the Order Paper, it is competent for a member to move at

any time:

"That it be read a second time on _____ next."

"On this motion being agreed to, the Bill takes its place on the orders. The same practice obtains with respect to the Bill at any previous or succeeding stage." My opinion is that a motion must be made to reinstate a Bill on the Order Paper, before it can reappear there.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think that the comparative smallness of the vote of last night shows one of two things, either that a number of members like myself, supposing that the discussion on the Bill would continue to a comparatively late hour, did not hurry themselves to be present, and were therefore absent, or that a number were conveniently absent. I beg to say that I was in the former category; and without giving any intimation of what I might or might not have done, I may say it was my intention to vote on the question and to preface my vote with some remarks explanatory of my reasons for doing what I proposed to do. Having been, unfortunately, absent when the vote was taken, through a reason which I do not care now to state, I was taken by surprise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. SCRIVER. And I would be glad of an opportunity to vote upon the question. Therefore I should be very much pleased, indeed, to see the motion of my hon, friend from North Simcoe prevail and the Order restored to the Order Paper.

Mr. IVES. It may be, Mr. Speaker, as you have said, that the Bill may be restored to the Order Paper; but what purpose would be served by restoring it? I fancy that the hon, gentleman who last addressed the House showed the object which hon, gentlemen would gain if the motion were restored to the Order Paper, namely, to rise in their places and in a very few words explain to their constituents why they did not vote. I fancy it would answer all purposes if we gave a few moments to these hon, gentlemen to explain to their constituents why they were not here, or why they were here and voted but did not speak. But it certainly would not serve any good purpose to take up the time of the House during one or two or, perhaps, three sittings to repeat speeches which we have already heard on two or three occasions; and certainly, at this late stage of the session, the interests of the large majority of the House, who are against the second reading of the Bill, ought to be considered rather than the interests of the score and a-half who are in favour of it, and who are not satis fied because they have not had an opportunity of explaining to their constituents what they think of this matter when their constituents already know what their views are.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall the hon, gentleman have leave to withdraw the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost. Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER. If there is a single dissenting voice the motion cannot be withdrawn.

Mr. OUIMET. If the motion is withdrawn the question will not be settled, but the motion will be presented again, and we will have another discussion. So, for my part, I object to the motion being withdrawn.

Motion negatived on a division.

Mr. SPEAKER.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAGGART moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 84) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The principal clause in the Bill makes provision for the prevention of frauds by conductors and those buying tickets upon which a rebate is allowed. The relate is to be confined to the person purchasing the ticket. Another clause refers to interlocking switches. Under the old law all trains were compelled to come to a dead stop on approaching a The modern appliances used on railways crossing. render that entirely unnecessary, and the provision is to allow a train to go on at a moderate speed where there is an interlocking switch. There are besides a few minor clauses.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

UNLAWFUL ASSOCIATIONS AND OATHS.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 85) further to amend the 10th chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, respecting seditions and unlawful associations and oaths. He said: This is a very unpretentious little Bill. It only seeks to change the word "of" to "in" in the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, chapter 10, which is an Act respecting seditious and unlawful associations and Section 9 of that Act provides:

"And whereas certain societies have been long accustomed to be holden in this province, under the denomination of Lodges of Free Masons, the meetings whereof have been, in a great measure, directed to charitable purposes, nothing in this Act shall extend to the meetings of any society or lodge, holden under the said denomination and in conformity to the rules prevailing among the said Societies of Free Masons: provided such society or lodge has been constituted, by or under the authority of warrants in that behalf, granted by or derived from any Grand Master or Grand Lodge in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland."

It was subsequently found that there was a Grand Lodge of Masons in Canada, under which a great number of lodges were constituted, and, therefore, in 1865 the Parliament of the then Province of Canada enacted as follows :-

"The words or Grand Master or Grand Lodge of Canada, are hereby added to, and shall follow the words Great Britain and Ireland, in the ninth section of the tenth chapter of the Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, intituled: An Act respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths."

Shortly after 1865, political changes took place whereby the name of Canada was applied to the Dominion, and it embraced all the provinces extending from ocean to ocean, and the name, therefore, of the Grand Lodge for Canada became a mis-Grand Lodges of Freemasons are constituted in all the provinces; and in the Province of Quebec doubts have arisen as to whether the Grand Lodge of that province is excepted from the Act respecting seditious and unlawful associations, because it speaks of the Grand Lodge of Canada, whereas there is now practically no Grand Lodge of Canada. It has been desired by a large number of the societies which have long existed in that province and have done a good deal of charitable work, that the words "of Canada" shall be changed so as to read "any Grand Master or Grand Lodge in Canada," and that the Act shall not apply to any lodges constituted under warrant issued by any Grand Lodge or Grand Master in Canada.