

tended in that direction. Lord Russell had passed a Bill called the Religious Titles Act, which prevented religious dignitaries of either sect holding titles; but this Act was never called into force, although many dignitaries of the Church of Rome held such titles. He also contended that no Orangeman could be expelled from a lodge for exercising his electoral franchise as he thought best, and any man thus expelled from a lodge for this reason was expelled illegally, and could be reinstated on appeal to the proper authorities in the Order. In reference to the united political action of Orangemen, the hon. member for Grenville ought to remember that the Catholics of the Province had taken similar action through their league. If the hon. member applied his rule to one sect he should also apply it to the other. But he (Mr. Macdonald) said the House had nothing to do with that. He merely asked the House to vote upon this measure upon its merits. He did not think the amendment of the hon. gentleman amounted to much. True he might have dealt more fairly by the Order, by inserting further particulars of the constitution and oath, but the principles of the Order were such that they were not unfit to be published and inspected by all. The House had already pronounced in favour of the Bill, and he did not think it would be influenced by the frenzied appeals and would-be arguments of the hon. gentleman. Outside parties had been sending him pamphlets respecting the organizations in connection with the Church of Rome, which showed that oaths were taken in them which bound men's consciences for the future as well as the past. He did not intend to discuss these matters now, as he did not desire to bring up any heated discussion. He hurled back upon the Commissioner of Crown Lands the charge that he was trying to sow the seeds of discord.

The gentleman had claimed that the Orange body had been disbanded in Ireland, but could he say it was not now in existence there, and presided over by the Earl of Enniskillen, stronger than it had ever been? In 1858 there had been only fifteen votes from Upper Canada cast against the Act of Incorporation then introduced. Since then the objects and working of the Order had become better known, and therefore more highly appreciated by the public, and would now receive a stronger support. An Act had just been passed in New Brunswick with objects similar to that which was now asked to be passed. He appealed to the living present for support of his Bill instead of going back to former ages as had been done by the member for Grenville. The members of the Orange body were not of one political party, but included Reformers and Liberals as well as Conservatives, and should be recognized by all parties. The opposition to these Bills was merely stirring up an ill feeling which was not intended by the promoters of the Bill, and which would not have resulted if they had been allowed to pass unopposed. There had been no reason for breaking up the Order here. No Act of Parliament had been passed here, nor had any Legislative action been had which

The members were then called in and divided upon Mr. Fraser's amendment as follows:—Yeas 21, nays 32.

YEAS—Messrs. Crooks, Scott (Ottawa), Pardee, Gow, Williams (Hamilton), Oliver, Cook, Striker, Paxton, Christie, Dawson, Gibbons, Gibson, Baxter, Fraser, Clarke (Norfolk), Finlayson, Caldwell, Craig (Glengarry), Snetsinger, Calvin—21.

NAYS—Messrs. Macdonald, Cameron, Ferguson, Williams (Durham), Graham, Grange, McManus, Haney, Deacon, Lauder, Rykert, Hamilton, Corby, Fitzsimmons, Boulter, Merrick, Meredith, Code, Read, Craig (Russell), Guest, Tooley, Scott (Ottawa), Gifford, Deroche, Fairbairn, McCall, Monk, Barber, Webb, Mowat, Wood (Victoria)—32.

Messrs. Hodgins, Clarke (Wellington), McKellar, Patterson, Sinclair, Springler, Clemens, and Smith, against the Bill, paired respectively with Messrs. Farewell, Coyne, Schune, McRae, McLeod, Wood (Brant), Monteith, and Watterworth, for it.

Mr. FRASER then offered another amendment which he trusted would meet the views of honourable gentlemen. He did not propose to make any attempt to kill the Bill now at its present stage, but he wished to have the preamble declare what the organization had for its objects, as a precedent for other bodies seeking incorporation. He would refer, however, to a remark made by the member for South Leeds in reference to the Catholic League. Now, there was no similarity between that League and the Orange society, for the former was not a secret one and the latter was. The Catholics in this Province, though forming about a fourth of the population, were only represented by three members in the House—three representatives against seventy-nine; and he could show

good reasons why the League should be formed, if he so desired. No persons were ostracised by it, but persons were by the Orange Society. He regretted the action taken by the Premier in regard to the measure, and had hoped that the views of that honourable gentleman would have reflected those of the Imperial Parliament. After a few further remarks he moved an amendment to the effect that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of altering the preamble and stating that it was a political and religious association, excluding persons of different religions, and worked by means of secret oaths and lodges.

