

a heretic. A similar report was made to the Duke of Saxony, who had just been married. He said, "I have no money, but I can give you my wedding-coat, which I shall not use again, if that will answer your purpose." My friend afterwards saw it adorning a saint in the Chapel of Loretto, and noticed that they had taken off the jewels, and replaced them with sham ones.—*Sights in Italy.*

COMMUNICATIONS.

[FOR THE CARLETON SENTINEL.]

MR. EDITOR,—I shall reply to your Fredericton correspondent in your next week's paper, if you will allow me space for that purpose.

I am, Dear Sir,
Yours, &c.,

CHAS. PERLEY.

Woodstock, 18th March, 1850.

[We will cheerfully comply with the request of Mr. Perley, and insert his reply at any time he favours us with it.]

[FOR THE CARLETON SENTINEL.]

MR. EDITOR,—In looking over the *St. John Courier* of the 2nd inst. I observe that the Address to Wm. Stevens, Esq., (late Agent of the York and Carleton Mining Company) and answer, was published therein, and immediately under the same, the observations or censure of the Directors of said Company, reflecting upon the signers of that Address, and calling upon them publicly to acknowledge that they came to a wrong conclusion of the Stockholders opinion of Mr. S's scientific knowledge. I also observe an extract from the Book of Minutes of two meetings held in the city of Saint John on the 6th and 13th of November last, and sworn to on the 1st inst. The Directors say, "they cannot concur with the statements contained in said Address, for the following reasons: that Mr. S. had no experience in erecting and managing blast furnaces, that they had Mechanics in the Province, and furnace men from the United States who took that charge, and that Mr. Stevens neither professed, nor took upon himself the charge of machinery, or furnaces connected therewith, and after pointing out some particular duties, concluded by saying that he had the general management of the concern." Now Sir, what does the general management of the concern mean? Does it not mean the superintendence of every department connected therewith, and that they had every confidence in his scientific knowledge and ability? If not why have given him the general management of the concern? I cannot say, Mr. Editor, what may be the conclusion of those who signed the Address, respecting the Stockholders opinion of Mr. Stevens scientific knowledge, but this much I do now, that the concern was carried on safely by Mr. Stevens before he left for England, and that during his absence the whole Foundry was destroyed by fire, clearly proving that he had sufficient scientific knowledge to avert such a catastrophe while under his management; and if I read aright the Directors have acknowledged that the signers of that Address did not arrive at a wrong conclusion when they say, that he had the general management of the concern. Again they say, "that Mr. S. is not so ignorant as he pretends to be respecting the cause of his separation from the Company, as there were a number of charges preferred against him, which the company have no wish to make public." Then why do they immediately after publish the extract of the two meetings in November, and certified by their Secretary under oath? Now, Sir, do those extracts contain charges, or do they not? or what were they intended to convey to the minds of those who signed the Address? I will tell you my opinion and it is just this: that Mr. S. had been guilty of using the Company's means for his own private purpose in possessing himself of a secret which he refused to give to the Company. Now let us see what the Company had to complain of. On referring to the extract from the minutes of the meeting of the 6th November, after some conversation Mr. S. stated to the company that he had received a secret from Mr. Mushet, which would be of great value to the Company for producing a superior Iron, and gave to the meeting a specimen of Iron smelted from the Company's ore. The Chairman asked Mr. S. what the secret was, Mr. S. replied that the secret was given to himself, and he was not at liberty to give it to the Company; the Chairman persisted, and Mr. S. again refused. Now will it not be obvious to those who read the extract from the minutes of the 6th the reason why Mr. S. did not give the secret at that time, does it not imply the fact, that Mr. S. stating he was not at liberty to give the secret until authorized by Mr. Mushet, and which fact is clearly made out from what took place at the meeting of the 13th November, which reads thus:—"Mr. Mushet's letter to the President was laid before the Directors, containing his charge for assays and experiments; and the secret now is, why did not the Directors publish both those letters in full, and not allow the signers of the Address and the public to draw their own conclusions from them? No, Sir, they would not do that; it would not suit their purpose, they publish just so much as suit themselves; but could they have supposed a discerning public would not see through the veil thus attempted to be thrown over their eyes? You said, Mr. Editor, that after Mr. Mushet's letter was produced, that Mr. S. gave up the letter containing the secret; and why did he do so? because there can be no doubt that Mr. Mushet in the second letter authorised him. Now Sir, a few more words and I have done. The Address and answer were published in the Sentinel on the 12th ult., and were copied the following week in many of the papers in this Province, and even in Halifax. And yet it was not published in the Courier until the 2nd inst., the day after. (I am informed) that Mr. S. sailed for England; and you will also observe that the meeting of the Directors was held on the first, the day after Mr. S. sailed. Now Sir, what was the cause of the delay? why not have called their meeting and replied before Mr. S. left, and have given him an opportunity

of replying before he left the country? The fact of their not having done so, plainly shows that they were afraid to confront him face to face, and leave the signers of the address to come to the conclusion, that, if they had done so, Mr. S. was prepared, and would have thrown back their invectives in such a way as would leave the public a poor opinion (if not of the Company) at all events of the Directors. Mr. S. Mr. Editor, will no doubt return to this country if his life is spared, and he will then, if not before, bring the whole proceeding before the public.

