DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from third page.)

pondency, into which they had fallen, not by a selfish principle, such as that proposed by the hon. member for Hamilton, but by a principle which would be fair to all parties. He then read the resolution of the hon. member for Hamilton, and pointed out that he had already promised to give to the Government partial support if they would abandon their "fly on the wheel" theory. He (Sir John) would have great pleasure in voting for the resolution of the hon. gentleman, and he would do so if the hon. gentleman would vote for his own resolution. (Laughter.) Last session the hon. member for North Norfolk, who made a Protection speech, got out of voting for protection by saying that he believed the 17½ tariff was enough. This session the hon. member for Hamilton expressed himself dissatisfied with the policy of the Government. He was in a dilemma; he had to support the Government, but he was opposed to its commercial policy. What did he do? The old saying was "I love Plato much, but I love truth more," so the hon. gentleman loved Protection much and Hamilton much, but he loved Mr. Mackenzie more. (Laughter.) He (Sir John) believed if the hon. gentlemen had thought that his motion would carry, he would not have moved it. Confident in the strong support of the Government, had from a large majority in this House, who believed in the general policy of the Government, he knew that his resolution had not the slightest chance to be carried. The hon. gentleman thought that in the course of two years he could flourish that resolution on the hustings at Hamilton and say, "Look at what I proposed, and the members for Kingston voted against it." He (Sir John) could tell him that he was not going to vote against it. He took it as the first step to protect the interests of the manufacturers. He (Mr. Wood) would thank the members of the opposition were genuine in voting for the interests of the manufacturers, and he (Sir John) hoped that he (Mr. Wood) would take a second thought and come to the conclusion that his kindness would not be illspent if it were spent in promoting the interests of the farmers and miners also. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. THOMSON (Welland) said the real question at issue was whether the Government or the Opposition were the best men. He favored a national survey based upon bond redemption as the only relief for the finance department. He believed that the agentry did not want Protection, it wanted more money in order to protect the rich manufacturers from foreign competition, at the country and sending it to Jericho. (Laughter.)

Mr. MACDONALD (Toronto) regretted Protection. He could not vote for either the amendment of the member for Kingston or that of the member from Hamilton.

Mr. BLAIN moved the adjournment of the debate, which was carried after some discussion.

The House adjourned at 11.30.

WEDNESDAY, March 7.

THE SENATE.

On motion to resume the adjourned debate on Mr. Read's motion for a committee on the Grand Trunk arbitration.

Mr. SCOTT said legislation in the direction asked for would be introduced to-day or to-morrow at the House of Commons. He could not say whether it was what Mr. Read wanted, but it would be the effect of making such cases different from those included in the Masters' and Servants' Act.

The House adjourned at 3.35 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

After miscellaneous business,

Mr. MACKAY (Cape Breton) resumed the debate on his motion to refer the petition of Henry Mitchell and others for a duty on imported coal or a bounty on native coal to a Select Committee. He expressed himself as willing to support the resolution, but wished to add to it words empowering the proposed Committee "to enquire into the best means of promoting inter-Provincial trade, with power to send for persons and papers, and to report thereon." He said he denied the assertion that no legislation could improve the coal trade, and alleged that if the machinery used in coal mining were put on the same footing as regards the import duty as the materials used in shipbuilding, the trade would be very much assisted. He contended that an enquiry should be made to find out what kind of trade involving an interchange of commodities could not be brought about between the Eastern and Western Provinces. There was no intention on the part of Nova Scotia to force its coal on Ontario, but it was worth while for the representatives of the latter Provinces to consider whether it would be wise to force the coal of Ontario on Nova Scotia.

