DOMINION PARLIAMENT.

FOURTH PARLIAMENT—FIRST SESSION.

THE SENATE.

OTTAWA, Wednesday, March 26.

WAR OF 1812.

In the Senate to-day,

A petition was presented by Mr. Allan from the York Pioneers, praying that better provisions be made for the returns of the war of 1812.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. MACPHERSON moved for a statement containing the following information:—The names and dates of appointment of all extra clerks and messengers employed in each Department of the public service on the 10th day of October last; the mode of their appointment, whether by order-in-Council or otherwise; the rates of salary or wages paid to each, and the instances, if any, in which their pay or allowances had been increased—and if so increased, when and by what authority; the appropriations or moneys out of which they were paid; and also the names of all extra clerks and messengers, if any, who were transferred from temporary to permanent employment in the Departments of the public service between the 1st January and 10th October, 1878, and the rates of salary or wages paid to each when employed temporarily and permanently, respectively.

After debate the motion was carried without amendment.

BANKING AND BANK STOCKS.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved the second reading of the Banking Laws amendment bill. He said the bill was to prevent the practice of persons selling bank shares without actually being the owners thereof, much on the same system as grain speculations were conducted in Chicago. Also to prevent banks from making advances on bank stocks, and to enable banks to reduce their capital stock under authority of the Governor in-Council.

The bill was read a second time.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION.

Mr. McLELAN (Londondorry) resumed the adjourned debate on the motion to appoint a Select Committee on Immigration and Colonization. He pointed to the fact that notwithstanding large expenditures to bring the population of the Old World to this country a large percentage of the immigrants had gone to the United States. To check this movement the country had decided at the last election to try a protective policy. Until that policy had a trial he thought it would be unfair and unwise to appoint a committee to suggest any other mode.

Mr. MACPHERSON said the question of immigration was one of very great importance to the country. He was not afraid of seeing too many people coming to this country. On the contrary, he believed our future prosperity depended on immigration. If we wished to prosper we should invite the best class of emigrants to come to Canada. In our North-West we have ample room for all who may come. Many farmers in the old Provinces were selling their farms and moving to the North-West, and thus giving excellent openings to the tenant farmer class of the old country to settle on improved lands. The Government should do what was necessary to inform the people of the Old World that we have plenty of room for all who may seek homes in Canada. This was especially necessary to counteract the announcement of the late Government that no immigrants were wanted in Canada.

Mr. ALLAN said one of the great difficulties in the way of immigration was that the proper class had not been sought out by the agents and recommended to come to this country. What was wanted was a class who would settle upon and improve the wild lands of this country, and agriculturalists who had sufficient means of their own to purchase the improved farms offered for sale by our own farmers, who desired to sell out and move west to find larger tracts on which to settle their sons.

The debate was adjourned on motion of Mr. Reade.

The House adjourned at 6 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 26.

THE TARIFF.

On the order for the resumption of the debate on the tariff,

Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked the Finance Minister if he was prepared to make to-day his statement as to the sources from which he expected to derive the revenue under the new tariff.

Mr. TILLEY—I have prepared an estimate which I purpose to submit to the House, and I thought it only right that the amendments we proposed to make we go back into committee again should be stated at the same time. The resolutions are being prepared by the Commissioner of Customs, and as I should like to have them to look at between six and the evening sitting of the House, I shall make a statement immediately after recess.

Mr. CASEY continued the tariff debate, stating that the Government was formed, not as a protectionist Government, but as a Government who believed that the past ill-deeds of the Conservative leader were condoned. He read a letter from a member of the Executive of the Grange in which the assertion was made that no benefit would accrue to farmers under the new tariff, while the articles he wished to purchase were all increased in price. He endeavoured to show that the duties on American cereals would not shut them out of our market, and yet our farmers would be called upon to pay enhanced prices for all they consumed. He charged the Government with inconsistency, and declared they had not fulfilled the pledges given to the people.

