

EDITORIAL NOTES.

— "No man in England," says Mr. Patrick Egan, "knows how to make an answer or how to speak upon occasion, and how upon occasion to be silent, as Parnell does. He is the ablest tactician in England. He has as exquisite a knowledge of the rules as Gladstone himself, and has a complete mastery of procedure."

— A Protestant paper, speaking of the present condition of Germany says: "The sending of boys and young men to Germany for education is a hazardous experiment. The air is full of doubt, materialism, Sabbath desecration, dueling and beer. The German papers report the settlement at Berlin of a feud between the students of the universities of Konigsberg and Heidelberg. Duels were fought without second by three delegates from each university. Delegates from all the German universities watched the proceedings. Konigsberg was declared victor, having drawn blood fourteen times. Into such an atmosphere the student goes. If his moral and religious principles are established, he may escape contamination, but we end as we began, by declaring the experiment as hazardous."

— Within a few weeks a Catholic church edifice for colored people will be begun in New York city. The late Father Farrell, pastor of St. Joseph's Catholic church, on Sixth avenue and West Washington place, who died July 20, 1880, left \$50,000 in 8 per cent. Alabama bonds for the purpose of aiding in the erection or purchase of a Catholic church for colored people. In his will he stated that he believed that Catholics had shamefully neglected to perform their duty toward colored people of African descent. Many of the colored principals and assistants in the colored public schools are Catholics, and it is anticipated that the new church, which will be largely aided by private subscriptions, will soon become prominent among the Catholic church edifices in the city. The Catholic churches for the colored people in Washington and Baltimore are among the most magnificent temples in the country.

— The correspondent of the London Tablet announces the following recent conversions to the one true faith:—"The Catholic journals of Verona announce the recent conversion to the faith of the Countess Morozzo della Bocca, nee Miss Harriet Louisa Venables. Four of her near relatives were lately received into the Church in the same city of Verona, by his Eminence Cardinal Canonica. Yesterday morning, Father Armellini, Secretary-General of the Society of Jesus, received into the Church a young American named Carey, from Ohio. The ceremony took place in the rooms of St. Aloysius, in the late Roman College. He will receive his First Communion from the hands of the Holy Father. Two distinguished persons, whose names are for the present withheld, are, it is said, under religious instruction preparatory to reception into the one fold of Christ. On Holy Thursday, Father Armellini, S. J., received into the Church and conferred baptism upon Mr. McNutt, of Indiana, U. S. A., a graduate of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. Today, Holy Saturday, his Eminence the Cardinal-Vicar administered the sacraments of baptism and confirmation to a Jewish family, consisting of the father, who took the name of High Benedict, of the mother, Maria Annunziata, and of three children, respectively baptized as Joseph, Louisa and John. The function took place in the baptistry attached to the Basilica of St. John Lateran, the sponsors for the children being Mgr. Perugini, Pro-rector of the House of Catechumens, and Donna Louisa Ruffo, daughter of the Prince of Bagnara. At a later hour his Eminence conferred Holy Orders upon 135 candidates, forty-four of whom were admitted to the priesthood."

THE ORANGE QUESTION.

It will, no doubt, especially in view of late events, be interesting to the readers of this journal to know something of the early efforts of the Orange body to obtain incorporation, and of the action of Parliament in relation to that body. From the journals of the Legislative Assembly of Canada, Vol. XVI., Part I., 1858, we take the following:

Wednesday, 6th May, 1858, Mr. Benjamin moved, seconded by Mr. Playfair, and the question being proposed, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of Canada:

And a debate arising thereupon. Ordered, That the debate be adjourned. On motion of the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Macdonald, seconded by the Honorable Mr. Attorney General Cartier, The House adjourned.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the question which was this day proposed, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of Canada.