Mr. WALLACE (Norfolk) said that the American duty which it had been said could be laid down in Toronto at $2.50 per ton, was a poor kind of Ohio coal, not fit for household purposes. The better class of coal was laid down in that city at from $4 to $4.50. He (Mr. Wallace) had visited the mines of Waterloo (Mr. Young) had argued that the placing of a duty of $1 a ton on coal would result in a loss of a million of dollars to our manufacturers. Why, the petitioners only asked for fifty cents a ton. He showed that an hon. member had stated that coal could not be brought from Nova Scotia to Toronto under $5.50, yet coal was brought from Liverpool to Montreal for $2 a ton. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. TUPPER said he consented with a great deal of pleasure to serve on the Committee in its original form, but he could not consent to serve on the Committee proposed by the amendment. The Minister of Finance, because the object of the Government was to make it impossible for the Committee to report on the prayer of the petition. That amendment threw discredit on the petitioners, because it confined the Committee to ascertaining the truth of allegations in the petition, when at the same time the statements in the petition were from self-evident to require any investigation. He was about to make an amendment similar to that of the member for Cape Breton, but as the amendment was made he would, if the Government allowed it to pass, give his best attention to the Committee.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said he had no objection to the amendment.

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton) favored the carrying of the original motion.

Mr. CAMPBELL said he only reason he could see for hon. gentlemen opposite pursuing the course they did with regard to this matter, was that they wished to see the predictions they had uttered fulfilled, even though the country was the sufferer in consequence. He had actually seen the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia dealt with American coal, which he did not consider very patriotic. It looked very much as if hon. gentlemen opposite wished to drive this country into annexation with the United States. Hon. gentlemen on the other side proposed to put on this committee gentlemen who were avowedly opposed to Protection. It appeared to him as if they wanted to make the whole matter a sham.

Mr. GOUDGE thought that a committee should be appointed to give the coal interest an opportunity to be heard. If they could see an opportunity to be heard, they ought to receive the consideration of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON said that the question of importing coal from Nova Scotia into Ontario was recently brought before the Toronto Board of Trade, and the latter body, composed of shrewd business men, was agreed that the article could be profitably carried from Nova Scotia to that city. What were we expending so much money on our Welland and St. Lawrence canals for? Was it simply to carry the produce of the West to the seaboard? He thought that when we incurred so much expenditure for these purposes, the Government should endeavor to build up an inter-Provincial trade. He read a telegram he had received from Toronto asking him not to allow Mr. McGregor's statement in the House to the effect that Ohio coal could be laid down in Toronto at $3.50 per ton to go uncontradicted. "Poor coal," the despatch said, "might be delivered there at that price, but the best Briar Hill with which ours must be compared, cost laid down in Toronto $4, and often $4.50 and $5." Nova Scotia coal was the best for house purposes in all respects.

The question was then put, and the amendment of Mr. McKay, with the amendment of Mr. Cartwright, was carried.

The House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

THURSDAY, March 8.

THE SENATE.

The papers in the matter of Mr. Mackenzie's demand for six new Senators were brought down to the Senate. The First Minister in his memorandum to the Privy Council gave no reason whatever why his request should be acceded to. It was embodied in an Order in Council dated the 23rd December, 1873. Earl Kimberley, then Colonial Secretary, replied in February, 1874. He pointed out that the power invested in her Majesty was designed to provide a means of bringing the Senate into accord with the House of Commons in the event of an actual collision of opinion between the two Houses. Her Majesty could not be advised to take the responsibility of interfering with the composition of the Senate except upon an occasion when it had been made apparent that a difference had arisen between the two Houses of so serious and personal a character that the Government could not be carried on without her intervention, and when it could be shown that the limited creation of Senators allowed by the Act would apply an adequate remedy. Earl Kimberley further pointed out that by the twenty-first section of the British North America Act the increase of members provided for was intended to be temporary only, and that the number should be reduced as soon as possible after the necessity for the exercise of this special power had passed away.

Mr. BOWELL moved for a return showing the number and names of all persons who have passed free on the Intercolonial railway and Northern from the 1st January, 1876, to the 1st March, 1877, stating by whose authority, and for what cause such free passes were given; also a detailed sheet showing the number of accidents to persons on the railways, and the loss to the revenue in the repairing the damages caused thereby for the same period; also a return of the salaries paid per annum or monthly, as the case may be, and the emolument or perquisites received by the General Superintendent and all other officers and employees of the said railway, including conductors, brakesmen, and ticket agents; also a return showing the total cost of the Saint Lawrence and Lake Superior, including the work done thereon by the artizans employed by the railway authorities, the extra cost of running the same, the purpose to which the said car has been applied, and the number and names of the persons who have been accommodated by its use.

