PUBLIC ARCHIVES OF NOVA SCOTIA

PUBLIC ARCHIVES OF NOVA SCOTIA

The Head Quarters.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, February 26.

ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP,

(Continued from our last.)

Dr. EARLE said, the Hon. Member from Gloucester (Mr. End) seemed particularly anxious to persuade him and other Hon. Members that they did not understand the Bill. He (Mr. Earle) could read the Bill and could understand it. It was a Bill authorising the Roman Catholic Bishop to manage the temporalities of that Church, and the Hon. Member from Gloucester could not persuade him that it was intended for any other purpose. He repeated he was sorry to offer so much opposition to the Bill, but unless it was amended he would feel bound to press the motion of which he had already given the notice.

Mr. END said, that the Hon. Member from King's who had just spoken, did not understand the Bill yet. It did not authorise the Clergy of the Roman Catholic Church to manage the temporalities, nor the Bishop either. There was nothing about the temporalities of the Church in the Bill

Mr. SIMONDS said, that he did not intend to have said anything about the Bill then before the Committee, nad it not been for what had fallen from the Hon. Member from Charlotte (Mr. Boyd.) That honorable Member had accused him of want of candour when the Bill was before the House last year. He had charged him with refusing to answer a question which he said he had put to him, enquiring whether the Bill of last year was a Government Bill; surely the Hon. Member must be mistaken in this, and has mixed up in his mind the question which he supposes had been put, with some other subject; honorable Members surely must recollect that when he brought forward the Bill of last year, it was so late in the Session, that the House had to suspend the rule limiting the time for bringing in Bills, in order to give him an opportunity of bringing it in, this was done on the 31st of March and on the 2nd of April, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill, and on the following day it was read a third time, and sent to the Council for concurrence. No discussion whatever ensued during its progress through the House, and therefore the Hon. Member from Charlotte must be mistaken, respecting his evading questions put to him respecting that Bill. It must have been some other Bill, or something relating to another subject, for he had distinctly avowed that the Bill of last year was a Government measure; and brought in in order that the Roman Catholics in this Colony might have privileges similar to those which had been given them in Canada by an act of the Legislature of that Province. The Bill of last year drafted, by the Crown Officers, could not contain any provisions hostile to the interests of the Crown, and it was to be presumed none at variance with the interests of the Protestant Church or of the Roman Catholics themselves; he was in favor of the present Bill, and as far as his vote went he would give it his support. He would like however to ask for information, whether the present Bill, was in conformity to the rights and usages of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland? This question he merely put for information, and he supposed honorable Members acquainted with such subjects might find from the statutes at large some information on this point.—If it was, then surely there could be no objection to its passing urged by any Member of the Protestant Church; and he thought the large number of Roman Catholics who petitioned in its favour in this Colony, were surely entitled to as many privileges as their brethren in that part of the United Kingdom. He would certainly support the Bill as it then stood, or with some trifling amendments.

Mr. GILBERT rose and said, that he had not made any objection to the Bill of last year from the supposition that it would be agreeable to the Romau Catholics themselves, and he was sorry now to offer any objection to the Bill as he was willing to do in that matter what he thought would be most agreeable to the Roman Catholics themselves. There was a large number of Petitions in favour of the Bill, but there were counter Petitions, the prayers of which deserve consideration. [Here the Hon. Member read a Petition against the Bill.] The Committee would see that these Petitioners complained of the measure now before them being about to deprive the minority of certain rights and privileges which they formerly enjoyed; but the principle objection in his mind rest'd on the fact, that all the Church property would be vested in one man, and if any thing went wrong with him, it might lead to serious difficulty. He would like the Bill much better, if it were amended so as to include two or three laymen in the corporation with the Bishop. He was however, quite anxious that the Bill should pass, and if amended it would set the dispute at rest, and tranquilise the minds of the people belonging to that very numerous body throughout the Province; but if it was not amended, he would vote for its postponement until the next session of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said, that it was proper to remark with reference to what had fallen from the Hon. Member of the late Government, about the Bill of last year being a Government measure;—that the present Government had nothing to do with the present Bill. The subject had never been discussed at the Council Board, nor was he aware of the opinions of members of the present Government with reference to the measure, he thougt it necessary to make this explanation in order to prevent any misunderstanding on the subject.

