

Company.—Mr. Watterworth.

To incorporate the Belleville Street Railway Company.—Mr. Boulter.

To incorporate the Kingston Street Railway Company.—Mr. Robinson.

To amend the laws respecting the Law Society.—Mr. Hodgins.

To incorporate the Prince Arthur's Landing and Kaminstiquia Railroad Company.—Mr. Dawson.

Respecting the Grand Junction Railway Company.—Mr. Boulter.

THE ORANGE BILL.

Mr. MACDOUGALL resumed the debate on the motion to refer the report of the Private Bills Committee back with instructions to declare the preamble to the Bill for the incorporation of the Orange Association of Western Ontario proven. He claimed that it had not been established that the incorporation of the Association could be accomplished by the general law, so as to leave its policy and principles intact. There had in the past been a feeling in favour of restraining the powers of religious corporations but this feeling had passed away. There was nothing illegal in this Association, and nothing unwarrantable in the privileges it now sought. It seemed to him from examining the correspondence on the subject that the action of Sir John Macdonald with regard to the past Bill had been strictly constitutional. The feeling of the country seemed to be that the Attorney-General had on that occasion shirked his duty for fear of losing political power. Those hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House who had cheered an Opposition member, because he had expressed his opinion that the incorporation of the Orange body would be inimical to the interests of the country seemed to forget that the Attorney-General himself had acknowledged that there would be nothing wrong in allowing the incorporation. He claimed that there had not been sufficient opportunity for discussing the Bill in Committee. Such Acts as the one now sought had been passed by other Provincial Legislatures, and the House should not deny an act of justice because one section of the community had a feeling of hostility towards the Orange body. He would vote for the motion.

Mr. BELL said it was rather remarkable that none of the opposition to the motion so far had come from supporters of that religion which it was feared would suffer by the passage of the Bill, but it had all come from Protestant members. Orangemen were neither more or less bigoted than other members of the Protestant community; they did not claim to be super-loyal. He believed the Roman Catholic members of the House would act justly towards the Orange body, as Orangemen had always acted towards them.

Mr. MONK said the Bill did not ask any privileges for Orangemen which other members of the community did not possess. He held that under the general Act all the branches of the body could not be separately incorporated.

Mr. GRAHAM (Lambton) said he found that the Orange body could very readily be incorporated under the general Act; he could not, therefore, see the necessity for a special Act. He had also heard prominent Orangemen in his district take the position that they did not want the special Bill. He thought the effect of the general Bill would be to do away with the acrimonious discussions which had been so common, and he was also satisfied that the majority of Orangemen did not favour the special Bill, but regarded it as clap-trap got up for political purposes. He would have voted for the special Act had not there been a general law.

Mr. ROSEVEAR said he had been listening very intently to members on both sides, but had received as yet very little information. (Laughter.) He believed every Catholic in his constituency would, if asked, say to him, vote for the Bill; and in fact, so agreeably did they manage matters in his part of the country, that he believed the Catholics would join the Orange lodges if they would let them in. (Loud laughter.) He would be sorry to do anything to injure the Roman Catholic body, but he didn't believe this motion would, and he would vote for it.

Mr. RICHARDSON said he believed in allowing equal privileges to all classes. The question, they might depend, would not be settled if they rejected the motion, for it would be agitated until the Orangemen got their rights.

Mr. CURRIE said he believed it would have been far better for the well being of the

country if Orangism had never been transplanted to Canadian soil. He could not see the necessity for the special Bill. He referred to the past history of these attempts to get the Orange body incorporated, claiming that when Bills which had the same object as the present had been introduced, prominent Orangemen had opposed them. During all the time that the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite had been in power in Ontario they had not sought to secure the privileges for the Orange body which they were now seeking. He read from a speech delivered by Mr. Sandfield Macdonald on the 5th day of May, 1858—just two weeks, he remarked, before his hon. friend the member for South Simcoe had been elected in South Oxford—in which Mr. Macdonald had expressed his surprise that such a Bill as one for the incorporation of the Orange body should have been introduced into the House, and advised its summary rejection. He (Mr. Currie) could see no necessity for a special Act when there was a general Bill.

Mr. HAY said that as there was a general Act, he could not support a special Bill for incorporation. He believed the local lodges did not desire to see the whole control of the property vested in the Grand Lodge. There was room for suspicion that the Bill had not been pressed before, and was pressed now for political considerations. It was a great pity that the religious animosities of the old country should be brought in here, but these institutions could not be driven out of the country. He did not believe that the Orange Institution was at present a menace to the Roman Catholics. He was prepared to vote against the motion.

Mr. PAXTON said he could not see that the Orange institution was a religious or charitable association, and if so it had some schemes behind the door. He remembered when the Orangemen declared that Protestants who did not belong to the Order, and Roman Catholics, were not loyal. He was opposed to giving the Orange Association any privileges which they did not now possess. This motion was made for only a political purpose, and the institution was only a political machine. In his constituency fly sheets were circulated from the Grand Lodge, calling on the Orangemen to vote for no one who would not support these Bills. (Opposition cheers.) He considered the institution a dangerous one, and should vote against it.

Mr. LONG said he had not received the support of a majority of his constituents on the understanding that he would vote for any Bill of a religious or denominational character. He intended to represent his constituents on matters affecting the interests of the Province, but he had always been a consistent Roman Catholic and should vote against the motion. He had received the support of nine-tenths of the Orangemen in his Riding, but had not been asked by any of them to vote for this Bill. On the contrary, several had requested him not to support the Bill, as it would be inconsistent on his part. If the general Act did not allow the Orangemen to get incorporation, he should vote for the Bill, but as there was a general Act he should vote against it.

Mr. CAMERON said the Orange Institution was a religious, political, and benevolent organization. It was religious because it carried the Bible in its processions (laughter), and its principles were to persecute no one on the ground of his religious belief. Now 200,000 of the community came forward and asked for the rights given to other men. These men claimed that the general Act did not give them what they asked. He read the Bill asked for, and argued that there was nothing in it which any Catholic might not readily grant. In 1858, a similar Bill was brought into the Parliament of Canada and rejected on the second reading by 54 to 46. In that case both parties must have united. Protestants who were not Orangemen felt that in this institution the Protestant religion was being trampled on. (Laughter.) If this Bill had not been rejected there would not have been the scene which they had witnessed in Toronto lately (hear, hear), and he predicted that there would be disquiet in this Province if it were not granted. The Attorney-General had voted for the Bill in 1858, and had declared in this House that the measure was eminently proper, but after the measure was passed he had yielded to outside influences, and buried the Bill. It was a wrong which would rankle in the breast of Protestants throughout the land. The Bill would do no harm, but resistance to it would do a great deal of harm. Let the Roman Catholics ask themselves, if the Protestants arrayed themselves against them what would become of