Mr. IVES said it was written of a celebrated general who lost a great battle on account of a great blunder, that he was in the habit later in life of visiting the scene of this battle and fighting it over again. So often did he do this that he finally persuaded himself that it was not owing to a blunder that he made that the battle was lost by him, but that it was owing to a great blunder which his victorious opponent had made. It seemed to him that the Opposition were following the example of the general he alluded to, and were trying to persuade themselves, by fighting the battle over again, that their policy was still right and that their opponents were wrong. (Hear, hear.) He could well understand that gentlemen on the Opposition benches should discuss the details of the tariff, but he could not see the propriety of carrying on a protracted discussion on the principles upon which the tariff was based. In his opinion one of the greatest causes for the depression was the over-importation of goods from 1872 to 1875. For those four years the average importations into Canada were $123,000,000 a year, while for the four years before 1872 the average importation was $85,500,000, and for the three years succeeding 1875 it was $95,000,000. The excess of importations from 1872 to 1875 over the four years preceding 1872 and the three years succeeding 1875 was no less than $140,000,000. What did that show? He was aware that many gentlemen said that a balance of trade against a country meant nothing, and quoted Great Britain as an example. But the position of Canada was very different to that of Great Britain. England was a creditor, while Canada was a debtor. England was receiving from the world millions and millions of interest on its bonds and debentures, while we were paying out every year millions by way of interest on Dominion, provincial, municipal, and even private debts. Our average exports from 1868 to 1871 were $69,000,000; from 1876 to 1879, $79,000,000; from 1872 to 1875, $85,000,000, so that there was an excess of imports over exports from 1872 to 1875 of $152,000,000, or about $38,000,000 a year. That money had to be provided here and sent out of the country. And not only that, but the interest on Dominion, provincial, municipal and private debts had had to be provided. The natural result of this was a scarcity of money, and that he looked on as the prime cause of the great shrinkage of value of all property since 1873, and a factor in the depression which had fallen on the country. He denied that the people had acted with credulity in accepting the remedy proposed by the Government, because it was a policy which had proved successful in every country which had adopted it. Among the advantages which the National Policy would furnish was that it would decrease the volume of imports and tend to restore the balance of trade between imports and exports. It would at the same time keep up the revenue of the country. It would increase the quantity of the goods manufactured in this country, and to that extent would furnish labour to the unemployed, and by increasing the consuming population would benefit the farmers. It would give strength to our manufactures, and by retaining our own market our manufacturers would in a few years be able to push out for foreign markets. The objection raised that the tariff meant increased taxation was an unfair one, because hon. gentlemen, if returned to power, would have been compelled to increase the duties, as they dare not have had another deficit. The contention that the tariff discriminated in favour of certain industries was answered by the fact that in every tariff there were discriminations made with respect to different classes of goods, and it was surely not more unjust to-day to discriminate than it was when the last tariff was framed. In regard to the allegation that the tariff was a system of legalized robbery, the House would remember that it is a tariff of equivalents, advantages being reaped by different classes. It was necessary in the public interest, and in view of the depressed condition of the country, the Government were justified in adopting any measures which would afford relief.

Mr. OLIVER contended that the tariff had been formed without regard to any principle whatever, and that as the electors of North Oxford had elected him by a larger majority than the Minister of Finance had been elected his opinion was entitled to more consideration than that of the Finance Minister, or of seven twenty members on the ministerial side whose majorities were not in the aggregate so large as his.

THE FINANCE MINISTER'S SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT.