Mr. WILMOT said, that a great deal of what had been said respecting the present Bill, appeared to him to be entirely uncalled for. The provisions of the Bill were as plain and simple as any Bill which was ever constructed, and he was at a loss to conceive how Hon. Members had been able to frame objections, and give constructions which were not, in his opinion, warranted by the tenor of the Bill. His first impression was when he listened to the speeches of the Hon. Members against the Bill, that he himself had mistaken its provisions, and that it conferred on His Lordship, the Roman Catholic Bishop some extraordinary and startling power which would be dangerous and particularly liable to abuse; but what was the fact? Did the present Bill convey any such powers? Certainly it did not. It merely authorized and constituted the Roman Catholic Bishop and his successors in office to be a Corporation sole, for the purpose of *receiving*, shuch real estate as may be conveyed to him, for the use of the Church.—This was the principle of the Bill. What came next? Did it authorize His Lordship, the Roman Catholic Bishop to appropriate such lands to his own use, or to sell them? It did no such thing; it merely provided that he might lease them for 21 years, or three lives This was the utmost extent of his powers after he had the property assigned to him, but that conveyance must first be had before the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church could be invested with a single shilling's worth of property under the operation of the present Bill, should it become Law. The Petitioners who appeared before the Committee against the Bill had been most egregously mistaken with regard to the provisons of the Bill, then under discussion. All the objections which these Petitioners urged were directed against the Canada Act, not against that Bill. And he (Mr. W.) thought that these Petitioners should have informed themselves of the nature of the present Bill, before they came to that House Petitioning against a measure which contained hardly a single provision to which the objections contained in their Petitions, could be made to apply. The question seemed now to narrow itself to a very small compass. Was there anything contained in that Bill, hostile to the rights and interests of any other denomination of Christians in this Province? He (Mr. W.) contended there was none, and if there was not, then the next question was, did the Roman Catholics themselves want it? The answer to this question was found in the Petitions on the table of that House. Upwards of six thousand, nearly seven thousand persons of that persuasion came before the Committee, by Petition, saying they did—surely that was a sufficient answer. He had already said that the Petitioners against the measure did not seem to know the provisions of the Bill under consideration; for if they did, they must be afraid that their Bishop would appropriate the funds to his own use, and perhaps run away from his diocese with the money. Was ever such a supposition heard of before? Yet strange as this may seem, and absurd as such arguments may appear, this was the only drift of the Petition which he held in his hand. The Bill gave no power to the Roman Catholic Bishop to do any such thing, even if he was so disposed; the only power which it gave him was to lease the land as he had already stated. The Petitioners seemed not to be afraid of the present Bishop, but of his successor. What right had they or any one else to assume that the successor to the present Bishop would be a person of this description, who would mismanage the Church property, even if he had the power?—None whatever. The power given by the present Bill to the Bishop gave no power to his Clergy which they did not now possess, nor could that power be delegated to them by the Bishop, nor to any one else; there was no such authority given by the Bill, unless in the case of sickness or absence of the Bishop, when the powers of the corporation could be exercised temporarily by two clergymen of the Church. It was however unnecessary to refute arguments which had already been refuted, by those who supported the Bill. The whole argument was based on the supposition, that the Roman Catholic Bishop would be dishonest and deal unfairly, with such property as might be conveyed to him. The course of argument adopted by some Hon. Members went to show, that, if they passed this Bill, and if it was found difficient or otherwise objectionable, it could not be altered, but must remain for ever. As well might the Hon. Members argue, that this present House of Assembly was the last House which would ever sit in this Province. If after the present Bill became law, and was found to work prejudicially to the interest of those it was meant to benefit, were they to be told that they could not amend it, the they had no power to alter it, and that it could not be repealed? Surely honorable Members knew that the power which created could destroy. This Bill was, a creature of the Legislature and might at any time be altered, amended or destroyed by the same power which called it into existence. Other honourable Members had assumed that the Roman Catholic clergy instead of consulting the interests, and caring for the welfare of their congregations would do all in their power to deceive and cheat them and destroy their property. Was that a fair line of argument? Are Hon. Members of that House to be told that it is for the interest of the shepherd to destroy his flock, and that the Roman Catholic priesthood thrives best on the ruin of their congregations? Such doctrines he confessed was new to him—new, and certainly very extraordinary and Hon. Members could not for a moment seriously entertain them. It was equally absurd to dwell on them or on those contained in the Petitions against the Bill, which Petitions he was afraid had been dictated rather by personal feeling, among a small portion of the Roman Catholics in Saint John than from any conviction of evils to arise from the present measure. The present Bill did not authorise the interference of the Roman Catholic Bishop with the property of the Church in any way, the rights of Pew Holders had been dwelt upon, but what right enjoyed by Pew Holders was interfered with by the present Bill? none whatever, the Bill merely provided for the regulation by statute of what property might be conveyed to the Bishop voluntarily. It did nothing more ("yes it legalizes persuasive powers" from Mr. Partelow) What persuasive powers did it legalize? Does the Hon. Member from St. John know so little of the polity of the Roman Catholic Church as to suppose that the persuasive powers of the Clergy, or of His Lordship the Bishop could be used with less effect on the congregation who elected the Church Wardens and Vestry, with regard to the management of the property while in their hands, than they could to persuade them to surrender the property to be held by the corporation for their use? surely not. The only argument which has a single shadow of force against the Bill was that used respecting the transfer of the funds from one parish to another, and that argument had been fully met by the proviso about to be introduced by the Hon. Mover, and although he did not think that proviso at all necessary, yet it had the effect of removing the shadow of objection which he had just referred to, and it might perhaps be better to introduce it. In all other respects the objections to the Bill had been fully met, and it should have his support. If it became law, he hoped the few who had opposed it by Petition would withdraw further opposition and join with their clergy, and the very numerous body who had Petitioned in its favour, in rendering its working as efficient and beneficial as possible. The idea of doing anything which could possibly injure the Roman Catholics in this Province never entered Dr. Dollard's mind, and it was unfair to presume that his successor would be less willing to consult the wishes and interests of his Church.

