

the first place, and that her supremacy is even now maintained, not alone by natural, but also by artificial aids, which being artificial and of man's creation may be both copied and counteracted by rivals in commercial ambition. At the beginning of the last century the British duties on foreign iron were from £2 to £2 10s. per ton; and in the present century they were as follows at the dates named:—In 1803, £4 4s. 4½d.; 1804, £4 17s. 1d.; 1805, £5 6s. 0d.; 1806, £5 7s. 5¼d.; 1809, £5 9s. 10d.; 1813, £6 9s. 10d.; 1819, £6 10s. 0d. if imported in British vessels, or £7 18s. 6d. if in foreign vessels; small sizes of hammered iron, £20 per ton; hoop iron, £23 15s. per ton. The high duties of 1819 continued in force until 1825, about which time the home manufacture having been firmly established, and foreign rivalry crushed out, Huskisson and his friends, the precursors of Cobden, began to talk Free Trade, and to invite the world to join in. England's iron manufacture was most indubitably established through Protection; aye, through Protection carried to the length of prohibition. It will not do to say that the high duties above quoted had their origin in the wars against Napoleon, for observe they were continued for ten years after the peace, and then only gradually reduced during the ten or fifteen years following 1825. If we, being a young nation, try Protection as a means of establishing the iron industry, in Canada, have we not a good patriotic English precedent to cite in our favour?

But not alone in virtue of Custom-House Protection, either past or present, do nations that have the start manage to keep it, requiring on the part of younger nations defensive measures in order to redress the balance. Again, let us come to concrete instances; the fact is not to be concealed, that what Canadian manufactures have most to dread is the competition of our nearest neighbour—our only actual neighbour, we may say—on one hand, and of our best friend in the world, across the Atlantic, on the other. Both have the advantage of us, not so much in actual cheapness of manufacture, at least in those lines in which we have made a respectable advance as in commercial facilities and *trade connections*. Again and again in our experience has it been proved that merely to be able to produce a certain article as cheaply as in England or the States is not by itself sufficient to assure success. With their larger capital and more extensive trade connections, our older rivals step in, and use artificial, and, as I may well add, predatory means to crush out the new competition. Now, as I have repeatedly admitted in these papers, we cannot alter the course of Nature, nor do we seek to acclimatize in Canada the sugar-cane or the cotton-plant. But it is within our power, by wise legislation and administration together, to build up for ourselves conditions of commercial equality with our rivals, or something approaching thereto. Natural advantages we cannot create, but those of an artificial or merely commercial character can be developed by bringing the powerful engine of government to the aid of energetic and ambitious individual hands. It is a balance of artificial advantages chiefly which Protection in Canada is intended to redress. And unless this *artificially-created balance against us* be retained, we have no fair start in the race. Under these circumstances, the Free Traders' plea of "let alone" (*laissez faire*) is really absurd, and cannot in justice to ourselves be admitted. I ask: Have England and the United States "let alone" in time past? or do they "let alone" even now? I refer here, be it remembered, not at all to Protection, but to quite *other* extra and adventitious means, by which the nation's commercial interests are sustained as against those of her rivals. But I have already exceeded the usual limit of space, and must take another opportunity of showing what these *other means* really are, and what we must do to give ourselves even the barest of fair play, and no more.

Argus.

LEGALITY OF ORANGE SOCIETIES.

The Montreal *Daily Witness* of the 9th instant gives some extracts from the "Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel" tending to show, that in the opinion of Lord Plunkett, Lord Chief Baron Joy, and the Law Officers of the Crown, Orange processions are not illegal at Common Law; and that the law in regard to them has not since been disputed until questioned by the four "Montreal Queen's Counsel," and by the Counsel for the defendant in the case of Grant *versus* Beaudry. In culling the extracts the *Witness* has been disingenuous by withholding Lord Plunkett's written opinion upon the subject.

Admitting, for the sake of argument, the validity of Orange processions, their utility and expediency may be questioned, and so may the prudential necessity of "Orangeism" be doubted and disputed, as the oath administered to an Orangeman only binds him to support, by lawful means, the Protestant ascendancy and the government of Her Majesty, Victoria, and never to join with "United Irishmen." Orange Societies are not required in this country where Protestants and Roman Catholics have for so many years worked harmoniously together in the support of certain individuals, in whom they have jointly confided, as responsible advisers of the Crown; individuals who, in combination as Protestants and Catholics, have always introduced measures, in their belief, suited to the interests of all the various classes of their fellow subjects, though their policy may change its aspect, varying its colours according to the vicissitude of human affairs.

There may be, probably, a greater exuberance of loyalty in Orangemen than in men of other associations, but there is not, in heart, a greater devotion to the Crown or an intenser love of our common country to be found among the Brotherhood than that evinced by the generality of the people of Canada. There is, as far as my observation and experience have taught me, no hostile,

no irritable feeling, no animosities—the relics of former antagonisms—between Protestants and Catholics in this country in their social and political relations. Each have their share in the Municipal, Provincial, and Federal governments, and in the administration of justice. The laws are freely, equally and equitably dispensed to all of every class, sect, and condition.