And the question being put, the House divided, and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follows:—

YEAS. Messieurs, Aikens, Allan, Alley, Baby, Bell, Bellingham, Benjamin, Brown, Buchanan, John Cameron, Malcolm Cameron, Corning, Bayley, Atty. Gen. Cartier, Clark, Connor, Cook, Daly, Dorland, Ferguson, Gould, Hartman, Hogan, Lacoste, Loranger, Macbeth, Atty. Gen. Macdon-

ald, McKellar, McMicken, Mowat, Munro, Notman, Patrick, Playfair, William F. Powell, Robinson, Sol. Gen. Rose, Rymal, Sherwood, Short, Sicotte, Simard, Simpson, Sidney Smith, Somerville, Talbot, Tett, Wallbridge, Webb, White, Wright—51.

MESSIEURS, Bignar, Bourassa, Bureau, Burton, Burwell, Campbell, Caron, Cauchon, Chapais, Christie, Daoust, Dawson, Desaulniers, Dionne, Duron, Drummond, Dubord, Dufresne, Dunkin, Foley, Fortier, Galt, Gaudet, Gauvreau, Hebert, Jobin, Laporte, Lemieux, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, McCann, McGee, Meagher, Morin, Panet, Papineau, Pope, Walker Powell, Roblin, Ross, Richard W. Scott, William Scott, Sincennes, Tasse, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte—51.

And the votes being equally divided: Mr. Speaker gave his casting vote in the affirmative.

Mr. Benjamin accordingly brought in a Bill to incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of Canada, and the same was received and read for the first time.

Mr. Benjamin moved, seconded by Mr. Playfair, and the question being proposed that the Bill be read a second time on Thursday the thirteenth instant.

The Honorable Mr. Cauchon moved an amendment to the question, seconded by Mr. Ross, that the words "on Thursday the thirteenth instant," be left out, and the words, "this day six months," inserted instead thereof.

And the question on the Amendment being put, the House divided, and the names being called for, they were taken down, as follows:—

YEAS. Messieurs, Bignar, Bourassa, Bureau, Burwell, Campbell, Caron, Cauchon, Chapais, Christie, Daoust, Dawson, Desaulniers, Dionne, Duron, Drummond, Dubord, Dunkin, Fellows, Foley, Fortier, Gault, Gaudet, Gauvreau, Hebert, Jobin, Laporte, Lemieux, John S. Macdonald, Mackenzie, McCann, McGee, McKellar, Meagher, Morin, Notman, Panet, Papineau, Pope, Walker Powell, Roblin, Rose, Rymal, Richard W. Scott, William Scott, Sincennes, Tasse, Terrill, Thibaudeau, Turcotte—54.

MESSIEURS, Aikens, Allan, Baby, Bell, Bellingham, Benjamin, Brown, Buchanan, John Cameron, Malcolm Cameron, Corning, Cayley, Atty. Gen. Cartier, Clark, Connor, Cook, Daly, Dorland, Ferguson, Gould, Hartman, Hogan, Loranger, Macbeth, Atty. Gen. Macdonald, McMicken, Mowat, Munro, Patrick, Playfair, William F. Powell, Robinson, Sol. Gen. Rose, Sherwood, Short, Sicotte, Simard, Simpson, Sidney Smith, Somerville, Talbot, Tett, Wallbridge, Webb, White, Wright—46.