Mr. BROWN said, that it was with great embarrassment which he rose to address the House on that occasion. The subject was one of great difficulty, and upon which he felt more embarrassment and indecision than what ought to be felt by any Member of that House, on any question which could be brought before them. Of all denominations of Christians, the Roman Catholic persuasion was one of which he was the most ignorant. The question came before the House in a very different shape, than that which it did when the subject was last under consideration; and what added to the difficulty in which he found himself, and the Committee placed, was, that there was no Member of that community on the floor of that House, which they could apply to for information. But although this was the case, he was sure there was no Member on the floor of that House which did not wish and anxiously wish, to give the Roman Catholic community every facility for securing and managing their property. He (Mr. B.) had had no direct communication with his constituents on the subject, but his Hon. Colleague had told them that he had, and that among the Roman Catholics in the County of Charlotte, there did exist a difference of opinion upon the propriety of passing the Bill. He was sure there was a most earnest desire to do this numerous body of Christians every justice, and had the Bill came before the Committee as it did last year without any Petition against it, there was hardly a doubt it would have passed unanimously. But the case was now very much altered; Petitions had been sent in against the measure, and in the absence of any positive information, how was the Committee to decide upon the respective merits of the conflicting Petitions. It was impossible for him (Mr. B.) to say who was right and who was wrog; for, as he had before stated, he knew so little of the polity of the Roman Catholic Church, that he felt himself unable to decide between the parties who differed so widely in opinion respecting the measure. The Hon. and learned Member for York (Mr. Wilmot) had made some remarks with regard to the Petitioners against the Bill, and in his (Mr. Brown's) opinion, those remarks were improperly and unnecessarily severe. The Hon. Member ought to recollect, that the Bill now before the Committee was not the Bill published in the Royal Gazette to which the Petitions referred, but another Bill which had never been published, and the Petitioners had raised their objections not against the present Bill, but against that which appeared in the Royal Gazette, which they supposed was about to be brought forward in that House. ("I did not know that," from Mr. Wilmot.) The Hon. Member says that he did not know that such was the case, but he should have known it before he went the length of saying that the Petitioners were bad Catholics, and were flying unnecessorily in the face of their Bishop. The Hon. Member's prejudices in favour of his own denomination, the Methodists, might have led him to be more severe on the Petitioners than he otherwise would have been. In the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches in the Province, the Laity managed the temporalities of their respective Churches, but in the Church to which the Hon. and learned Member belonged, all power was vested in the Clergy; the Laity had nothing to say in the matter, but must do just as they are directed. If they had a popular Preacher who they would wish to retain, they cannot do so; he is here to-day and away to-morrow; the congregation have nothing to say in the matter, and must lose the Minister they liked to attend, and must take just such a one as may be sent to them. In fact, the Methodist Clergy take their own way in every thing, and the people cannot help themselves. ("You are wrong," from Mr. Wilmot.) No, he was not wrong; for although the Hon. Member ought to know better than he did, being a member of that Church, yet he (Mr. B.) knew that in the County to which he belonged, this was the case; he had known very popular Preachers in that County who had been beloved by the People, and who they would have wished to retain, taken away without any ceremony, and another which they did not like put in his place. This the Hon. Member cannot deny. But with regard to the question before the Committee, he confessed his ignorance of the manner in which the Church Wardens and Vestry spoken of in the Petitions against the Bill are chosen. He was far more ignorant on this subject than he ought to be; he did not know whether those officers were elected by the congregation generally, by the Pew holders, or whether they were nominated by the Bishop or Parish Priest; and with the absence of further information, he was yet uncertain whether he would support the Bill, or vote against it.