Mr. TILLEY then proceeded to make his supplementary statement. After criticising the financial policy of his predecessor in office, and replying to some of the attacks which had been made on the last loan, he said the House was told that the present tariff was a sectional policy and that it was going to split up the Confederation. One hon. gentleman said that the Finance Minister was acting simply as the receiver of propositions from whoever chose to make them. Well, he could only say that if he had accepted the propositions just as they came to him from all parts of the Dominion the tariff would have been a queer mixture. (Laughter.) There were conflicting interests, but the Government, in view of the responsibilities resting upon them—not as representing Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, but looking after the entire Dominion—made what in some cases might be considered a compromise in order to meet the interests of the whole. (Applause.) The tariff was not framed for provinces but for the prosperity of the entire Dominion. (Cheers.) A great deal had been said about the poor man. If this proposition was successful it would greatly benefit the poor man and the labouring man. If they had no work to perform what was the use of their living in a cheap country? They did not want a cheap country to live in. They wanted to get employment, something to do. (Hear, hear). Here he might add that when our friends on the other side of the Atlantic saw what the proposition was, and that instead of sending 700,000 men out of the country, the proposal was to make room for more in the country, and to add thus to the strength and power of the mother country, their objections would be removed. (Hear, hear.) Hon. gentlemen opposite talked about the poor man, and the hon. member for North Oxford had said he (Mr. Tilley) remarked that if he had been in office in 1874 he would have adhered to the 15 per cent. tariff. His (Mr. Tilley's) words were, that had this Government been in office in 1873 it would have had ample revenue to meet the $22,500,000, which ought to have been the limit of the expenditure; but that if an increase was necessary, instead of having increased the tariff the Government would have taken the money out of articles the taxation of which would have encouraged the interests of the country. But returning to the poor man. What had he (Mr. Tilley) said with reference to him? He had said that it was unfair and unjust to the poor man to pay five cents a pound on his tea costing sixteen cents a pound, while the tea for which the wealthier man paid 40 or 50 cents was taxed only to the same extent. He repeated that this was unfair. (Hear, hear.) And he could add that the same remark applied to the duties on wine under the late Government who put a duty of 72 cents on wine which cost 50 cents a gallon, and 72 cents also on that which cost from $4 to $5. He admitted that under the proposal of the Government a higher duty would be levied on the coarser than on the finer qualities of articles. Therefore hon. gentlemen argued that the Government were taxing the poor man and leaving out the rich. When we could not manufacture articles of a certain class, there was no reason why a high duty should be levied on the English manufactures, which our people would pay. Raw material, such as wool, would be admitted free, and the Government believed that woollens could be manufactured in this country, thereby providing employment for the people and giving a market for wool. The Government proposed that the woollens for our workingmen should be made from our own wool. The experience of the United States furnished proof of the correctness of the Government's position. Twelve years ago they imposed a duty of 50 cents per lb. on all woollen goods imported, besides 20 or 40 per cent. To-day woollen goods were from 12 to 25 per cent. cheaper than at that time. That they believed would be the effect in this country, and the working classes would obtain at lower prices, good and sound woollens in the place of rotten and worthless cloths. (Cheers.) It was contended that the Government were legislating in the interest of the rich because they proposed to impose a duty of 20 per cent. on superior classes of earthenware, and 30 per cent. on common qualities. But this industry was already established in Canada. In Montreal there was a factory, and in New Brunswick stoneware factories, and the tariff would soon lead to the establishment of others. The duties were imposed for the encouragement of articles we could or would produce, and thus employment will be afforded, for the industry did not require a large capital. On classes of glassware which we did not manufacture a duty of 20 per cent. would be levied, but on common classes an additional tax would be imposed. Those, however, we produce in the country, and furnish at a cheap rate. With respect to pianos, it was almost impossible to regulate the duties so as to bear equally, but the tariff was prepared with a view to encourage that industry in the country. We can make all, or nearly all, we require, provided we have the market to ourselves, the proper duty being placed on imported instruments. Under those circumstances, it was considered advisable to impose a specific and *ad valorem* duty. A good deal had been said about cheap books, printed on light paper, paying a less duty than a higher class of literature. A specific instead of an *ad valorem* duty was imposed for the purpose of removing an anomaly under which 17½ per cent. was levied on paper, while books were admitted at 5 per cent. He came now to the question of sugar duties. He was a little amazed at the statement made by his predecessor the other night, that we would lose one million dollars by the proposals in regard to sugar duties.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT.—The people of Canada will lose more than one million.