The motion was carried.

A variety of routine business was disposed of.

The House adjourned at 5.35.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

In the debate to-day on the Quebec graving dock, M. Caron spoke in English, and so effectively as to create a strong desire to hear him more frequently. The President of the Council has so long pattered with this matter that it looks as if he would keep it for bribery purposes at the next election, as he used it at his last election. M. Caron's readings from M. Gauthier's speeches during that election had a telling effect.

Considerable progress was made with the insurance bill to-day in committee. Mr. Mackenzie appeared on behalf of the United States companies, arguing that if the bill became law it would drive many of them from Canada, inasmuch as it would compel them to divide their business on one side under different jurisdictions. The committee overruled the objection. Mr. Young moved, by a majority of one, an amendment requiring that the Government deposit of the American companies in Canada be held solely for the benefit of Canadian policy holders. Mr. Blain contended that the amendment would be ruinous to these companies.

FRIDAY, March 9.

THE SENATE.

The business of the Senate was devoted to routine.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. MACKENZIE presented a supplementary return to the Canadian Pacific Island harbour, a return of the correspondence regarding an increase in the salary of the Postmaster, and a return of the correspondence with reference to the wages of workmen on Section 8 of the Interoceanic railway.

Mr. VAIL presented a return showing the number of officers on the militia staff and the dates of their appointment.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD presented the petitions of a number of gentlemen praying for the incorporation of the Dominion Grange.

Mr. YOUNG presented the first report of the Public Accounts Committee containing the papers relating to the superannuation of Mr. Warren, late Collector of Customs at Whitby.

Mr. MACKAY (Cape Breton) moved that the Committee on the coal interest of Nova Scotia be permitted to employ a shorthand writer to take the evidence. Carried.

The House then proceeded to name the Committee to enquire into the matters connected with the Northern railway with the following result:—Messrs. Guthrie, Archibald, Bertram, DeWolf, Cargain, Killam, McCarthy, Burnham, and Wright.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved that any witness to be examined before the Committee respecting the affairs of the Northern Railway Company be examined on oath. Carried.

Mr. VAIL asked leave to make a personal statement. It would be remembered that a few days ago a debate took place in this House on the question of the dismissal from office of certain men in the County of Victoria, N.S., and that in the course of it a reference was made to a letter written by him (Mr. Vail) to the member for Victoria. That letter was produced and read in this House. It was marked private and confidential, but he expressed his willingness that it should be read here. He found in a public publication in Toronto, which he believed was understood to be the organ of the Government, reference made to that letter, and the letter itself was printed in what purported to be its actual reading and spelling. He did not charge the hon. member for Victoria with having had the letter printed, but he thought they were responsible for that, but he thought the letter should now be laid on the table of the House so that hon. gentlemen should have an opportunity of examining it for themselves and seeing what correspondence with the city printed in the paper.

Dr. TUPPER said that on the occasion of the debate referred to, the Minister of the Customs stated that the dismissals referred to were made upon a report of an inspector appointed by himself. He (Dr. Tupper) had a copy in his hand of the papers brought down in order that he might see if the Minister of Customs, and those papers disclosed the fact that there was no report against any man dismissed, and that the only report upon which the Government took action was letters written by certain dates against whom those men had voted at the election, Mr. Ross, the Collector, and Mr. Tremaine, the Inspector of Customs.

Mr. BURPEE said that when he made that statement he said that there was either a letter or a report.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said that he (Mr. Burpee) said "letters or a report from the Inspector."