Mr. WILMOT said, that it was not the first time he had seen his honorable friend a-straddle of a hedge, when he did not know which side he should jump down upon, but his present seat was so uncomfortable that he would soon be glad to jump on one side or the other. The honorable Member is entirely mistaken with regard to the temporalities of the Methodist Church. They are managed by Trustees, and they had no intention of giving additional powers to their clergy. The laity of the Church had a share in the management of its temporalities, and would hang on to what they had got. He was not aware when he alluded to the Petitioners that the Bill before the Committee differed from the Bill which had been published. The remarks which he made were made under the presumption that they were the same, but petitioners should inform themselves of the nature of the Bill to be brought in before they petitioned against it.

His Honor the SPEAKER said, that all the objections urged in the petition against the incorporation of the Roman Catholic Bishop, applied to the Canada Bill, which had been published in the Royal Gazette—not to the Bill before the Committee. There appeared to be some unnecessary alarm in the minds of honorable members respecting the operation of this Bill should it become Law. There was no occasion for alarm on this subject, as the Bill did not interfere with any property until it had first been conveyed to the Roman Catholic Bishop by the present holders; nor was there any danger of the Roman Catholic Bishop ever acquiring under the provisions of that Bill such an amount of real estate as would occasion any solicitude in the mind of any one. The Roman Catholics in this Province, although a numerous body were not rich, and generally speaking, they did not hold much real estate for the use of their Church. They might have some considerable real estate about St. John and in a few other parts of the Province, but generally speaking, they held little land for ecclesiastical purposes. In the northern section of the Province he was not aware they held any land for that purpose, and he thought it would be found on examination, they did not hold real estate to any great extent, in any section of the Province. Objections had been raised to the Bill, that it interfered with the rights of Pew holders; he confessed he did not see the force of such objections, for there was nothing whatever in the Bill which could be construed to interfere with the existing rights of any one; and he thought it would avoid trouble and a great deal of special legislation, if it should pass into a Law. It was conceded on all hands, that the Roman Catholics should have the means of protecting their Church property, and this Bill did nothing more than consolidate the titles of such property, in their Bishop as a Corporation sole. If this Bill was carried, it would save much of the trouble and difficulty of special enactments, reinvesting the Bishop or the Church in those lands held by trustees, who, in future, may die without making a conveyance of the land which they held in trust for the Roman Catholic Church. Even if this Bill does pass both branches of the Legislature this Session, he (Mr. Speaker) had little doubt something of the kind would be necessary, and he did not doubt they would be called upon to reinvest portions of real estate in cases where the legal owners of the property were already dead. Great difficulties had already arisen on the subject of lands, where the Trustees had died without conveying the title, and this Bill was intended to remedy this evil. With respect to the petitions which had been presented against this Bill, it was quite impossible that the petitioners could have been acquainted with its enactments, as it had only been on the files of the house for a few days, consequently they could have known nothing of its nature, and supposed, no doubt, it was the same as the Bill which had been published. There was nothing new in the proposal to invest lands for the use of the Roman Catholic Churches in their Bishop, for if he mistook not, this had been done on the other side of the Province, where lands were held in the name of Bishop McCaffie. There was no danger to be apprehended from the Bill. The people were generally poor, and there would be little land conveyed to the Bishop unless the Church land they now possessed; he trusted, therefore the Bill would pass, as it could not by any possibility deprive any man or body of men, of any property they possessed without their own consent. Should the Bill become Law, it would consolodate and quiet the titles to Church property already possessed by that denomination, when conveyed to the Bishop, and prevent some difficulty and confusion hereafter.