It was then ordered that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

In the session of 1860, Mr. McGee moved "that in the opinion of Mr. McGee House, no avowed leader or chief of any exclusive, secret, politico-religious society ought to be entrusted with the prosecution of justice on behalf of the Crown in this Province." In speaking to his resolution Mr. McGee made direct reference to the Orange body. He said that the city of Montreal where he resided and the adjoining townships, there was to be traced here and there, the presence not only of lodges but of troops of men who acted under the auspices of agents sent out from Montreal. In the neighborhood of Ottawa, the city to which it was proposed that the seat of government should be removed, it was well known that there were numbers of lodges to which every member of this House belonged and which members it was well known had during the present Parliament, absented themselves from their Parliamentary duties in order to head a grand Lodge in the city of London, giving the preference of their time and labors to a secret organization in preference to their public duty, and actually afterwards having the audacity to plead this on the floor of the House as an excuse for their absence. The other day he read in the Kent Advertiser, a statement to the effect that propagandists were going through the country endeavoring to establish lodges. As to the extent of the institution some idea might be formed from the fact that nearly 1,100 warrants had been issued by the Grand Lodge, giving, at a moderate calculation, some 20,000 organized men, though he believed they numbered 100,000. It was, therefore, a matter of great importance to know something of this institution, and the patience of the House would not be ill employed in devoting an evening to its discussion, to the discussion of the existence and objects of an organization which had engaged the attention of two Committees of the House of Commons in 1835, and which, in those days, was the subject of a special address to the throne and of an enquiry whether it contributed to the peace, the prosperity and the welfare of the country, or whether it produced ill-will, feuds, and litigation. There were documents published of the Irish origin of the society, and he might entertain the House with a tale of scandal, but these were aside from the main issue. His argument was that this was not an institution of Canadian origin, that it did not spring up in this country, that it was imported into this country in the worst spirit. Fortunately he could give some of the solemn oaths of the order from its lowest to its highest degrees. It had its origin in the heart of the county of Armagh, in the Province of Ulster, Ireland, and the first lodges were agrarian, arising from the dissatisfaction of a dispossessed tenantry with the then proprietors of the soil. The society was founded on the 21st September, 1795, after a faction fight called after the place it was fought, the battle of the Diamond. This had been celebrated as the Marathon and Thermopylae of the invaders, previous to that day an agrarian society for the whole of the landowners, the Earl of Gosford at their head denounced it as such.

"Mr. Gowan—Do you say they denounced the Orange society?" Mr. McGee—I did. Mr. Gowan—I deny it. Mr. McGee, continuing, said that it changed its name on the day of the victory. The charters of the lodges were called in: the society remained the same, but it took the name of Orange, in honor, as its members commonly supposed, of the Prince of Orange. He (Mr. McGee) had

one or two observations to make on that name and its use.

The society pretended that it represented the principles of the Prince of Orange, glorifying him as the exemplar of the order. One would almost have supposed the order had been founded by him, that Beninck or some of his ministers, or Barret or some of his divines who possessed his confidence had framed its constitution. But it was a hundred years from his time, and had further off in degrees than in time, that the real foundation took place. If the Prince of Orange had been alive at the time of the battle of the Diamond, no man in England would have rebuked more readily the spirit of his great antipathy to Popery. The Prince of Orange counted Pope Innocent XII. as his most intimate ally. Catholics who were ignorant of history probably thought the Prince to be as he was represented to be by the Orangemen of this day. Educated Catholics thought otherwise. The celebration to-morrow in honor of what he had done for liberty, he (Mr. McGee) would be proud to attend it. He believed indeed, that the hand of the King had pressed heavily on Ireland, but he was to be honored for what he had done in England, namely, the restoring to the Constitution the limitation of the Power of the Executive. Now, as to the selection of the anniversary of the Society—it celebrated the great battle of the Boyne, and in so doing, its animus was apparent. He should like to know where, in any country, any body of men who professed to be friends to their neighbors, had selected for celebration the anniversary of a battle of their civil war? Where, in England, were there found societies which, in the days of Henry VIII. or Elizabeth, celebrated the Battle of Barret or of Wakefield, or of any other, fought during the Wars of the Roses? Did we here find, on the anniversary of the surrender of Quebec, that the French flag was hoisted down and the British hoisted—although it might be argued that that would be of no signification, as nobody now thought the country had suffered through the change of sovereignty? Well, such being the animus of the society, he would now allude to the opinions entertained of it by men who lived at the time of its origin. Edmund Burke was the personification of all that was Conservative in the last ten years of the last century, who preserved the British Constitution during the Gallomania of that day. After his retirement from public life he was often consulted by Pitt, who availed himself of the great powers and facile pen of the great statesman. Now Burke, in a letter to Pitt, published on the 18th January, 1796—six months after the society had sprung into existence—spoke of it in terms almost of alarm. Lord Gosford, too, in a letter to Pitt, and had stated that seven thousand Catholic families had been driven in the course of a few months from one County of Armagh, by that organization in the first year of its existence. Similar accounts of outrages were to be found in the Memoirs of Grattan. Petitions were presented in the Irish House of Commons in 1779, for the prevention of the lawless and violent depredations of mobs formed by members of that secret society. Time would not allow him to detail the various distressing events of that period, but several interesting reports on the subject could be found in the Edinburgh Review for January, 1836. One remarkable fact in the history was the rapid spread of the society from one part of County of Ireland, over the whole country, into England and among her sailors and soldiers to almost every part of the world in which they were stationed, where there were men enough to form a lodge, extending thus to the shores of the Mediterranean, to Naples and even to Rome.