Mr. BLAKE said he heard the hon. Minister of Customs, and he heard it as he was the hon. gentleman opposite stated according to his (Mr. Blake's) understanding.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said that a letter to a Minister was a report, and could be anything else. He had read the letter (Sir John's) own remarks in the debate referred to, he repeated the statement of the Minister of Customs that he had seen the letter or a report of the Inspector. Would the hon. gentleman read the letter? He (Sir John) was not in a position to do so, as he was. The hon. gentleman said he was not, however, to blame for saying this, but others were who induced him to give the answer he did. The hon. gentleman had said that he had made a mistake, that the correspondence to which he referred was in regard to St. Thomas St. Louis, but when the papers in relation to that matter were laid on the table, it was found that they did not contain a single correspondence with the Local Government either. When such things as these occurred in one session, he thought hon. members had some right to be very particular about the statements made by Ministers.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he threw back the imputation of his hon. gentleman with all his energy and force. He (Mr. Mackenzie) did not care what his (Mr. Masson's) opinion was, and he could tell his friend that he had made no statement at the instance of any party. The statement he (Mr. Mackenzie) made in reference to the matter in question, he believed to be perfectly correct. He always made statements based on the information at the time, and the hon. gentleman, with everyone around him, enjoyed at systematically and ostentatiously put the worst possible construction upon what he said.

Mr. MASSON—Was there any correspondence going on at the time the motion was made?

Mr. MACKENZIE—I refuse to be catechised by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL, then withdrew his motion.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT suggested that the letter referred to by the Minister of Militia be laid on the table of the House.

Mr. BOWELL said the fact had been brought by reports to the attention of the Minister of Customs, and he had thought it his duty to bring it before the House.

Mr. VAIL said it did not matter what paper it appeared in first, but when it appeared in the paper like *The Mail* he felt it was his duty to bring it before the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL said he had read a part of the letter. It had been taken down in the *Hansard*. He had not misstated what was in it.

Mr. BLAKE said it was impossible for the letter to have got in the press without being furnished by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell). He was, therefore, responsible for the disgraceful manner in which it had been published. The letter was alleged to be printed verbatim *et literatim*, and had been spread over the length and the breadth of the land in that manner, and it was the duty of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) to produce the letter. It was his duty to say whether the letter was exactly the same or not.

Mr. CAMPBELL said as far as he could see the spelling was not exactly the same as in the letter.

The matter then dropped, and the motion for adjournment was withdrawn.

Mr. BLAIN resumed the debate on the tariff. He said he had been a consistent advocate of Protection ever since he had held a seat in this House, but he felt that the principle was put being properly dealt with by the Opposition. He contended that Free Trade was a pernicious doctrine. There was not a country in the world holding Free Trade views, and he challenged anyone to say to the contrary. He held that the political parties of the day were not consistent. The Government preached Free Trade in one place, while the Opposition preached Protection and privately favored Free Trade. He then proceeded to criticise the amendment of the hon. member for Kingston, and alleged that there was no protection in it, that it did not propose a broad principle of Protection, and that it's proposition to reduce the expenditure to meet the deficiency in the revenue was not a safe one. He held that Protection was outside the revenue altogether, as it was not intended to affect the revenue at all. Incidental protection was an incidental fraud. It was not Protection at all. The resolution was merely a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and considering the character of the gentlemen who composed the top political parties, he was not willing that the Government should be obliged to leave the Treasury benches by the carrying of such a resolution as that. As a Protectionist he would neither vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Kingston nor for the amendment to the amendment.

Mr BERTRAM said the question was not whether we were to have a complete policy of Free Trade or a complete policy of Protection, but it was whether we should continue to have a system of Protection modified or a system of Free Trade. He did not look on the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition in the way that the last speaker did. If it proposed Protection of any kind, but it was very attenuated Protection after all. One industry which was left out of Protection had been left out, and that was the lumber trade.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD—That is a manufacturing industry.

Mr. BERTRAM wished to know how the lumber trade could be protected. Hon. gentlemen seemed to think that upon Protection being adopted the lumber trade would be protected. He contended that the fact that the financial agents in London took only a large amount of it themselves was beneficial to the credit of this country, because it showed that they had confidence in the securities they had to sell. He went on to allude to the Riel question, that relating to the New Brunswick schools, and the admission of British Columbia, remarking that the only fault he found with the Government in regard to the latter matter was that they had not as soon as they came into power formally broken the engagement to build the Pacific railway. (Derisive cheers.)