Mr. HILL said that the Legislature should take care on what grounds they passed a Bill with such sweeping powers as the one then under discussion. He was as willing as any member on the floor of that House to do the Roman Catholics justice, but in doing so, they should take care that they did not go wrong, and do more than justice to that denomination. There was one important feature in the Bill, which all who had addressed the Committee, for and against the measure, appeared to have overlooked. This Bill not only legalized the Roman Catholic Bishop as a Corporation, but it also legalized the granting to him, as such Corporation, lands to any amount. There was no limit nor bound in this Bill, fixing the maximum amount which the Bishop is empowered to hold in any Parish, nor in the Province, generally. This was conferring a power which had never before been granted in this Province, and which was, in his opinion, contrary to the English Law. Every Corporation authorized to hold real estate should have some limit as regarded the quantity and value of land which it should acquire in its Corporate capacity, and he was astonished that when this Bill had been discussed by so many lawyers they should have overlooked this serious objection. This power had never been granted by the Legislature of this Province to any other Corporation, and was contrary both to the law and practice of this or any other part of the British dominions with which he was acquainted. There was another objection which struck him as worthy of consideration—there was nothing in the Bill before the Committee which required that the Bishop should reside in this Province. It might be possible, if he did not do so, that the rents and profits arising from the property invested in him as a Corporation might be withdrawn from the Province altogether. He did not apprehend much danger of even the amount of land invested in the Corporation being so great as to have any serious effect in a political point of view, nor did he suppose that the Roman Catholic Bishop would likely be a non-resident, but as prudent Legislators they were called upon to provide for contingencies, however remote, which might interfere with the intesests of their constituents at any period. These were the principle objections which had not been already noticed, and he felt himself called upon to bring them before the Committee. He was only astonished they had not been before noticed, as they were so very apparent that he had thought they would have been urgen long ago by those who had preceeded him. He was willing that the Roman Catholics should have all the powers and privileges possessed by other denominations, but the power to hold lands to an unlimited extent was not possessed by any other denomination, and should not be possessed by them. With these views he should recommend the honorable mover to insert a clause restricting the amount of real estate to be acquired by the Corporation to some specific amount, large enough to cover all the real estate throughout the Province, likely to be vested in the hands of the Roman Catholic Bishop.

Mr. PAYNE said, that he agreed with the Hon. Member from Charlotte (Mr. Brown) that the remarks made by the Hon. and learned Member for York, (Mr. Wilmot) were severe and uncalled for. The Roman Catholics who had Petitioned against the Bill, had a right to bring their objections before that House, and there was no doubt these applied to the present Bill. He thought it was the duty of the Committee to endeavour to pass a Bill as perfect as possible, and some modifications might be introduced, which might have the effect of meeting the views of all parties. With regard to the Pews in the Churches already erected, he thought a clause might be introduced, giving the Pew holders a right to hold their property, or at any rate if the property was to be conveyed to the Bishop, that they should have a right to be present before the transfer was made and have a voice in the matter. If some provisions of this kind was not made, there Pews might be taken from them and sold to the highest bidder. This would be improper and unfair, and he hoped the Bill would be modified in this respect. If that was done he was quite sure it would pass, and if it was not done he would go against it.

