

**NAYS.**—Messrs. Ballantyne, Baxter, Bethune, Bishop, Bonfield, Chisholm, Clarke (Wellington), Cole, Currie, Dawson, Deroche, Ferris, Finlayson, Fraser, Gibson, Graham, Grant, Haney, Hardy, Hargraft, Hay, Hodgins, Hunter, Lane, Lyon, McCraney, McMahon, Massie, Master, Miller, Mowat, O'Donoghue, Pardee, Paxton, Robinson, Ross, Sexton, Sinclair, Snetsinger, Springer, Striker, Waterworth, Widdifield, Williams, Wills, Wilson, Wood—47.

Mr. FRASER then moved that the words "it is not expedient that any person whilst a member of the House of Commons or the Senate of Canada should be appointed to" be struck out of the amendment, and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:—"Having regard to the efficiency and regularity of the public service of Ontario, it is not expedient that hereafter any person whilst a member of the House of Commons or the Senate of Canada shall have or hold," etc.

The amendment as amended was then carried on the same division, and the original resolution lost.

#### NON-PAYMENT OF TIMBER DUES.

Mr. SCOTT moved for an order of the House for all correspondence between J. B. McWilliams or John McDonald or others and the Commissioner of Crown Lands, or any officer of the Crown Lands Department, relative to the seizure of certain lumber of the said McDonald, or of Messrs. Gilmour & Co., for alleged non-payment of timber dues; and copies of all receipts or vouchers for the payment of the dues, or any portion thereof, for the non-payment of which such seizure was made. He referred to certain rumours to the effect that McWilliams, an officer in the employ of the Crown Lands Department, made use of his position to influence voters in the Dominion election in the east riding of Peterborough in 1874. It was alleged that he circulated among certain voters receipts for the payment of timber dues for amounts which never were paid. Afterwards these persons sold their timber to one McDonald, from whom it was seized by the Department for the dues in respect to which receipts had been given, and which McDonald refused to pay. If the rumours were true, the official should not be continued in office, and if they were not, the charges should not be allowed longer to hang over him.

Mr. PARDEE said public rumour had been all wrong in this case, and the hon. member for West Peterborough had been entirely deceived. The case was similar to many that arose every year. McDonald was a mill owner, and last year he took a lot of logs, some of which were, and some not, liable to pay dues. As he refused to pay dues on any of them the Government had no other course but to seize the logs, as they did in all such cases. McDonald had, however, paid dues on a large number of logs, and the seizure had been discharged. Two other bush rangers besides McWilliams had made enquiries, and found the facts to be as he had stated. He confidently denied that McWilliams had misused his position in influencing voters, and he defied the hon. member for West Peterborough to produce one receipt which he had given. Dues could only be paid at the head office of the Department. He had found McWilliams to be a most efficient officer, the increase in the collection of dues under his charge since he had been a forest ranger having amounted to \$165,755. There was no objection to the papers being brought down, and they would show that the rumours referred to were entirely untrue.

Mr. CAMERON said the charge was that discharges had been given improperly for the purpose of securing votes. It would be just as well to have a Committee, as Mr. McWilliams might be maligned. His words were reported to be that the Government dare not do anything against his interests. Of Mr. McDonald he (the speaker) knew nothing beyond that he was represented as a respectable man, but the hon. the Commissioner's action made him out to be something else.

Mr. PARDEE said that he had given Mr. McDonald the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. CAMERON said that the Government did not appear to have acted properly in this

when it was remembered that it was in connection with this charge that the assertions were made of improper discharges. The papers possibly would not be down till next session, and the matter might be carried over to next session.

The motion then carried.

#### THE ORANGE BILL.

Mr. MERRICK, in rising to ask for leave to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of Eastern and Western Ontario, and that rules 51, 53, 56, 57, and 58 be suspended for that purpose," explained the circumstances which caused him to adopt the course which he did to seek to introduce his Bill. In proceeding he read from the hon. the Attorney-General's remarks upon the Bill of last session, when he said the ordinary law would enable them to incorporate. This statement was afterwards modified by introducing an amendment enabling them to procure incorporation by application to the County Judge, which had its drawbacks. He then proceeded to explain briefly the scope of his Bill, and hoped that if the hon. gentlemen who in the past had opposed such Bills did so on this occasion it would, at all events, pave the way to success in the next session. He thought that their constituents would say that justice had not been done to a large and honourable body of men.

Mr. FRASER, after a few introductory remarks, said that the hon. gentleman had not explained some features of this measure. It was common talk that it had been decided not to introduce this Bill this session, but the party managers saw after the assembling of the House they were between the devil and the deep sea—the deep sea of the general election, and the devil of the spirit of the party they had raised by their persistent advocacy of this measure. The difficulty with the general election was the probability of prejudicing the Catholic vote. Those who had promoted this Bill had not followed one rule of the House in private Bills. With a strange deliberation they had defiantly and deliberately proceeded against all rules. Were he to raise the question of order the hon. the Speaker would be bound to rule the matter out of order. But this he would not do, and would confine himself to examining the irregularities in the proceedings, which he proceeded to do at length, saying that even had the notice reached the publishers of the *Gazette* it was so arranged that for the purposes of this House it would be irregular. The notice had been received by the publisher and returned for the money, which never came, so they knew that their notice was not being inserted. Even in the *Orange Sentinel* the notice was not inserted for the correct time. Within two weeks of the time the notice should have been inserted, no copy of the Bill with the \$100 necessary had been handed to the Clerk.

Mr. MERRICK—The Clerk held the \$100 which accompanied the Bill of last year.

Mr. FRASER said that the Clerk had no power to retain the \$100, and even if the money were in the House the Bill was not. The next course that should have been taken should have been that they go to the Committee on Standing Orders and ask them to report to the House upon the whole matter. A mere bald verbal statement was made to them; not even was this local advertisement shown to them. Indeed, all the rules of the House had been contemptuously set at naught. The notice was put on the paper not till the 8th February—a Government day—when it was impossible to overtake it. The mover deliberately allowed two days to pass during that week on which he might have had his Bill put before the Private Bills Committee, which had now reported for the last time. Then, again, the Bill would have to be posted up for five days in the lobby, and then the House would have risen. In view of all these matters he contended that the Bill was introduced for election purposes; the hon. gentleman indeed was between the devil and the deep sea. Two sessions ago he had asserted that this body was a political-religious organization, backing up his assertion by