

Canada endured. The volunteers who defended the country against foreign invaders did their duty. But the grander part was taken by the men who refused to submit to tyranny. If one party is to be commended the other must be commended for the efforts to secure liberty. If the veterans of '37 are entitled to recognition the place is at Ottawa, especially in view of the statement of the leader of the Opposition that they were occupied in defending the hearthstones of the country against foreign invaders.

Mr. Tait reviewed the arguments of the Opposition and pointed out their inconsistencies. He said that if the volunteers were to be rewarded the others who suffered should also be rewarded. He knew of one old gentleman now over 70 who was imprisoned for four months on mere suspicion, and was offered his liberty repeatedly if he would swear to a document concerning parties of whom he knew nothing. Such cases of hardship should also be recognised. What recognition had the volunteers who served the country in '66 except the consciousness of having done their duty? The amendment expressed fairly and squarely the true positions of the case, that recognition should be sought at Ottawa. No feeling was introduced into the debate except by the leader of the Opposition. He (Mr. Tait) could have no feeling in this matter, because the affair of '37 took place some years before he was born. (Cries of "Oh, oh, withdraw.") Any man who would defend the monstrosities of the Government of that day—his lips would blister to defend them. Reading of the history of the rebellion before he came to Canada, he wondered that the people submitted so long. If there is to be recognition, it should be to those driven to despair and compelled to rebel as well as those mentioned in the resolution. (Applause.)

THE DIVISION.

The vote was then taken on Mr. Ray-side's amendment as follows:—

YEAS.—Allan, Awrey, Biggar, Bishop, Blezard, Barr (Renfrow), Caldwell, Carpenter, Charlton, Chisholm, Cleland, Connee, Dack, Davis, Dowling, Dryden, Field, Garrow, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Guthrie, Harcourt, Hardy, Harty, Kirkwood, Lockhart, McKay (Oxford), McKay (Victoria), McKechnie, McMahon, Mackenzie, C., Moore, Mowat, O'Connor, Paton, Rayside, Robillard, Ross, Sharpe, Snider, Stratton, Tait, Waters, Wood (Brant)—44.

NAYS.—Balfour, Barr (Dufferin), Bush, Campbell (Durham), Clancy, Fell, Glendinning, Godwin, Hammel, Hiscott, Hudson, Kerus, McCleary, McColl, McLenaghan, Magwood, Marter, Meacham, Meredith, Miscampbell, Monk, Horke, Smith (Frontenac), Tooley, Whitney, Willoughby, Wood (Hastings), Wylie—29.

There were eight pairs as follows:—

Liberals.	Conservatives.
Gilmour,	Clarke,
Mack,	Reid,
Bronson,	Preston,
Baxter,	White.

There were seven Liberals absent as follows:—Messrs. Evanturel, Fraser, Loughrin, Porter, H. McKenzie, Smith (York), Sprague.

The House therefore stood as follows:—

	Liberal.	Con- servative.
Voted.....	45	29
Paired.....	4	4
Absent.....	7	0
Speaker.....	1	..
Totals.....	57	33

On the question as to whether the main motion as amended should be adopted Mr. Wood (Hastings) made some sarcastic and angry remarks on the opinion of loyalty held by the Government benches. He regretted that the Attorney-General had said that the rebels were as worthy of reward as those who put down the rebellion. (Applause from the Liberal benches.) He moved in amendment to the amendment that there be added these words:—"But whether by this Legislature or by the Parliament of Canada, this House is of opinion that the recognition should at all events be made."

This amendment was lost on the same di-

vision as before, except that Mr. Ferguson arrived and voted, the division being 29 to 45. The main motion, as amended by the amendments of Mr. Gibson and Mr. Rayside, was declared carried on the same division.

A TIMBER LIMIT QUESTION.

Mr. Whitney moved for a return of copies of all correspondence between the Commissioner of Crown Lands, or any officer of the Department of Crown Lands, and George Paget and John Regan, or either of them, on the subject of or with reference to an action in the High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division, between F. F. Jones, plaintiff, and James Sharpe, Peter McDermott, George Paget and John Regan, defendants, which said action was tried, or partially tried, before the Hon. Mr. Justice Rose at Hamilton on the 2nd day of October, 1890, and settled by the parties thereto, giving also copies of all correspondence between the said Commissioner or any such officer and any other person or persons on the subject of or with reference to the said action. He said the matter had nothing to do with the member for Parry Sound, because it took place before he was a member, but it was necessary to introduce his name to give the facts correctly. He read from the evidence at the trial, which he said showed that these rangers for their own gain made use of information they obtained in an official capacity. These men employed confidentially and paid by the Crown Lands Department speculated in the property of the Crown.

Mr. Hardy said that the charge was that these rangers, with the assistance of McDermott, had by misrepresentation induced Jones to buy a limit for \$8,000 which was not worth more than \$2,000 or \$3,000. But the trial ended by all charges of fraud being withdrawn, \$500 being returned and Mr. Sharpe paying half the costs. The charge of fraud being withdrawn, there was perhaps no necessity for the Government regarding the matter as very serious. Mr. Paget was not responsible in any way for the agreement made by others. He quite agreed that it was incompatible with the duty of a woodranger to have an interest in a limit over which he had in some sense control. Orders in Council have recently been passed prohibiting woodrangers of the department, whether while employed by the Government or during the part of the year they are not so employed, from being directly or indirectly interested in any limit held by the Crown or accepting any fee or emolument in connection with sale of such limits. No charge of fraud and no complaint was made to the department, and therefore when the charge of fraud was withdrawn at the trial, it did not seem necessary to do anything, as Regan had been suspension during the investigation of the question. It was not a very grave affair. There was no cheating of the Government. The Government, therefore, did not think it necessary to discharge these men who had been for a long time in the employ of the department. He had no objection to the motion.

Mr. Sharpe said it appeared to be the idea of some members to see how near the line of blackmail they could come. He purchased the limit from the Bank of Toronto before he was elected to the House. He gave the details of the sale to Jones, showing that he knew nothing of the actions of Regan and Paget, and that Jones seemed so well satisfied with the limit that he entreated him (Sharpe) to sell. He declared that Paget and Regan were hounded down as a political trick. The question was brought up because Paget met the member for Muskoka on election platforms, and that member now takes this mean, cowardly way of attacking him.

Mr. Marter said he knew nothing of the intention of Mr. Whitney to bring this matter up until quite recently. He declared that Mr. Sharpe knew Regan and insinuated that there was collusion between Mr.