Mr. FLEMING moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ROSS (Prince Edward) wished to reply to the remarks of the member for Halifax with reference to sugar. He (Mr. Ross) held that there was enough duty on sugar now. He read figures showing the whole quantity of sugar imported into Canada during the six months ending 31st December last to have been 33,129,000 pounds, and said that the larger portion of this did not come from the United States.

The motion was then carried, and the House adjourned at 12 15 p.m.

MONDAY, March 12.

THE SENATE.

After routine,

Mr. BROWN said—With the permission of the Senate I desire to call attention to the following paragraph in the Ottawa *Free Press*:

"In the Senate on Friday, Hon. Mr. Brown stated that prior to the departure of his late colleague, Hon. Mr. Blake, for Ireland, the Secretary of State said in answer to a question put by Mr. Blake, that he had issued a patent for 13,000 acres of land to the Pacific Railway Company, and that the Pacific railway on Lake Superior was completed and has been opened, to say the denial was in some degree incorrect."

He desired to be allowed to correct the statement. It was Mr. Blake who was the whose name those lands had been secured. Now, Mr. Blake was not prepared to allow hon. Senator never came from me. I only indulged in a little badinage. I heard in the Commons that my hon. friend, who I know took a deep interest in the North-West, had a large property. In badinage I said it was too bad for my hon. friend to come down here with his large legal and local knowledge, being a large proprietor of lands in the North-West, and discuss this question as he had done. So far from bringing any charge against him, I said then that it would give additional interest to the statement he made. No more patriotic act could be done by a member of the Legislature or any citizen than to endeavor to acquire an interest in the North-West, and go to the trouble to get a personal knowledge of it to be communicated to Parliament. My feeling was that I hoped he had got a good bargain in a pecuniary point of view, and that it open to everyone else. My opinion in those lands was not low as compared to those who go there to settle. So far from feeling that it would be a reproach to my hon. friend, that he had acquired lands there, my earnest desire is that every one of us should go there and do as he has done. Nothing could be further from my mind than to state or impute to my hon. friend what is reported in this paper.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said that there was no duty which the Government could more fairly ask the House to sustain than the duty we are in. It was the only one which would yield a large revenue without pressing too heavily on the people. The adroitness of Confederation were fond of pointing to the prosperity of the United States, but he believed that Canada was not so depressed and in either trade or manufactures as the people of that country. He did not think that the interests of commercial men were in favor of Protection, believing that it would stimulate unhealthy competition, and result in greater depression. He did not think that an industry which could not exist under the present tariff, could be aided by any addition. He was of opinion, however, that there were some articles on which the duties might have been increased. He thought the sugar interest should have received some assistance at the hands of the Government, sugar being an article on which a large amount of revenue was collected. (Hear, hear.) He thought the Government had not sufficiently consulted the interests of the people. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) had said that Canada as if it were a mere finite, small place. He would like to know where that gentleman was born! (Laughter.) If he was a Canadian, he surely had very little patriotism, and if he was from the United States, he must have carried the spirit of the freedom of America with him, for the people still pursued the policy which he so much decried. The gentleman opposite talked of such a policy as nonsense and one which the people of the country had condemned, but he (Mr. Palmer) was rather afraid they all the while would rather shrink from the responsibility of acting according to their judgment. (Hear, hear.) The Government of the United States when they found any foreign manufacturer interfering with their native industries, soon shut the rival out of their markets even if it involved a war. After appealing to the Government on behalf of the ship-building interest of the Eastern Provinces, he (Mr. Jones) was sorry to see the gentleman criticised severely the tariff, and declared himself in favor of the amendment of the hon. member for Kingston.

Dr. ORTON, in refutation of the assertion of the Government that it was the duty of the new power of the Government to take up the question of the Pacific Railway, said that it was a large amount of it themselves was beneficial to the credit of this country, because it showed that they had confidence in the securities they had to sell. He went on to allude to the Riel question, that relating to the New Brunswick schools, and the admission of British Columbia, remarking that the only fault he found with the Government in regard to the latter matter was that they had not as soon as they came into power formally broken the engagement to build the Pacific railway. (Derisive cheers.)

