry, who at present manage the Temporalities of the Roman Catholic Church in Saint John, would be affected by this Bill. The rights of the Roman Catholics in that Church were likewise unprotected, and he would at the proper time, move an amendment to the said section, restoring the said rights to the parties now enjoying them. There was a good deal of excitement on this question in the City of Saint John, and great difference of opinion on this subject among the Roman Catholics themselves; and under such circumstances, he for one was not disposed to take away the rights, or supposed rights of the minority, in this summary way; if those who supporting