They had a third object, to introduce a mob formed by members of that secret society. Time would not allow him to detail the various distressing events of that period, but several interesting reports on the subject could be found in the Edinburgh Review for January, 1836. One remarkable fact in the history was the rapid spread of the society from one part of County of Ireland, over the whole country, into England and among her sailors and soldiers to almost every part of the world in which they were stationed, where there were men enough to form a lodge, extending thus to the shores of the Mediterranean, to Naples and even to Rome.

They had a third object, to introduce a mob formed by members of that secret society. Time would not allow him to detail the various distressing events of that period, but several interesting reports on the subject could be found in the Edinburgh Review for January, 1836. One remarkable fact in the history was the rapid spread of the society from one part of County of Ireland, over the whole country, into England and among her sailors and soldiers to almost every part of the world in which they were stationed, where there were men enough to form a lodge, extending thus to the shores of the Mediterranean, to Naples and even to Rome.

They had a third object, to introduce a mob formed by members of that secret society. Time would not allow him to detail the various distressing events of that period, but several interesting reports on the subject could be found in the Edinburgh Review for January, 1836. One remarkable fact in the history was the rapid spread of the society from one part of County of Ireland, over the whole country, into England and among her sailors and soldiers to almost every part of the world in which they were stationed, where there were men enough to form a lodge, extending thus to the shores of the Mediterranean, to Naples and even to Rome.

They had a third object, to introduce a mob formed by members of that secret society. Time would not allow him to detail the various distressing events of that period, but several interesting reports on the subject could be found in the Edinburgh Review for January, 1836. One remarkable fact in the history was the rapid spread of the society from one part of County of Ireland, over the whole country, into England and among her sailors and soldiers to almost every part of the world in which they were stationed, where there were men enough to form a lodge, extending thus to the shores of the Mediterranean, to Naples and even to Rome.

They had a third object, to introduce a mob formed by members of that secret society. Time would not allow him to detail the various distressing events of that period, but several interesting reports on the subject could be found in the Edinburgh Review for January, 1836. One remarkable fact in the history was the rapid spread of the society from one part of County of Ireland, over the whole country, into England and among her sailors and soldiers to almost every part of the world in which they were stationed, where there were men enough to form a lodge, extending thus to the shores of the Mediterranean, to Naples and even to Rome.

They had a third object, to introduce a mob formed by members of that secret society. Time would not allow him to detail the various distressing events of that period, but several interesting reports on the subject could be found in the Edinburgh Review for January, 1836. One remarkable fact in the history was the rapid spread of the society from one part of County of Ireland, over the whole country, into England and among her sailors and soldiers to almost every part of the world in which they were stationed, where there were men enough to form a lodge, extending thus to the shores of the Mediterranean, to Naples and even to Rome.

