

thrown into the balance at a time when parties were evenly divided. He did not say that that Bill was wrong in principle, but pointed to it as an illustration of the way in which the power he had alluded to would be exercised. In the history of the past usurpation began very quietly, but the encroachments continued till the liberties of the people were invaded. Who could tell what the Roman Catholics might be to-morrow? If they had the same power in Ontario as in Quebec, it would be a calamity not only to the Protestants of Ontario but to the general laity. If they could say to the House whether a certain measure was to pass or not, the dictation would increase as the Roman Catholics increased. When he conceived that the liberties of his countrymen were in danger he felt it to be his duty to raise his voice against the use, or rather abuse, of the religious power. Then civil liberty could only be preserved by drawing a distinct line between the spiritual and civil domain. (Cheers.)

Mr. BAKER denied the statement of the member for Kingston, that it was in consequence of a letter he had received from the County Master of the Orange Association of Russell that he had not voted on the Orange Bill last session. The letter the hon. gentleman referred to was from a friend in Russell who gave the opinion that his not voting would not endanger his position in Russell.

Mr. DEACON did not think there was anything to justify the insinuation that the supporters of the Bill were not sincere in their advocacy of it. The argument of the Attorney-General was to the effect that greater facilities existed for Orange incorporation in the general Bill than in that before the House. To this he would reply, do not kill the Orangemen with too much kindness, but let them choose their own method. It could make no difference to the Roman Catholics in which way the Orangemen were incorporated. In referring to the difficulties in the way of incorporation under the General Act, he stated that the first section was worded in such a way as might leave room for doubt whether it mentioned the Orangemen. He pointed out that it would be extremely inconvenient, if not impossible, for the County Judge to receive a declaration signed in his presence by the officers of the lodges who were generally scattered over the country and met together but once a year. He contended that the enactment of the Special Bill was preferable to that of the General Bill. The speech of the hon. member for Kingston had had a most damaging effect on the prospects of this Bill. A Bill for the Sparks' estate at Ottawa had been passed because of the greater expense required if the Special Bill was not carried. If this Bill was carried incorporating the heads of the Institution, the subordinate lodges could be incorporated at little or no expense. He advised the Government to put an end to the agitation by taking the wind out of the sails of the Opposition.

Mr. MASSIE said he was happy to say that he could give an independent vote. He represented a constituency in which there was not a large number of either Roman Catholics or Orangemen. The master of the Orangemen was, he believed, in his (Mr. Massie's) own employment, but so little did they appear to think of the matter that they had never asked him anything about it and had not requested him to present their petitions. He had no feeling antagonistic to the Orange body or the Roman Catholic body. He thought it a pity that the hon. member for Stormont had dragged in the question of the feeling of Roman Catholics against the Orange body. There was no doubt that the Orange Institution had been a standing menace against the Roman Catholics for many years, and the effect of this Bill would only be to stir up and keep alive the feeling. He adhered to the view taken by the Attorney-General—that there was no reason why the Orange body, if it were a charitable or benevolent institution, should not be incorporated under the general Act. He pointed out that no difficulty would be found in the cases of the St. Andrew's and Caledonian Societies, of which he was a member. He was prepared to sustain the Attorney-General, and was perfectly untrammelled. He was not coerced one way or the other. The member for Stormont had said that he thought this might be the thin end of the wedge for the destruction of civil and religious liberty. He (Mr. Massie) thought the Protestants of Ontario were quite able to defend

their rights independent of the Orangemen, and it would be a sorry day for Canada when they had to depend upon the Orange body for defence. (Loud cheers.) He, as a Protestant and a Presbyterian, was not prepared to leave his liberties in the hands of the Orangemen. It was the boast of this free and independent country that we gave every man the right to worship God as his conscience dictated, and he was not afraid of the Roman Catholics trying to trample on his rights. He believed this Bill was only brought forward for political purposes, and should sustain the views of the Attorney-General. (Cheers.)

Mr. MILLER said the members for West Simcoe and Algoma were Roman Catholics, and coupled their seats pretty much by virtue of Orange votes. The Orangemen had never hesitated to vote for a Catholic Conservative in preference to a Protestant Reformer. He could understand the opposition of the Commissioner of Public Works to the motion without reference to the fact that he was a Catholic, because in Leeds and Grenville the Orangemen were bitter Conservatives to a man, while the Catholics were divided. In his (Mr. Miller's) constituency the Orangemen were mostly Reformers, but there the Orange lodges had been originally established for social purposes, and had been extended with the view on the part of the leading members of the Institution to make the constituency of Muskoka thoroughly Conservative. In his district the Orange Lodges had served a good charitable purpose. In his election he had promised to support this Bill, though he said he would not do so if the fate of the Government depended on it. If the vote was one upon which the continuance in office of the present Government depended, he would cast his vote in support of the Government; otherwise he should vote for the motion. Instead of keeping this matter barging over the House and country it should be put an end to at once and forever by granting special incorporation. The effect of the General Bill in his constituency would be that the officers of each lodge would have to come an average of 100 miles to the County Judge of Simcoe in order to incorporate each lodge. It was certainly a little remarkable that during all the time that the Conservative party were in power there had been no agitation in favour of this measure, but in justice, not only to the Orangemen, but to themselves and their followers, the Government should put an end to the agitation by passing the Bill.

Mr. BARR regretted that the Bill had been buried in the Committee. He disclaimed the imputation that the supporters of the Bill asked for it to embarrass the Government or to make political capital. The Orangemen only asked that they should enjoy the privileges which were extended to other bodies. He believed that the influence of certain members of the Government upon the Attorney-General was inducing him to refuse the Orange bodies an act of justice. Those who opposed the Bill were responsible if the present ill-feeling between Orangemen and Catholics were perpetuated in the country.

Mr. LAUDER said he had never seen any reason why this Bill should not pass. No one member had yet said that he had been convinced by the Attorney-General's speech that the General Act was better for the purposes of incorporation than the Special Act. He (Mr. Lauder) feared very much that the Attorney-General was being influenced against his better judgment by the Commissioner of Public Works. Did the Attorney-General mean to say that if the Commissioner of Public Works were acting as a County Court Judge he would be willing to grant the certificate necessary to incorporation under the Act, after what he had said regarding the Orange body. The effect of refusing the Bill would be to accede to the wishes of a small minority, and to pay no attention to the desires of a large majority. He regretted the position taken by the member for Kingston to-night in charging the member for North Leeds with insincerity, and in retelling private conversation on the floor of the House. He (Mr. Lauder) much mistook the Orangemen of the country, if they did not call the hon. member for Kingston to account for what he had said to-night.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) failed to see that the Attorney-General had made out a sufficient case for refusing the Special Bill. The petitioners for the Bill had come to the conclusion that owing to the peculiar nature of their organization, the General Act did not meet their wishes. This fact