Mr. JORDAN said, that the Bill under consideration was of much importance to a large number of his constituents and he felt bound to give his opinion on the subject. The Bill, as he understood it, gave no power to the Roman Catholic Bishop to do any thing, more than to hold lands which were conveyed to him for a particular purpose, and he had read and studied it with very great care and had fully made up his mind, that a matter of this importance should be treated with very great caution. He had consulted with no body on the subject, but was determined to judge for himself. He thought that those who Petitioned against the Bill, had no right to complain, seeing that it affected no other property than such as came into the Bishops hands, after the passing of this Bill; and he could vouch from personal knowledge, that many of the signers to the Petition from St. John in favour of the Bill, were persons of the highest respectability, and although his supporting the Bill might injure him at the next general election, he was bound to give his opinion fairely and honestly. When the Bill was first brought in it might have been objectionable respecting the transferring the funds of our Parish to another; this would not have been right, but that had been so well met by the proviso of the Hon. Member from Gloucester (Mr. End) that it was no longer objectionable in that repect, he would therefore go with the Bill. It was his opionion that it should pass, and that opinion he would not alter, even if it cost him the loss of his election.

Mr. PARTELOW moved that the Chairman report progress.

Mr. HANINGTON opposed the motion, on the ground that the subject had already been pretty thoroughly discussed, and if postponed until a future day the same arguments would be brought up, and it would take another whole day to arrive at the same point the Committee had now reached. He thought the Committee were quite ready for the question.

Mr. PARTELOW hoped that the question would not then be taken; there were two amendments to be proposed to the Bill, and on the amendments there would doubtless be some discussion. The amendments were important and the Bill should not be hurriedly passed through the House. The Petitions against the Bill deserve some consideration at the hands of the Committee; and if the supporters of the Bill are confident of success, there could be no necessity for hurrying it through the House.

Mr. END said, he rose to state on authority which was undoubted, that out of 130 Pew holders in St. Malichs Church in St. John, 103 had petitioned in favor of the Bill; twenty were neutral, and had not petitioned for or against the measure. In St. Peter's Church there were 82 Pew holders, 78 of whom were in favor of the Bill; and he repeated on the same authority, that those who had petitioned against the Bill, signing themselves Church Wardens, were not Church Wardens. While he was up, he would allude to the extraordinary course pursued by the Hon. Member from Charlotte, (Mr. Brown) with reference to what had fallen from his Hon. and learned friend from York, (Mr. Wilmot) who had received a sort of castigation, for having given his opinion of the Petitioners against the Bill. That Hon. Member had not uttered a single word but what those Petitioners richly merited. These Petitions were presented early in the Session, and had doubtless reference to the Bill published in the Royal Gazette; but subsequently the Petitioners had been made acquainted with the alterations made in the Bill. Instead of altering their Petitions what did they do? they sent back on the 23d of February the Petitions now before the Committee, in precisely the same words as those which had been presented in the early part of the Session. These were the facts of the case, and Hon. Members should be careful how they attempted to throw blame on those who were performing their duty. By this Act the Petitioners endorsed the error they committed early in the Session. ("Then there are just where I put them," from Mr. Wilmot) Exactly; instead of correcting their Petitions, which they ought to have done, they returned them as they were first drawn up. He hoped progress would not be reported; they could go through the Bill that evening, and dispose of it; and besides, there were influences at work which he wished to prevent. Hon. Members knew what he meant, and this Bill ought to be carried or lost, without such influences being brought to bear on the subject.

His Honor the SPEAKER rose and said that he was surprised to hear such language held on the floor of that House as had just fallen from the Hon. and learned Member from Gloucester. What could that Hon. Member mean by talking of influences being brought to bear on Hon. Members of that House? They were then to do their duty—not to be swayed by influences. It was to be presumed that every Hon. Member was willing to do his duty conscientiously and independently, and it was very wrong—it was highly improper for any Hon. Member to insinuate that any Member of that House was to be swayed by any influence, from the path of his duty. It was his (Mr. Speaker's) opinion that this Bill ought not to be hurried through that House. For what purpose did the House go into Committee of the whole, on any Bill, if it was not to insure full and free discussion? This was the sole purpose of going into Committee, and he trusted that they would coolly and deliberately discuss the merits of the Bill before taking the question, particularly when some Hon. Members had declared that their minds were not made up, and that they wished further time to consider the matter.