If the private rights of individuals are universally respected and an opportunity is given to every one interested to protect his peculiar rights, if all civil disabilities are removed, and there is no pre-eminence of any religion in Canada, what possible use is there for such an institution as "Orangeism"? Protestant ascendancy ought not to be either insisted on or struggled for here, where all possess equal rights; and there can be no reason why any particular persons, bound by secret oaths, should be presumed to possess more than any others a greater loyalty to the Throne, or a mental superiority, or a larger sagacity and integrity, or a peculiar adaptability for the civil conduct and religious government of a people who are blessed with the free and liberal institutions we have the privilege to enjoy; neither is there any reason why any particular class should be allowed to usurp a dictation and warrant in matters of doctrine, divinity, and worship which are repugnant to others, and should endeavour to force its opinions upon men of opposite thought, treating them as though they had a weakness of understanding, forgetting, themselves, that it is a weakness to which minds of every class have been for ages liable, and a weakness from which the dictators are not exempt.

Without being an admirer of the official conduct of ex-Mayor Beaudry, or an apologist for his obstinate refusal to listen to the wholesome advice given him in the matter of the intended Orange Procession on the 12th of July, 1878, and without being a partizan, like the *Witness*, I wish to give some of the opinions and sentiments regarding Orange Processions and Orange Societies uttered by Sir Robert Peel in the House of Commons, prior and subsequent to the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill in 1829, in order that they may be synchronically circulated, through the medium of the *SPECTATOR*, with the *Weekly Witness*, "containing a full account of the Orange Trial."

Again, without wishing to offend, or to utter one word of disrespect for those who differ from me in religion, I cannot but think that some extreme Catholics are too prone to construe every act of political exultation into an insult directed to themselves, and that they let the sight of an orange lily on the 12th of July produce upon them the same effect which the mention of a Catholic concession produced upon George the Third, who was kind hearted and benevolent upon other subjects; whereas, if these extremists took no notice of the flower, the Orange Societies in Canada would, in all probability, starve and die of themselves for want of Faction.

I shall now present in their order of time the utterances of Sir Robert Peel in Parliament, and their nature. First, the inadvisability of Orange Societies; secondly, that Orangemen ought to be excluded from public offices; thirdly, that Orange Societies ought to be suppressed; fourthly, that secret societies ought to be altogether suppressed.

March 5, 1823. Orange Societies. Mr. Abercromby's motion.

"Were I a gentleman of Ireland, I would use all the influence of my station to induce the Orangemen to desist from any of those practices which are considered so objectionable by their Catholic countrymen. I might appeal to them on grounds of policy; but I would choose higher grounds. On motives of policy I would say to them, You are a small party, and it cannot be wise to irritate a body of men so greatly superior in point of numbers. But I would appeal to their better feelings. I would say to them, These processions, toasts, and other manifestations of your opinion cannot be supposed by any moderate man to be contrary to law; but they are of no use; they give offence to many who have not deserved injury; they wound the feelings of many respectable persons; you ought therefore to dispense with them, however harmless they may be in the view of the law."

February 22, 1825. Unlawful Societies (Ireland) Bill. Committee.

"But it is said, 'Suppose a person should be proved to belong to an Orange Lodge?' Why, upon that point I find no difficulty in saying that it would be the duty of Government to remove from office anybody who shall be found to be in such a situation." (Opposition Cheers.)

Lord Althorp said of this declaration: "It affords me great pleasure to hear from the right hon. gentleman that no Orangeman will be permitted to hold office. This single declaration from the right hon. Secretary will do more to put down all illegal societies in Ireland, than this bill or any other measure that Government can propose."

March 29, 1827—Debate on a petition:—

I feel the utmost satisfaction at the intimation that there is to be a complete end to Orange Societies in Ireland. I most cordially join in the exhortation that these associations will yield to the repeated sense of Parliament, and obey what will in all probability become the law of the land. The petitioners have referred to the testimony I bore to their loyalty in 1814. I am willing to bear the same testimony now. But no loyalty on the part of the members of the Lodges can compensate for the evil of their existence."

March 29, 1827—Mr. Brownlow's motion for papers relative to Orange processions at Lisburne:—

"I must be allowed to say, that I wish all these associations were at an end. I believe they are dying away; but at the same time I agree with the Right Hon. Baronet (Sir J. Newport) that if the processions were done away with, it would be better for the peace, the tranquility, and the happiness of Ireland, I declare to God, that I would, by my influence, by my example, by every means in my power, endeavour to put down these associations and processions."

February 23, 1836—Mr. Hume's motion for the suppression of Orange lodges:—

"I am sure it would be for the tranquility of Ireland that an end should be put to all secret societies in that country. The existence of any of them is an evil, inasmuch as it holds