They had a third object, to introduce a mob formed by members of that secret society. Time would not allow him to detail the various distressing events of that period, but several interesting reports on the subject could be found in the Edinburgh Review for January, 1836. One remarkable fact in the history was the rapid spread of the society from one part of County of Ireland, over the whole country, into England and among her sailors and soldiers to almost every part of the world in which they were stationed, where there were men enough to form a lodge, extending thus to the shores of the Mediterranean, to Naples and even to Rome.

part, ever since he had set his foot in Canada, he had never by word of mouth, or by anything that had followed his pen, aided in keeping them alive. He had always spoken of the country as a whole and exhorted his fellow-men to get rid of their prejudices, and to cultivate peace and good will. The first experience that Canada had had of the Order was said to have been in 1838, and he understood that it glorified itself in having put it down, but this was not correct, for he found that Chief Justice Robinson had shortly after published a pamphlet in London, in which he stated that the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada had throughout the Rebellion, remained loyal to the Crown, so their exclusive loyalty was not the prerogative of Orangemen, and therefore he did not see that, in order to make men loyal, they needed to be sworn and decorated, and tied with cords, and have W. W. inscribed on their garments. He understood that these mystic letters were employed in making a Knight of the Purple—perhaps they meant a Knight of Whiskey and Water. During the Rebellion Lord Glenelg, then Secretary for the Colonies, transmitted a despatch to Sir Francis Bond Head, the then Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, on the subject of Orangemen, in which he said that while in the parent country the Government were endeavoring to allay the evils created by the religious differences, he was sorry to find that some of the representatives of the Crown in the dependencies of the Empire were acting in a way calculated to increase them, and without supposing that he (Sir F. B. H.) had erred in this way, he was cautioned so to act as not to lay himself open to blame in this respect. In consequence of this communication a question was submitted to the officers of the Crown, whether certain proceedings of the Orange body were not illegal. The lawyers gave it as their opinion that processions were contrary to law, and might be suppressed. Such were the well known and settled views of the Imperial Government on this subject, that the Governor had addressed a circular to the Magistrates in the District of Bathurst, enclosing these opinions. On the 24th June, 1839, Sir George Arthur had also addressed to the magistrates a letter in which he spoke slightly of the Order and reminded them to be vigilant in respect to the opinions of the Imperial Government on this subject, which had taken place in the Mother Country on account of connection with Orangemen. The letter went on to say that the Institution had originated in circumstances that had passed away, and expressing surprise that any real lovers of the country should countenance or encourage it. He had now quoted the opinions of high and distinguished persons in Great Britain and the Province, and he would now give the opinions of the Times, the great leading paper of England, the Saturday Press, the organ of Lord Derby, and the Dublin Express. [Mr. McGee here read extracts to show that these papers considered it was wrong to place Orangemen on the Bench, and that the influence of the Order was injurious to public peace and order.] Was it right, then, he would ask, for the Government in Canada to entrust the business of the Crown to a member of such a society? So much for the past; he now came to the present organization of the order in Canada, and wished to prove that, in the words of his resolution, the society was an Exclusive Secret Politico-Religious one. How was it that the by-laws were not to be bought anywhere for a reasonable sum, and that he was obliged to the kindness of a friend for the book he held in his hand, "Form and Ritual of the Royal Scarlet Order," printed by Alex. Jacques, "printer to the G. L. S. O. B. N. A."—and other letters. (Laughter.) That was itself an argument as to its secret nature, of which the Hon. Attorney-General had, last year, said there was no evidence before the House. Well, the Book said, "the candidate shall be introduced by two brethren, each carrying an Orange rod, &c." then followed some phrases of Scripture—and all the texts contained some allusion to blood—blood was in them the leading idea. What had done words to do with a peaceful institution? He could understand, if it were a benevolent society, how words from Scripture inculcating love might be used, although, indeed, the Church to which he belonged did not allow the sacred words of the Bible to be used except on the most holy occasions, not even when people met together for prayer, without direction. And now for the oath. A. B., the candidate, swore allegiance to Her Majesty, as long as she should maintain the Protestant religion—that was, of course, Protestantism of the Church of England, since, undoubtedly, under the Act of Succession, Her Majesty would lose her right to the Throne if she became Presbyterian or Unitarian, or joined any other than the Church of the State, there—thank God, we had no State Church here. This part of the oath limited the loyalty of the members of the Order to a degree less than even his, for he held that no change in the private opinions of the Head of the State, nothing short of irremediable tyranny, could justify the denial of allegiance. The next part was: "I swear that I am not and never will be a Roman Catholic." Such an oath, which he could not consider binding, was directly opposed even to the Protestant principle of liberty of private opinion. If a Catholic were to swear that he never would become a Protestant, how foolish would he be thought, to assert that it was impossible a change in his opinions ever would occur? Lastly, the oath ran—and this was the obligation to secrecy—"I swear that I will conceal and never reveal, &c., so help me God, and keep me steadfast in this my Orangeman's obligation."

