

ONTARIO LEGISLATURE.

The Claims of the Volunteers
of 1837-8.

AN EXHAUSTIVE DEBATE.

No Recognition of Services
Should be Made.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES—AMENDMENTS TO THE
LIQUOR LICENSE ACT—CENTENARY OF
PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT.

TORONTO, April 4, 1892.

In the Legislative Assembly to-day the following bills were read a third time and passed:—To incorporate the Hospital for Sick Children; to incorporate the Town of Rat Portage; respecting the City of Ottawa; to amend the act incorporating the Synod of the Diocese of Niagara and to authorise the sale of certain lands.

The House went into committee on and passed the following bills:—To consolidate the debt of the Town of Cobourg; respecting the Town of Toronto Junction; to incorporate the Niagara Falls Park & Queenston Electric Railway & Steamboat Company; to incorporate the Carp, Almonte & Lanark Railway.

In committee on the bill respecting the City of Toronto, Mr. Tait moved that the following section be added:—"All property, both real and personal, owned by and standing in the name of the Parkdale Public School Board at the date of the annexation of the Town of Parkdale to the City of Toronto, by virtue of 52 Vic., c. 73, is hereby declared to have passed under the said act to and the same is hereby vested in the Toronto Public School Board, with all the estate, rights, title and interest of the Parkdale Public School Board." The bill as amended was reported.

The following bills were read a second time:—To incorporate the Town of Thessalon (Mr. Conmee); to incorporate the Toronto Railway Company and to confirm an agreement between the Corporation of the City of Toronto and George W. Kiely, William McKenzie, Henry Azariah Everett and Chauncey C. Woodworth (Mr. Clarke).

THE REBELLION OF '37.

Mr. Willoughby moved that in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the Government should make some suitable recognition to the volunteers of 1837-8 for the valuable services they rendered in defence of their country at that time. He endeavored to show that legally this matter came within the jurisdiction of the Province. Mr. Tyrwhitt moved a similar resolution in the Commons in 1874. Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Blake then said that it was a matter which belonged exclusively to the Province and that the Dominion could do nothing. In 1885, on Mr. Hickey's resolution in the Commons, the same opinion was expressed by Sir John and Mr. Blake. In 1873 the Legislature considered the question and appointed a committee, which awarded the trustees of the Baldwin family \$4,000. The sum of \$3,000 was also paid to the heirs of the Montgomery estate. The Legislature therefore recognised its obligation to these veterans. The veterans now living are very old, and it is high time that something should be done. Those engaged in the struggle did the country great service. He thought even the descendants of those who rebelled must recognise the services of those who fought in defence of the flag

of this country. He trusted the Government, appreciating the lasting benefits conferred on the country by those who fought for its Government and flag, would reward the services of the veterans.

THE OBJECT OF THE RESOLUTION.

Mr. Gibson (Hamilton) said that the mover could not be accused of adopting an immoderate tone, but he (Mr. Gibson) took the same view now as he formerly did. There was no good motive, no good object to be served by introducing such a resolution at this late stage of the period when nothing could be done. The only object could be to reopen old sores and to arouse those animosities which long ago were laid at rest. He did not propose to discuss the general point at which rebellion was justifiable. No one would say that rebellion against oppression would never be justified. He would say, however, that those living then in Canada had suffered extreme provocation, and lived under a state of things well nigh intolerable. Discontent at the sort of government they were compelled to submit to was not to be wondered at. The people in those days really had no part in the government of the country. Responsible government is now called the cornerstone of the constitution. The people of that time wanted responsible government, but it was a stranger to the country. The country was governed by an oligarchy. There was indeed a popular Assembly, but the will of the majority did not prevail. The Governor and his Council ruled the country. But the Assembly elected by the people had no hand in the government of the day. The Assembly at that time consisted of two to one against the Government of the day, but their will did not prevail. The country was ruled by the Governor and his oligarchy, who did not admit the authority of the Assembly. It was inconceivable how the people of that day could submit to such an intolerable condition of affairs. The conduct of the Liberal party of the day was the essence of patience and the very reverse of rebellious. Petitions and delegates were sent to the home Government to protest against the intolerable state of affairs, but there was no redress. A commission was sent out, but instead of endeavoring to find out whether there were grievances, went home and reported that responsible government was not to be thought of and advocated the continuance of the existing form of government. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were levied upon the people for salaries of officials sent out here, and levied without their consent. That was only one of their grievances.

LORD BROUGHAM'S OPINION.

The debates in the Imperial Parliament show that the home authorities were sinning with their eyes open. As an illustration Mr. Gibson read a few words from a speech of Lord Brougham:—

We loudly censure the Canadians, urged he; but which is the country, who are the people who gave them the example of insurrection? You exclaim against them for revolting! You who have disposed of their money without their consent; you who have violated those rights which you made a merit of having accorded to them. Then you enumerate their other advantages; how that they have no taxes to pay, that they receive considerable aid from this country, that they enjoy gratuitously precious trading privileges which it cost us dear to obtain, and then you wind up all with the scornful observation: "The whole dispute between us and them resolves itself into the fact that we have appropriated some £20,000 without permission of their Assembly." Why, it was for resisting the illegal exaction of a poor pound sterling that Hampden gained an undying name as an English patriot; a name for which the Plantagenets and the Guelphs would have given all the blood that flowed in their veins! If it be a crime to resist oppression, to rise up against a usurping power and to defend public freedom when it is assailed, which are the greatest criminals? Was it not ourselves who set the example to our American brethren? Blame them not too harshly for following it.

THE FAMILY COMPACT.

Continuing, Mr. Gibson said that the Family Compact of that day held power against the wishes and interests of the peo-