Mr. MACDONALD denied that the association was a political one.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN held that the amendment was out of order, as no notice of it had been previously given.

Mr. FRASER contended that the Bill was open to objection at any stage.

Hon. Mr. PARDEE said that the preamble could not be amended without the Bill going back to the Private Bills Committee.

The SPEAKER ruled the amendment out of order.

Mr. FRASER then altered the wording of the previous amendment, and proposed another one, which read in substance as follows:—That there be added to the original motion the following words:—"The association intended to be incorporated by the said Bill being a political and religious association, excluding persons of different religions, using secret signs and symbols, and acting by means of associate lodges or branches."

Mr. MACDONALD raised a point of order which was not sustained by the Speaker, and the amendment was then put and lost on division—Yeas 21, nays 32.

YEAS—Messrs. Scott (Ottawa), Gow, Pardee, Fraser, Baxter, Williams (Hamilton), Oliver, Striker, Paxton, Christie, Dawson, Gibson, Gibbons, Clarke (Norfolk), Wells, Snetsinger, Finlayson, Craig (Glengarry), Caldwell, Calvin—21.

NAYS—Messrs. Macdonald, Cameron, Ferguson, Williams (Durham), Deacon, Granam, Haney, Grange, McManus, Lauder, Hamilton, Rykert, Corby, Fitzsimmons, Boulter, Merrick, Meredith, Code, Guest, Scott (Grey), Gifford, Tooley, Craig (Russell), Monk, Deroche, Fairbairn, Wood (Victoria), Webb, Barber, Mowat, Crooks, McCall—32.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed on the following division:—

YEAS—Messrs. Cameron, Macdonald, Ferguson, Craig (Russell), Tooley, Merrick, Meredith, Boulter, Code, Guest, Scott (Grey), Fitzsimmons, Corby, Rykert, Lauder, Deacon, Williams (Durham), Hamilton, Gifford, Graham, Haney, Grange, McManus, Monk, McCall, Deroche, Fairbairn, Wood (Victoria), Webb, Barber, Mowat—31.

NAYS—Messrs. Crooks, Pardee, Gow, Scott (Ottawa), Williams (Hamilton), Oliver, Fraser, Striker, Paxton, Cook, Christie, Clarke (Norfolk), Baxter, Dawson, Gibbons, Gibson, Wells, Finlayson, Calvin, Snetsinger, Craig (Glengarry), Caldwell—22.

WESTERN ORANGE ASSOCIATION.

The Bill to incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of Western Ontario was then read a third time on the same division.

FENELON FALLS RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House then went into Committee on the Bill to amend the Act respecting the Fenelon Falls Railway Company, which was reported with some amendments.

Mr. WOOD (Victoria) moved that the Bill be read a third time.

Mr. FAIRBAIRN moved in amendment, that the Bill be re-committed to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to add certain clauses exempting the county of Peterboro' from liability. In moving the amendment Mr. Fairbairn explained that the charter of this Railway Company and amendments contain "grouping clauses" similar to the provisions of the Municipal Institutions Act. Under these clauses application was made to the County Council of Peterboro' to submit a by-law to be voted upon in the grouped section, and the County Council refused. Application was then made for a mandamus to compel the submission of the by-law, and the matter is now pending and not yet decided. That county is willing to abide by the decision of the Court, but this Bill, if it passed, will override the decision if it is favourable to the county. In order to let the House understand the whole question he explained the character of the different parts of the county—the proposed railways, viz., Grand Junction, Peterboro' & Haliburton, and Ontario & Quebec; of the by-laws submitted in aid of each, and the present position of those by-laws: the position of the Fenelon Falls Railway, its relation to the town of Lindsay and the County of Peterboro'. He contended that the present case afforded a practical illustration of the unjust and unfair effect of the group-