Mr. FLEMING moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ROSS (Prince Edward) wished to reply to the remarks of the member for Halifax with reference to sugar. He (Mr. Ross) held that there was enough duty on sugar now. He read figures showing the whole quantity of sugar imported into Canada during the six months ending 31st December last to have been 33,129,000 pounds, and said that the larger portion of this did not come from the United States.

The motion was then carried, and the House adjourned at 12 15 p.m.

MONDAY, March 12.

THE SENATE.

After routine,

Mr. BROWN said—With the permission of the Senate I desire to call attention to the following paragraph in the Ottawa *Free Press*:

"In the Senate on Friday, Hon. Mr. Brown stated that prior to the departure of his late colleague, Hon. Mr. Blake, for Ireland, the Secretary of State said in answer to a question put by Mr. Blake, that he had issued a patent for 13,000 acres of land to the Pacific Railway Company, and that the Pacific railway on Lake Superior was completed and has been opened, to say the denial was in some degree incorrect."

He desired to be allowed to correct the statement. It was Mr. Blake who was the whose name those lands had been secured. Now, Mr. Blake was not prepared to allow hon. Senator never came from me. I only indulged in a little badinage. I heard in the Commons that my hon. friend, who I know took a deep interest in the North-West, had a large property. In badinage I said it was too bad for my hon. friend to come down here with his large legal and local knowledge, being a large proprietor of lands in the North-West, and discuss this question as he had done. So far from bringing any charge against him, I said then that it would give additional interest to the statement he made. No more patriotic act could be done by a member of the Legislature or any citizen than to endeavor to acquire an interest in the North-West, and go to the trouble to get a personal knowledge of it to be communicated to Parliament. My feeling was that I hoped he had got a good bargain in a pecuniary point of view, and that it open to everyone else. My opinion in those lands was not low as compared to those who go there to settle. So far from feeling that it would be a reproach to my hon. friend, that he had acquired lands there, my earnest desire is that every one of us should go there and do as he has done. Nothing could be further from my mind than to state or impute to my hon. friend what is reported in this paper.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said that there was no duty which the Government could more fairly ask the House to sustain than the duty we are in. It was the only one which would yield a large revenue without pressing too heavily on the people. The adroitness of Confederation were fond of pointing to the prosperity of the United States, but he believed that Canada was not so depressed and in either trade or manufactures as the people of that country. He did not think that the interests of commercial men were in favor of Protection, believing that it would stimulate unhealthy competition, and result in greater depression. He did not think that an industry which could not exist under the present tariff, could be aided by any addition. He was of opinion, however, that there were some articles on which the duties might have been increased. He thought the sugar interest should have received some assistance at the hands of the Government, sugar being an article on which a large amount of revenue was collected. (Hear, hear.) He thought the Government had not sufficiently consulted the interests of the people. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) had said that Canada as if it were a mere finite, small place. He would like to know where that gentleman was born! (Laughter.) If he was a Canadian, he surely had very little patriotism, and if he was from the United States, he must have carried the spirit of the freedom of America with him, for the people still pursued the policy which he so much decried. The gentleman opposite talked of such a policy as nonsense and one which the people of the country had condemned, but he (Mr. Palmer) was rather afraid they all the while would rather shrink from the responsibility of acting according to their judgment. (Hear, hear.) The Government of the United States when they found any foreign manufacturer interfering with their native industries, soon shut the rival out of their markets even if it involved a war. After appealing to the Government on behalf of the ship-building interest of the Eastern Provinces, he (Mr. Jones) was sorry to see the gentleman criticised severely the tariff, and declared himself in favor of the amendment of the hon. member for Kingston.

Dr. ORTON, in refutation of the assertion of the Government that it was the duty of the new power of the Government to take up the question of the Pacific Railway, said that it was a matter of national importance, and that it was the duty of the Government to take it up. (Hear, hear.) He was not a party man, but he was a manufacturing industry.

Mr. BERTRAM wished to know how the lumber trade could be protected. Hon. gentlemen seemed to think that upon Protection being adopted the lumber trade would be protected. He contended that the fact that the financial agents in London took only