

them! He claimed that the Conservatives had always given Catholics their just rights, but they would give them no more.

Mr. BETHUNE said that politically he had no sympathy with the Orange organization, but the question was what should a member do as a matter of right. Some time ago this Assembly had passed a Bill for the incorporation of the Orange body. He had always been of opinion that the Attorney-General had been constitutionally right in the course he had taken with regard to that Bill, but the result had been that they had been accorded the right to pass the Bill. Why, then, should it not pass? No one doubted but the opposition to the Bill sprang out of a regard for the Roman Catholic Churches. The various Roman Catholic corporations throughout the country had been endowed with their corporate powers by Protestant Parliaments, and if any of these bodies had been refused the very Act which was now asked for a Protestant body, would they not have continued to agitate for so simple an act of justice? Why, then, should not the Orange body have what they wanted in a direct, straightforward way? If the Orangemen had not come seeking for incorporation before the General Bill was passed, and before the House had in reality passed the very Act they were now seeking, he would have said they should have taken advantage of the general Act. If there was anything in the Orange body in the shape of a political organization the way to make them innocuous was to give them justice. There was not on the face of the globe to-day so powerful an organization for political purposes—taking the worst meaning of the word “political”—than the Roman Catholic Church. He looked at the matter from a standpoint of right and justice; it would perhaps be more to his advantage if he voted against the Orangemen, as they had always voted against him—but he believed the vote he intended to give was one for an act of simple justice. He believed it would have been a good thing for this country if the Bill had been granted at the very first.

Mr. CROOKS said he regretted very much the course which the hon. member for Stormont was taking. He (Mr. Crooks) had taken a position all along with regard to this matter which was in accordance with the well-known principles of the Liberal party in England as well as here. It was one of the fundamental principles of that party to ignore denominational distinctions, to repress any tendency towards the union of Church and State, and to regard as of chief importance the secular interests of the people. He was prepared to stand by the principles of the Reform party, to allow the incorporation of voluntary associations. But this Orange body was not an association which could in any sense be regarded as a voluntary one. He was furthermore prepared to say, as a Canadian and a Reformer, and in doing so to accept the full responsibility of the statement, that he could not concede that the principles of the Orange body were those which would act beneficially to the interests of this country. (Cheers.)

Mr. SINCLAIR said he was not a supporter of the principles of the Roman Catholic Church, and he therefore did not give the vote he intended to give as a matter of favour to that denomination or for fear of the Roman Catholic Church. But he opposed the motion simply because he believed that these politico-religious societies, whether Protestant or Catholic, were detrimental to the interests of the country. He disapproved entirely of these societies, and, as a Reformer, knew, as did many members of that party, the opposition which Orangemen had in the past offered to the Liberals of Canada. He did not think that the Orange Society had much influence in resisting the encroachments of the Roman Catholic Church. If they passed such a Bill as the present, they would in all probability soon have to pass another of the same kind for the Roman Catholic body, and he thought the multiplication of such organizations would be calamitous. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. SEXTON said he thought the Orange body should not ask for a special Bill for their incorporation until they had shown—which they had not yet done—that they could not get what they wanted under the general Act.

Mr. MERRICK, in reply, defended the Orange institution against the criticisms of gentlemen who had spoken, especially the member for North Essex. In proof that the Attorney-General had yielded to Catholic influence in reserving the former Orange Bills, he quoted an article in the *Canadian*

*Freeman*.

Mr. FRASER pointed out that that paper was the organ of Sir John Macdonald. (Cheers.)

Mr. MERRICK said he was speaking from a religious standpoint. He denied that the Bill was introduced for political reasons. If the Orangemen were as strong as the Roman Catholics, and would vote against any Government which would not pass these Bills, the result would be a very different one. He hoped in voting no hon. member would be influenced by prejudice.

The House then divided, and the amendment to the amendment was lost. Yeas, 28; Nays, 47.

YEAS.—Messrs Appleby, Barr, Bell, Bethune, Boulter, Broder, Brown, Cameron, Creighton, Fletcher, Graham (Frontenac), Grange Haney, Ken Lauder, Macdougall (Simco), McKee, Meredith Merrick, Monk Moatyn, Preston, Richardson, Robinson, Rosevear, Tooley, Wigle, Wills.—28.

NAYS.—Messrs Ballantyne, Bishop, Chisholm, Clarke (Norfolk), Clarke (Wellington), Coles, Coutts, Crooks, Currie, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham (Lambton), Grant, Hardy, Hargrave, Harkin, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Lane, Long, Lyon, McCroney, McLeod, McMahon, Mowat, O'Donoghue, O'Sullivan, Pardee, Patterson (Essex), Patterson (York), Paxton, Ross, Scott, Sexton, Sinclair, Smetaniger, Spinner, Striker, Watterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wilson, Wood.—47.

Mr. McGowan for, paired with Mr. Gow against the motion.

Mr. MOWAT said it had been the intention of the Treasurer to introduce and explain to-day the Government measure with regard to tavern licenses. As it was now so late, the statement would be made to-morrow. The Government were still without the complete information which was necessary before they brought down their measure in reference to railways, but they daily expected it. He moved the adjournment of the House.

The House adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

#### PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE.

##### METHODIST UNION.

Mr. McLEOD introduced the Bill to amend the Act respecting the Methodist Church of Canada.

Mr. J. D. ARMOUR appeared to promote the Bill, which proposed to add the following proviso to the Act respecting the Methodist Church in Canada:—

“Provided always, that if any congregation in connection or communion with any of the said Churches shall, at a meeting of the said congregation, regularly called according to the constitution of the said congregation, or the practice of the Church with which it is connected, and held within two years after the said union takes place, decide by a majority of the votes of those who, by the constitution of the said congregation or the practice of the said Church with which it is connected, are entitled to vote at such meeting, determine not to enter into the said union, but to dissent therefrom, then and in such case the congregational property of the said congregation shall remain unaffected by this Act or by any of the provisions thereof; but in the event of any congregation so dissenting as aforesaid at any future time resolving to enter into and adhere to the said united Church, then from the time of such resolution being come to, this Act and the provisions thereof shall apply to the property of such congregation.”

He said the Act of last session in reference to the union of the Methodist Churches had been unjust, because it provided that all the property of both bodies should be handed over to the United Church. The congregations in the Manvers Circuit belonging to the New Connexion Church had their property handed over without their consent to a body having a different polity from that of the Methodist New Connexion Church. They did not oppose the passage of the Act, simply because they were not aware of its being passed until last summer, but if they had opposed it there could be no doubt that a clause similar to this, which was a transcript of the clause in the Act uniting the Presbyterian Church, would have been inserted.

Mr. HARDY.—Was it not a condition of the agreement of the Presbyterian Churches?

Mr. ARMOUR could not say as to that.

Mr. LAUDER said the Act did not change the trust deeds at all, but left them as they were before the union of the Methodist Churches.

Mr. ARMOUR said there was a change in the disposition of the property. The Methodist Church of Canada was not so liberal in its polity as the New Connexion Church. If this clause would have been