I am, Mr. Editor,

(ONE OF THE SIGNERS OF THE ADDRESS.)

Woodstock, 18th March, 1850.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

[From Mr. Grigor's Reports.]

FRIDAY, March 8.

After the usual preliminary business had been disposed of, Mr. J. Earle, Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Ansley presented Petitions in favour of Incorporating the Orange Societies of New Brunswick.

At 12 o'clock, Mr. J. Earle moved that the House proceed to the order of the day, which was to go into committee of the whole, on a Bill to incorporate the Grand and Subordinate Lodges of Loyal Orangemen in New Brunswick, in connection with the Grand Orange Lodge of Canada.

The order of the day having been read by the Clerk, The Hon. Attorney General said, that before His honour the Speaker left the Chair, he felt called upon to make a few remarks. There appeared to be a good deal of excitement about the question now about to be submitted to the House, and he felt it his duty to say, on behalf of himself and his colleagues, that they were determined that this debate should be conducted in a manner becoming a deliberative Assembly. If, during the debate, any manifestation of feeling—anything like approbation or disapprobation—should be manifested by the audience, it would then become the duty of the House to conduct the debate in another way. These remarks could not be misunderstood. Whatever may be done elsewhere, in the House of Assembly of the Province, they would maintain order and preserve the dignity of the Legislature. He hoped, therefore, that no manifestation of feeling would be exhibited in the gallery, as such an occurrence must inevitably lead to the consequences which he had already hinted at.

Mr. J. Earle concurred in what had fallen from the hon. Attorney General. Nothing could be further from his intention than to excite popular feeling on an occasion like the present. He hoped that the debate would be conducted with calmness and moderation, and that every hon. member would vote according as his own conscience dictated. He would earnestly deprecate anything like a manifestation of approbation or disapprobation from any quarter during the debate.

His Honor the Speaker then left the chair, and Mr. Botsford took the chair of the committee.

Mr. J. Earle said, that the bill now in the hands of the chairman was supported by a number of petitions, and these Petitions were signed not only by Orangemen but by many most respectable inhabitants of the Province, unconnected with the order. On that ground alone, the Bill would be entitled to the consideration of the Legislature, but there were other grounds upon which the Loyal Orangemen vested their claims for an Act of incorporation. The Orange Association owned considerable property, which they were now obliged to invest in the hands of trustees, and they wished to be placed in a position to hold that property as a corporate body. He (Mr. Earle) did not think there was anything unreasonable in this request.—The Legislature had already incorporated the Sons of Temperance, and only the other day the House of Assembly passed a Bill to incorporate a Masonic Lodge in St. John. He (Mr. Earle) had the honour to bring in the bill to incorporate the Sons of Temperance. He belonged to that order and he also belonged to the order of Free Masons.—He could, therefore, assure the committee that, as far as secrecy was concerned, both of these societies were as much secret societies, and more so, than the society of Orangemen. The Sons of Temperance had been incorporated with the full knowledge on the part of the Legislature that the head of that Association resided in a foreign country, and that he himself was a foreigner. Notwithstanding this, the Legislature had not hesitated to grant them an act of incorporation, and he could not see upon what principle they could refuse to give Orangemen similar privileges. The Orange body in this Province owned no allegiance and rendered no obedience to a foreigner.—They were thoroughly British, and determined, at all hazards, to maintain British connection. The Legislature had also incorporated the Roman Catholic bishop of New Brunswick, in order to enable him to hold lands belonging to his church. Surely Protestants were entitled to similar privileges. Orangemen only wished to have for themselves what had been granted to others, without dispute, and the only reason which could be assigned for refusing the loyal Orangemen of this Province the privilege of managing their own affairs was, that they were a secret society. He (Mr. Earle) could assure the House that there was nothing secret connected with their organization, further than the sign which enabled an Orangeman to discover his fellow Protestant in any country, or under any circumstances.—The oath, the rules of the society, and everything connected with the society, with the exception of the sign, could be examined by any person not an Orangeman, who would take the trouble of investigating the matter. The hon. Attorney General had said, on a former occasion, that he would put questions to him, (Mr. Earle) with respect to the organization of Orangeism. He (Mr. Earle) would have much pleasure in answering these questions, when put, but in the meantime, he would, with the permission of the House, read the rules of the society. (Here the hon. member read from a printed copy the rules and regulations

of the Orange society, together with the oath.) It would be evident from these rules, that the Orange society was to cultivate peace and good will among themselves, without interfering with their neighbours. The very first requisite to enable any man to become a member of the Orange Society was, that he should have a thorough reverence for his Almighty maker. Orangemen took their stand on the altar and on the throne, and wished to preserve both. They would have one from pollution and the other from being overthrown. He was sorry to say, that although these were the objects which the Orangemen had in view, yet in many cases Orangemen did not act up to their obligations; nineteen out of twenty could not be found that in all respects came up to what an Orangemen should be. He (Mr. Earle) as head of the society in this Province, had endeavoured to inculcate on its members the necessity of spiritual regeneration, and he was quite sure that the officers of the society, generally, entertained similar views. He had read to the House the obligation of an Orangemen. He had taken that obligation himself, and he was ready to take it a thousand times over, were that necessary to convince the country that he was sincere in his opinion. The Orange society stood as a brazen wall against anything like Annexation, and if the House refused to give Orangemen an Act of incorporation they could only do so on the grounds that Orangeism was exclusively a Protestant Association. The Bill before the House might not pass into a law, but he felt that he had only done his duty in bringing it in, and he should divide the House upon it.

Mr. Brown said, that this was a question of very great importance, and one which should be discussed calmly and dispassionately. What knowledge he (Mr. Brown) had of Orangeism was derived from public documents, not from Jesuitical writers, as had been erroneously alleged. The records of Parliament, in many places, refer to Orange Institutions and proceedings, but no thorough investigation of the subject took place until the year 1835. During that year two committees of the House of Commons were appointed to inquire into the origin, nature, extent, and tendencies, of the Orange Associations in Great Britain, the Colonies and in Ireland. These committees consisted of nearly an equal number of Conservatives and Liberals, including several Grand Officers of the Orange Institution, one Committee sat five months, the other forty-one days—they sent for persons and papers, and examined witnesses on oath. Most of the witnesses examined were noblemen and gentlemen of high standing, eight of them were Grand Officers of the Orange society; also Lord Caledon, Lord Gosford, Mr. Crawford, M. P., Sir Francis Stovin, Mr. Keran and Mr. Innis, Lawyers, Mr. Christie a Quaker proprietor and several others. The most of them were members of the Church of England, and they belonged to places where Orangeism had been most active—their testimony and the Reports made four large folio volumes, more than 10,000 pages, nineteen-twentieths of this evidence was produced by Officers of the Orange Institution, and collected from existing documents, and extended over a period of the forty preceding years. It was affirmed by Lord Gosford and by Mr. Christie, that the first Orange Lodge was formed on the 21st of September 1795, in the House of a man of the name of Sloan in the village of Loughgall and county of Armagh. That a party "calling themselves Break-of-day men commenced driving out the Catholic inhabitants and planting Protestant Colonies in their stead, that twelve or fourteen Catholic houses were sometimes wrecked in a night, and numbers of the inhabitants were seen wandering about the country hungry, half-naked, and infuriated. That this party dropped the name of Break-of-day men and took the title of Orangemen, and continued their wrecking nearly three years, carrying it over the greater part of the Northern Counties. Lord Gosford drew a sad picture of those proceedings at the time, which stands recorded in the minutes of evidence page 3251. He says neither age nor acknowledged innocence, as to the late disturbances, is sufficient to excite mercy, much less to afford protection. The only crime which the wretched objects of this merciless persecution are charged with, is a crime of easy proof—it is simply a profession of the Roman Catholic faith, a lawless banditti have constituted themselves judges of this species of delinquency, and the sentence they pronounce is equally concise and terrible—nothing less than a confiscation of all property, and immediate banishment. (His Lordship continues) where have we heard, or in what history of human cruelties have we read, of more than half of the inhabitants of a populous country deprived at one blow of the means, as well as the fruits of their industry, and driven in the midst of an inclement winter to seek a shelter for themselves and their families where chance might guide them. These horrors are now acting, and acting with impunity.

Orangemen boasted of the antiquity of their institutions, but by reference to these authorities it would be seen that they had no claim whatever to go further back than towards the close of the last century. He would read an extract from Gordon's History of Ireland, published in London in 1806. Mr. Gordon was a Clergyman of the Episcopal Church, and Rector in Ferns, county of Wexford. This testimony was also corroborated by all the evidence given to the committee of the House of Commons in 1835; and there could be no doubt of its correctness. The passage was as follows:—

"The lower classes of the Protestants in the North of Ireland, coalesced with the Peep-o'-day Boys, and began in December 1795 to form associations under the name of Orangemen, a name assumed from William 3d, Prince of Orange, who had rescued the Protestants of Ireland by his arms, and given them a political superiority. Notwithstanding the inferiority of their numbers, they were soon decidedly victorious, but they shamefully abused their victory, by the forcible expulsion of some hundreds of Catholic families, (fourteen hundred, according to the most probable account) most of whom took refuge in Connaught. This extremity, system, was totally repugnant to the principles of the great King William, whose magnanimity inclined him to the most liberal toleration."