Mr. END said that His Honor the speaker had taken him by surprise by the remarks which he had just made. He could not conceive what construction had been put upon what he had said which could have called forth such remarks. He could assure his Honor, and he could assure the Committee that he did not mean to impute any improper motive to any one, but Hon. Members must be aware that there was some excitement on this subject and that every Member of that House was liable to be questioned out doors, and he had little doubt that some Hon. Members would be laid hold of that very evening for the purpose of attempting to influence the vote on the following day. He did not say, nor did he mean to say, that such application would have weight on the minds of Hon. Members, but was it right that they should be pestered in the streets and every place where they could be found, on a subject which he presumed every Member of that Committee was already prepared to vote upon, and it was to rid himself and other Hon. Members of this annoyance that he had made the remarks which he did, and wished the vote taken that evening.

Mr. J. A. STREET regretted that the Hon. Member from Gloucester had exhibited so much warmth on the subject, and talk of influences and of being pestered in the streets and every where else about this measure. He for one, could assure that Hon. Member, that no human being had ever opened his lips to him on the subject, either for or against the measure. Although he was in favor of the Bill, he had no wish to hurry it through the Committee, and he had no fear of any influences being brought to bear, which could do harm to the Bill. He was perfectly willing to discuss the Bill at any time, and just as soon as the opponents of the measure pleased, for he believed it correct in principle, and did not fear the result of further examination.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said, that he rose for the purpose of thanking his Honor the Speaker for the dignified and well merited rebuke, which his Honor had bestowed on the Hon. Member from Gloucester. The imputation which that Hon. Member had cast generally on Members of that House, richly merited the rebuke which he had justly received; and had such imputation been addressed to him personally, he would have treated it with silent contempt. The whole House was, however, involved in the imputation, and he thought his Honor the Speaker merited their thanks, for the manner in which he had vindicated their rights; he, for one Member, tendered him his warmest thanks. He (Mr. Hazen) did not deny that there was considerable excitement on this subject in St. John, and Members were liable to be importuned on matters which affected a large body of people whatever might be the subject, this was incident to their situation, and they must put up with it; and although he was prepared to vote that evening he would prefer not taking the question until to-morrow as some honorable members now wished a short delay. The honorable member from York (Mr. Wilmot) had been much too severe on those who had petitioned against the Bill, and he must tell his honorable friend that the sixth Section will require amendment in terms of the petition, and he was determined, when the proper time came, to move that amendment; if it was carried, it could not injure the Bill—if it was not carried, he had so far done his duty to his constituents. It was quite evident, that most of the other objections had been raised, in consequence of a supposition, that it was the Canada Act which was to be embodied in the Bill then before the Committee; he hoped progress would be reported.

Mr. END said, that if he was surprised at the remarks which had fallen from his Honor the Speaker, he was still more surprised at what had just fallen from the honorable and learned Member from the City (Mr. Hazen.) That Hon. Member talks about treating his remarks with contempt—he mignt treat them with all the contempt he pleased but it would be better to be sure that they deserved such contempt. He likewise talks of the dignified reproof which had been bestowed on him by his Honor the Speaker. He (Mr. End) was realty at a loss to know what all this could mean;—he had already explained that he imputed no personal or improper motive to any one, yet he must be told of dignified rebuke—for doing what? For simply expressing his opinion that it would be better to go on with the Bill that evening, and thereby avoid being pestered out doors on the subject. This to say the least of it was rather a strange way of attacking him when doing nothing more than his duty, and he would repeat that he could not understand why the Hon. Member from the City had taken up the subject so warmly when he (Hon. Mr. Hazen) himself acknowledged that there was strong feeling out doors on the subject, at any rate, in the city of Saint John. He would much prefer going through the Bill that evening, but as honorable Members seemed desirous that progress should be reported, he was quite willing it should be done.

Mr. JORDAN said, that he had never been importuned or pestered about this Bill by any person, his mind was made up, and neither the Clergy nor the Laity had attempted to influence his opinion. As it was getting late he would say no more on the subject at present.

The motion to report progress was then put, and carried without opposition.

VA SCOTIA

IC ARCHIVES OF NOVA SCOTI