

action from conviction, not from political interest. It would have been to his political advantage to vote the other way. It might not be in the future to the advantage of his party that he should remain a member of this House, but so long as he was in the Legislature he would act as his conscience prompted him to.

Mr. McCALL referred to the clause which had formerly been on the Statutes, precluding Orangemen from being policemen or constables, and congratulated the House and country on the advanced liberality that now prevailed in the country. He believed that many Acts incorporating Catholic Societies had been passed in this House which were as offensive to Protestants as those now before the House could be to Catholics. The greatest liberality and consideration had been shown to Catholics. He felt bound to support the amendment of the hon. member for Leeds, and believed that in so doing he was doing no less than even-handed justice to Catholics. With respect to a statement made by the member for North York, that many prominent Orangemen did not wish the passage of these Bills, he quoted from a circular issued by the Grand Orange Lodge, calling upon all friends of the Order to use every means to secure the passage of these two Bills.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN said he had regarded with wonder the action of the Orange members of the House who remained silent, and appeared to be afraid of advocating and defending their Order and the Bills brought forward by it, instead of leaving that defence to hon. gentlemen who, like himself, were neither Orangemen nor Catholics but who yet felt bound to defend these Bills. That silence went a great way towards making him believe that the object of the promoters of these Bills was not a good one. He maintained that these gentlemen deserved no credit for their action in allowing the passage of the Christian Brothers Bill. There was no analogy between the two cases. He believed that as the Orange body had now a legal existence consonant with the laws of the country, therefore the House could not deny it a corporate existence. The Bill, however, as framed in the first place contained much too extensive provisions, as though its promoters wished to have it rejected. He reminded the House of a resolution passed by the Grand Orange Lodge assembled at Dublin declaring that the objects of the order had been attained, and that there was no further necessity for the continuance of the Order. This expression of opinion, however, had been overturned by the great masses of the Order. He contradicted the statement of the member for Grenville that the oath taken by Orangemen interfered with the religious freedom of any man. The Orange body in this Province held that the Church of Rome was aggressive in its character, and the oath was defensive and not aggressive in its character. It only maintained the rights of British citizens. Could our Roman Catholic friends blame Orangemen for doing what they considered to be their duty in resisting the aggressive character of the Church of Rome, and in doing what they believed was required of them as Protestants in maintaining the British Constitution? Rightly or wrongly Orangemen believed the Catholic Church was aggressive, and therefore they acted as they thought on the defensive. A good deal had been said about the oath, but there was nothing particularly secret about it.

Mr. FRASER reminded the speaker that if a member divulged any of the secrets of the Order he would be expelled.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN said that that rule applied to all other secret societies. He also thought it an unfair argument made use of by the member for Grenville, that if Orangemen were bound not to intermarry with Catholics, they ought, to be consistent, to make it unlawful for them to do so.

Mr. FRASER explained that he had remarked that if a man was bound by an oath to do or not to do a certain thing, the logical conclusion was that such men who administered the oath, if they had the power, would seek to establish what they wanted as the law of the land.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN went on to say that the object of the institution was to guard against the influence of Catholics, and the oath as to the marriage of members with Catholic women originated in that way. This obligation, as well as that as to the education of children of members, was entirely a voluntary one. He did not think it became Catholics to assail the Orange body as a political organization, for it was well known that the Catholic Church was one of the greatest political institutions in the world. In all countries as well as ours that Church was a more compact and powerful political engine than any

other in the whole world. He did not believe that this was right. He did not believe that the Orange body was now a political organization or its members would not be so divided. Formerly the Orangemen were nearly all Conservatives, but now many of them were beginning to look favourably upon the Reform party. Referring to the refusal of the old Parliament of Canada to incorporate the Orange organization, he said that it was the composition of the House at that time which had prevented the passage of the measure. The Friendly Societies Act in England, which allowed of the incorporation of any secret societies, was a precedent for the passage of these two Bills. If the Catholic body as a body were to oppose his re-election he could not be re-elected; but he did not care what the result was; he believed his position to be a correct one, and therefore he took it.

Mr. MACDONALD said the discussion had taken a wide range, induced no doubt by the remarks which had been made by the member for Grenville. Though an Orangeman himself and a Grand Master, he was member for South Leeds, and thus represented all classes of the people. He would not advocate any measure which would bear unfairly upon any man, no matter what his religious faith was. All that the Orange Association asked for was liberty of action for themselves, and that they were willing to grant to all other men. He denied emphatically that the Bill of Incorporation was introduced for the purpose of promoting discord in the House. The Bill was asked for by both eastern and western Associations of the Orange body, and at their request he pressed the Bill now before the House. All that it asked was that Orangemen should have similar privileges to those already granted to other bodies, such as the right to hold real estate and to have power to sue and to be sued. In 1858 a similar Bill had been introduced, and it was supported by 37 members from Upper Canada and opposed by only 15; and among those who voted for it were a number of Reformers like the present Attorney-General, who was consistent now in supporting the measure. It had been said by the member for Essex that the Orangemen prevented the Prince of Wales from landing at Kingston in 1860, but he failed to state that an address from the association here was subsequently presented to Her Majesty by the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, and Her Majesty was graciously pleased to receive it. That was the best answer to the conduct of the Duke of Newcastle. With respect to the principles of the association, they were such that no man who could not subscribe to them was no true Protestant, whatever particular body he might belong to. Orangemen were not aggressive in their principles, but simply defensive, and all they asked for was simple justice. He was sorry that so much had been said about the Bill under discussion; but, if any hard feelings should be engendered by what had been said this evening, it should be remembered that they were not induced by anything that had been said by gentlemen on his side of the House, but by the remarks of the member for South Grenville.

Mr. CHRISTIE said he had great sympathy with those hon. gentlemen who said that they occupied a difficult position with regard to this question, but perhaps not for the same reason. One cause of his perplexity was that he felt that he had lost his leader—that the principles on which he had been elected had been ignored by the Premier he had come here to support. He did not understand why associations of this character should come to this House and ask for incorporation. The question was only one of sentiment. He felt that if the House granted this Act of Incorporation, it would commit the greatest error it had committed since it had been in existence.

Mr. RYKERT said that though an old Orangeman himself, he was not in favour particularly of such legislation as that now under discussion; but all the Bill asked for was that Orangemen should deal with their own property as they pleased. He went on to allude to the remarks made by the member for Grenville, and charged that gentleman with trafficking with the feelings of his co-religionists, in trying to draw the Catholics together for the purpose of redeeming the Tory constituency of Brockville. But the question was, whether the eastern Association of Orangemen were entitled to be incorporated or not, and he thought they were. The member for Grenville showed a spirit of intolerance in his remarks, and had claimed that men who had done all for the Catholics that they could were intolerant. He (the speaker) said that the bulk of the Catholics felt that something was due to