Hon. Mr. Foley—Amen. (Laughter.) Hon. Mr. McGee would abrogate his Hon. friend from any intention of making a feat of sacred things, since they almost lost their character by their association with this institution. An oath was the bond which kept society together; but to what less uses was it here put? The oath of an Orangeman was but an engine of despotism; by it a man laid down his liberty, and sacrificed the right of private judgment, of which those who belonged to the Order were so often heard to boast. Coming to the Scarlet Order, he proceeded to read a description of the ceremony of initiation, at which it would appear, the candidate was obliged to kneel while taking the obligation, on one knee here. Fancy that fastidious gentleman

Hon. J. H. Cameron in this position, with his trousers up. (A laugh.) He wondered whether the Postmaster-General went on his bare knee when initiated, if so, he, doubtless, would have given anything, to have had one of the Globe under him. He called attention to the fact that not only the grand master of the Orangemen, Mr. J. A. Cameron, was employed by the government as Crown prosecutor, but that all the County attorneys recently appointed in Upper Canada were officers or members of this mysterious society.

Hon. Atty. Gen. Macdonald—That is not the case. Mr. McGee submitted that he has proven from his past character, as well as the documents published by the order, that the Orange association was an exclusive secret, politico-religious society. As to its voting in elections, every one knew that it often times influenced them not only powerfully but unexpectedly, and visited with severe penalties those who did not vote as they were directed. He could instate an outrage on liberty of speech by Orangemen in relation to himself, but would not further refer to it than by saying that the persons concerned came from a distance, men under distinct commands, and went away when they had accomplished their purpose. Did the Orangemen also interfere in the administration of justice? At the trial of the Orangeman Miller, for the murder of Farrell at Guelph, was not Chief Justice Robinson obliged to say there was a mysterious influence at work? The hon. gentleman concluded by saying that that was a dangerous system which allowed criminal justice, in most important parts of Upper Canada, to be administered by a man who held the office of Grand Master of the Orangemen. His obligations to the order, an order which he had shown excluded from its ranks not only Catholics but large classes of Protestants, must so shake confidence in him, as to render him a very unfit person for such a position. He much feared that the encouragement given to the society by persons in high places, would have the effect of leading to the establishment of counter associations, a thing which would be very much deplored, as the evil would be thereby increased and perpetuated. He did not wish to see any legislation on the subject, but never in the operating of public opinion, rather than on penal enactments, for the suppression of the evil.

In the debate which followed several members took part, but there was on all sides an evident desire to shirk a direct vote on the motion. When therefore the previous question was moved, the House refused by a division of 23 to 64 to have the question put.

In the same session Mr. Piche moved a resolution of want of confidence on the ground that several members of the government belonged to the Orange Society. This resolution nine members voted, Messrs. Bignar, Bourassa, Laberge, Lemieux, McGee, Papineau, Piche, Thibaudeau. The majority consisted of 105 members.

No effort was made by the Orangemen of old Canada to obtain incorporation till after confederation. In 1873 a bill proposed for their incorporation passed the Legislature of Ontario, but never received the royal assent. It has been several times introduced in the same body but never since could command a majority. The attention of the Dominion Parliament was not till this session directly given to this subject of Orangemen. And it is quite remarkable even if the Senate and Commons should agree to a bill of incorporation for the Orange body, that it would ever receive the royal assent.

