

worst passions, and be productive of serious consequences to the Colony.

Mr DUNCAN—A great deal has been said on this subject; but what the hon. members of the Opposition have advanced goes to strengthen my opinion that we should not reject the prayer of the petition. The hon. member who last spoke, said Roman Catholics have not asked their rights,—they have not returned Roman Catholics members to represent them. Well, Sir, this is a matter of their own choice. If they have selected Mr. Sinclair, or any other Protestant, it is because they felt that he would serve their interests better than one of their own religion. It is all probably on account of policy. We have never had a more peaceable election than the last, and I believe it was a good deal owing to the number of Orangemen in the country. (Laughter.) I am sorry that there is religious contention in the Colony, but I cannot help it, for it has been brought on by the Roman Catholics themselves. What support had the Government party received from them? I believe I myself received one vote. (Laughter.) A very few others, I understand, voted for Government candidates, and I hope they will have their reward.

Hon COL. SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I have not heard from the opponents of this Bill anything which, in my opinion, demands a serious reply. I shall, nevertheless, notice, briefly, remarks made by several hon. members. First, Sir, the speech of the hon. member from Cascumpeo, Mr. Howlan. This hon. gentleman has said and read a great deal, in all of which, however, I have failed to discover any argument. The opinion of no less a personage than a former Chancellor of Ireland has been adduced as “undoubted proof” that the Orange organization is in this Island “illegal.” The statement of the hon. member himself, or that of his colleague, Mr. Conroy, to the same effect, would, in my opinion, be quite as “undoubted proof” as which has been ascribed to Mr. Napier. According to the showing of the hon. member himself, Mr. Napier’s opinion is no proof whatever. This opinion “is grounded upon the Statute Laws of England” asserts the hon. member with an air of triumph. Granted, Sir, but the Statute Laws of England,” upon which it is grounded, are not in force in this Island, consequently all that is “grounded upon them” must be worthless. In fact, Sir, Mr. Napier’s opinion is rather adverse to the hon. member’s view of the matter before the House. The ex-Chancellor says “before these laws (the Statutes upon which he grounds his opinion adverse to Orange Societies) were passed, the Orange organization had some semblance of justice.” Now, according to Mr. Napier, in this Island where those laws have no more effect than though they had never been enacted, the Orange association has, at least, “some semblance of justice.” As to the opinion of Earl Russell, to the effect that it is the interest of every Government that such Societies should not exist, I have only to say that that may be his Lordship’s opinion. The opinion of the majority of the people of this Island is, that it is for their interest that, in this Colony, such societies should exist. The hon. member; from St. Peter’s, Mr. Whelan, has informed the House that Orangemen is an institution, “the career of which is marked by cruelty, bloodshed and crime.” Sir, there is an organization the history of which is traced in blood—an organization which is, indeed, justly chargeable with “cruelty, bloodshed and crime.” I refer not to the Orange organization, but to that monstrous system of iniquity, the Papacy. The career of Orangemen is marked by no such atrocity as the massacre of St. Bartholomew’s day in Paris—no “Grand Master” ever danced and sung, on hearing of the massacre of thousands of innocent men, women and children, as did the ruffian Pontiff Gregory, on hearing of the, to him, joyful intelligence, of one of the most diabolical outrages against humanity ever perpetrated. Orangemen never devised and attempted to carry into execution so fiendish a design as the Gunpowder Plot. The Orange organization, “an infamous institution;” Orangemen “moral vermin;” Orangemen “disloyal;” Orangemen “dangerous;” because they constitute “a secret society.” Sir, the “Popish

confessional” is more worthy of being denounced as an “infamous institution” than is the “Orange organization.” As a secret society it is truly dangerous. The obligation of an Orangeman binds him to make known all conspiracies against his Sovereign of which he may be aware; the very opposite is the case as regards the confessional. Should a Popish Priest learn in confession that an attempt was to be made to assassinate our Gracious Queen, or to destroy our great empire, what think you, Mr. Speaker, is the course which he would pursue? Would he give information to the proper authorities in order that such attempt might be frustrated? He would not; but even if questioned on the matter, he would deny all knowledge of anything of the kind; he would go further: he would swear solemnly that he was in utter ignorance on the subject. In order, Sir, that the Roman Catholic members of this House may be assured that I am fully justified in making this astounding statement, I will quote from the book of sure guidance for Ecclesiastics, the following:

“The violation of the sacramental seal is a sin of sacrilege against the virtue of religion; also a sin of unfaithfulness against a neighbor, because a secret committed to another, is obligatory from fidelity. This treachery is a mortal sin, no matter how small the affair itself may be. No circumstances can justify the disclosure of anything learned at the confessional, *although the life or salvation of a man or the ruin of the state should depend upon it*, nor can the Pope give any dispensation in this: so that this secret of the seal is therefore more binding than the obligation of an oath, vow, natural secret, &c., and this from the positive will of God.”

“What, therefore, must a Confessor reply who is asked concerning the truth which he has learned through sacramental confession alone?

“He must reply that he does not know it, and, if necessary, he must confirm the same with an oath.

“Objection.—In no case is it lawful to lie; but this Confessor would lie, because he knows the truth, therefore, &c.

“Answer.—I deny the minor, because such a Confessor is interrogated as a man, and answers as a man; but now he does not know this truth as a man, although he may know it as a God.—Dens. Theo. Mor. et Dog., Dubini, Coyne Bibliopol., R. Col., Maynooth, 1832, Tom. vi, p. 219.

Which, Sir, is the “disloyal,” the “dangerous,” the “infamous institution”—that which obliges its members to use these best exertions to put down all traitorous conspiracies against the Sovereign and the common wealth, or that which does the very opposite? The theology of Rome here plainly teaches her Ecclesiastics, Bishops and Priests not only to lie, but to commit foul perjury and blasphemy. Sir, I have been denounced by the whole priestly fraternity of this Island, and accused of misrepresenting them and their religion. If I have done so, why do they not prove it? At public meetings, on the hustings, in the newspapers, and on the floor of this House I have declared that I have neither written nor spoken anything against Papists or their religion which I am not prepared to make good from their own standard works. It has been said, Sir, that the ignorant Papist cannot argue, and that the cunning Papist will not argue, and so I have found it. I have given chapter and page for all that I have advanced. Is any member of this House, is any Popish Bishop or Priest prepared to deny the authority of the books from which I have quoted, or the fidelity of my quotations? I presume, Sir, no refutation will be attempted. It is said that this Bill will not receive Her Majesty’s Royal allowance. Sir, if the Bill be disallowed the fault will not be mine. I feel it quite unnecessary that I should, on the present occasion, say anything further on this subject.

Hon. Mr. Kelly moved, in amendment to the Hon. Col. Secretary’s motion, that the petition be referred to a special Committee to report thereon this day three months; and after a few remarks from Hon. Mr. Coles, the House divided on the motion of amendment: