

Lands and the hon. member for South Grenville would oppose the Bill for the incorporation of the Western Association; if so, it was perhaps as well that the discussion should take place now and the matter be settled, so that they would have no further trouble with the first Bill. Respecting the Orange oath not to marry a Catholic woman, he said that it was well known that the Catholic Church strongly disapproved of, and advised against, the marriage of the adherents of their religion to Protestants.

In answer to a statement of Mr. Wood, Mr. FRASER said it was not true that the marriage sacrament was withheld from a Catholic marrying a Protestant.

Mr. CAMERON continued that the oath taken by Orangemen not to marry a Catholic was the same oath that was taken by the Queen. He then referred to the establishment of the separate schools for the sake of allowing Catholic children to receive their own religious training, and to the vote of Mr. Macdonald on the Christian Brothers Bill, to show that the Orangemen felt no such bitterness or animosity as the hon. member for Grenville. He maintained that the clause in the Orange oath to which the hon. gentleman had particularly objected was nothing more than an assertion on the part of Protestants that their religion was the best, just as on the other hand Catholics maintained that theirs was the best. He hoped that the discussion would do no harm, but that in future Catholic and Protestant would work hand-in-hand for the prosperity of the country.

Mr. CRAIG (Glengarry) said he did not know much about the Orange Association, but he had understood that it was designed to protect the Protestant religion. It might be that there were some Protestants whom the Orange body could protect, but the Church to which he belonged had existed without aid from them and had passed through a great deal of persecution. He really considered that, protected as we were by British law, each Church could enjoy its rights without any fear of interruption, and that was all that was wanted. He could see no reason why the Bill for incorporating Orangeism should pass, because he believed that it would stir up feelings of animosity that did not now exist. There was no necessity to insult the Catholics when, as had been admitted, there was nothing of real advantage in the Bill to Orangemen that they did not already possess. He deprecated anything like the raising up of sectarian prejudices, and for that reason, and wishing justice to be meted out to all men, he would vote against the Bill. (Applause.)

Mr. BOULTBEE said that the Government should have before this time in the debate expressed its opinion. He said there was no precedent for the granting of such an Act of Incorporation, and it became the Government to direct the House. The House had a right to the guidance of the Government in this matter. He had himself formed an opinion, but would submit it to that of the Government, if it expressed any. The objects of this Bill were quite different from those of the Christian Brothers, who had expressed in their preamble what they wanted. The member for Stormont asked for the Bill to be passed on the ground that thereby Orangeism would be weakened. That was one of the most hollow arguments he had ever heard. There would be a war of denominations again if the Catholics thought that they were not being treated fairly because they were in a minority, and it would be a long time before Protestants and Catholics would again go hand-in-hand to the polls. In his constituency he believed that with one exception he received every Orange vote; and if there were any persons in the world to whom he would wish to see the utmost justice done it would be the members of this Society; but at the same time he could not do what he believed to be wrong even if he should lose their support by it. He did not believe that the Orangemen as a rule were in favour of the Bill, but it was pressed forward by a few members of the body. It had been said in the lobby of the House that the Bill had been introduced for the purpose of casting a fire-brand into the House. He believed that no good would come of the Bill under discussion, and he was decidedly opposed to the principle of it. He would vote for the amendment for the sake of getting the Bill back to the Private Bill Committee, but he wished to be considered to be at liberty to oppose the Bill in that committee if he saw fit.

Attorney-General MOWAT said he hoped that when the Government was united the hon. member for North York would be as anxious to support it as he now appeared to be on a question on which it was unfortunately divided. There must always be open

questions, although it was desirable that they should be as few as possible. In the old Parliaments and Governments of Canada there had always been associated together those who had voted for and those who had opposed Orange Bills. He had long ago been called upon to decide what was his duty in reference to this matter, and he had not seen occasion since then to change his view on the subject. He thought his Roman Catholic friends were rather too sensitive about a Bill of this kind. Those who promoted it contemplated no insult to Roman Catholics; neither in nor out of the House had this been intended. On the other hand, he thought that his Orange friends were far too eager to press such a Bill. He never could sympathise with the strong reasons urged by the one party or the other, and shared in the feelings of neither those who opposed nor those who supported the Bill. He would have been glad if the House had not been called upon to decide upon this question, but now the Bills were before them and hon. members had to form the best judgment they could. For his part he must say that he thought the opposition to this Bill attached too much importance to its effect. Orange bodies were, he said, legal bodies now; the Bill did not legalise them. Orangemen would not be one whit stronger if the Bill passed or one whit weaker if it was thrown out. All that was asked was an additional convenience in doing that which they could legally do now, and he did not see how that could be refused by any legislative body. With reference to the secrecy of the Orange body, to which the hon. member for Grenville had such strong objection, he himself could not see that was any objection which should make the House reject the Bill. He could see no harm in signs and passwords by which the members of the same body might know one another. Respecting the charge that it was a party organization, he quoted several cases in which this was disproved by the fact that the body was divided, some of its members taking one, some the other side in politics. Then, Orangemen attached a great amount of importance to loyalty but our religion also taught us to be loyal to our rulers. There were quite as strong Protestants out of the Orange Association as in it; and apart from the feeling which was always mixed up in such matters as that before the House, there were no grounds for refusing the incorporation asked for. If opposition to it was really pressed he should feel it his duty to vote for the amendment of the honourable member for South Leeds.

Hon. Mr. CROOKS believed that the passage of the Bill would infringe upon liberal principles, and that it would be establishing a dangerous precedent if the House consented to incorporate the Orange body. It was the duty of the Legislature and the Government to see that in not the slightest degree did they interfere with full individual freedom of action. The aim of the Association, instead of being devoted to universal charity, seemed to be wholly concerned in placing a limit upon the freedom of the individual, and with that he could not agree. The same objection would apply to other bodies hostile to the Orange Association, and these might seek similar powers. The House should know no man's creed; all that was asked was that he should be loyal to the Government of the land. He was prepared himself to vote against the amendment of the honourable member for South Leeds.

Mr. ARDAGH said he had no personal feeling in the matter. He had been supported in his election by both Protestants and Catholics, and wished to see equal justice dealt out to both. He could not agree that any legal recognition by legislation should be given to any body which had not benevolence or some other useful object in view, and he would therefore vote against the amendment of the member for South Leeds.

Mr. SINCLAIR was opposed to the Bill because it gave special favours to one particular body, and that he did not approve of, though he was a Protestant himself. The speaker was proceeding with his remarks in opposition to the amendment of the member for South Leeds, but the hour of six o'clock having arrived the House rose.

After recess,

Mr. SINCLAIR resumed, and said that his chief reason for opposing the passage of this Bill was that he objected to the incorporation of any secret political organization. If he voted to pass the Bill he would not feel justified in opposing the passage of a Bill to incorporate a similar Catholic body. He had been agreeably refreshed by hearing the statement of the hon. member for Grenville, loudly proclaiming his opinion that any man ought to be allowed to change his religious views if his conscience prompted him to do so. He (Mr. Sinclair) took his present