Since the above was written a very lively and interesting discussion took place on the Orange bill which came up for a second reading on Monday, April 16th. The House and galleries were crowded to excess. The debate was opened by Mr. White (Hastings) who moved the second reading in a very weak but inoffensive speech. After Mr. White had concluded, Mr. Curran of Montreal delivered one of the ablest speeches ever heard in the Parliament of Canada against the second reading.

Mr. Curran said he felt the responsibility which rested upon him in rising to oppose the second reading of the bill. Those who had seen what had been taking place since this matter had been first mooted must feel that there was a great and intense feeling abroad on this subject. He trusted that no word might issue from his lips which any one could take exception to. He looked on this occasion as one of the most momentous in the history of Canada, because if this Parliament sanctioned the incorporation of the Orange Association, with its history since 1795 all over the world, if they were going to plant the Orange flag upon the tower of this Dominion, what would be the effect upon the immigration to this country? If they put this in the hands of the American immigration agent, where was the Catholic who would come to Canada, where was the Protestant who would choose a spot where the old aims and bitterness of 200 years past and foreign to our skies were still in existence and were being nurtured. He had been born and brought up in Montreal, where Catholics and Protestants lived side by side, where they had Protestant charity and Catholic charity rivalling each other in all good works, but, while he had seen the party fight and the party funeral, he had never seen the party orphan asylum for those who were made orphans by the party fight. When this question was before the English House of Commons Lord John Russell said he would not enter upon the discussion of this question, as if Protestants and Orangemen were synonymous, as he would be sorry to pass such a sweeping condemnation on the Protestants of Ireland. He (Mr. Curran) opposed this bill as being contrary to the Treaty of Paris, and to the laws of Lower Canada, an infringement on the rights of other Provinces, contrary to the British North America Act. His first point was that the Parliament of Great Britain, if it still governed us, could not pass this Act of incorporation without violating the Treaty of Paris, and therefore this Parliament with its delegated authority could not entertain this bill. The main feature of this Orange society, history proved it, and he should prove it beyond a doubt—was in Protestant ascendancy. He quoted the evidence of Sir Francis Hincks, given on oath in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry, "Chamber's Encyclopedia,"

"Le Dictionnaire de la Conversation," the "Edinburgh Review," an address from the Orange order to the Duke of Cumberland, and the speech of Mr. Finch, a distinguished Orangeman and a member of the English House of Commons in proof of this assertion, and declared that the incorporation of any society having for its object the ascendancy of one creed over another was in direct violation of that treaty which guaranteed perfect freedom to the Catholic subjects of His Majesty of France who then transferred to His Majesty of England. Protestant ascendancy was incompatible with Catholic liberty. By that treaty none were guaranteed the enjoyment of their rights and immunity from intrusion.

Mr. White (Hastings)—hear, hear. Mr. Curran said his hon. friend said "hear, hear," but the members of his order did not say so, for the Provincial and Grand Lodge of Western Ontario, after passing other resolutions which had not the ring of benevolence about them, which had nothing to show that there was one attempt at benevolence in the organization, declared "that the opening of all public institutions in the land, religious or otherwise, to public inspection by Government officials, shall form part of the programme of this institution." That was in direct violation of article 32 of the capitulation. He next contended that such an Act could not be passed by this Parliament, even admitting its power, without violating the laws of the Province of Quebec, where this institution was illegal, and had been declared illegal by the highest tribunal in the Province. The evidence in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry showed that this was a secret, oath-bound, politico-religious association, and chap. 10 of the Consolidated Statutes of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal, with the exception of the Freemasons. He cited the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Ramsay, and concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Cross, in the case of Grant vs. Beaudry. A law was passed in 1863 in Prince Edward Island, but the Governor of Quebec declared all secret oath-bound societies illegal,