Mr. TILLEY said the hon. gentleman came down to the House and proposed by way of encouraging refining in the Dominion to take off one quarter of a cent off the sugar duty. The hon. gentleman was proposing thus to counteract the bounty given in the United States and he was thus holding out something to them when there was nothing whatever in his proposal; or else he submitted a proposition which was very much in accord with that now presented. The proposal of the Government levied specific duties exactly as the hon. gentleman levied them. The *ad valorem* duty on sugars below No. 14 was 30 per cent. instead of 25. If they were imported direct from the West Indies no duties were charged on packages, which was equivalent to 5 per cent. The hon. gentleman then dwelt on other branches of the sugar question and showed that $8,633,644 were paid on sugar imported and consumed last year, as against $8,293,000 for the next year, the difference in favour of the consumer being $340,000 in addition to the benefits conferred on the country by refineries and the employment given to the people and Canadian vessels. With respect to the duty on breadstuffs, he agreed, to a certain extent, that where there was a surplus the duty imposed would not affect materially the price of the articles. The statement that England controlled the price was not always correct, and, as was recently pointed out in a newspaper article, the United States last summer regulated the price in England. But the proposition was that the people, the farmers of Canada, should have the market of Canada for their produce. (Hear, hear.) One hon. gentleman had referred to the price of flour in the Maritime Provinces. He would admit that it was plain that if it affected the price at all it would be in some such cases. But if a bonding system were adopted by which Canadian flour could be sent through the United States and taken by the coasters he did not see why it should affect even the price on the coast of the Maritime Provinces. With respect to corn he expected to get some duty out of it. He had a letter from a gentleman in St. John, in which he said that since the tariff had been brought down he was offered cornmeal from New York by telegraph at 35 cents per barrel less than it was before. Now, if that was a fact, the Americans would have to pay something. He now came to the statement as to the bearing of the tariff on England and America. The following list would show the articles of which we imported the largest number from the United States, and the duties we now receive upon them. The articles from the United States were the largest in value:—

Agricultural implements—From Great Britain, $9,592; from the United States, $132,000, added to the duty of 7½ per cent.

Animals—From Great Britain, $3,084; from the United States, $835,000.

Breadstuffs—From Great Britain, $21,824; from the United States, $13,350,777.

Carriages—From Great Britain, $2,130; from the United States, $83,000; 7½ per cent. addition.

Clocks—From Great Britain, $7,000; from the United States, $69,000, an increase of 17½ per cent.

Anthracite coal—From Great Britain, 1,383 tons, valued at $7,505; from the United States, 1,468,458 tons, valued at $331,123.

Copper manufactures—From Great Britain, $8,000; from the United States, $15,000.

Cotton manufactures—Great Britain, $1,208,000; United States, $2,472,000; ten per cent. addition proposed.

Coarse earthenware—Great Britain, $40,000; United States, $40,000; an increase of 7½ per cent. proposed, and an ad. of 12 per cent.

Dried fruit—Great Britain, $166,000; United States, $261,000.

Green fruit—Great Britain, $134,000; United States, $338,000; ten per cent. added.

Furniture—Great Britain, $12,201; United States, $337,270; 17½ per cent. proposed addition.

Gas fixtures—Great Britain, $24,000; United States, $262,578; 7½ per cent. addition.

Locomotives and machinery—Great Britain, $137,000; United States, $607,000.

Tacks, nails, spikes, sewing machines, &c.—Great Britain, $138,000; United States, $379,000; 12½ per cent. addition.

Common glassware—Great Britain, $37,000; United States, $208,000.

Finer glassware—Great Britain, $149,000; United States, $212,748.

Builders' and carriagemakers' hardware—Great Britain, $466,000; United States, $1,731,000.

Lard—Great Britain, $1,600; United States, $210,000.

Bacon—Great Britain, $1,014; United States, $260,000.

Organs and pianos—Great Britain, $9,000; United States, $459,322.

Books—Great Britain, $370,009; United States, $451,495.

Billiard tables—Great Britain, $175; United States, $11,129.

Brooms and brushes—Great Britain, $20,000; United States, $82,000.

Gunpowder and explosives—Great Britain, $37,000; United States, $90,000.

Hats and caps—Great Britain, $368,000; United States, $675.

The total of these imports were $25,961,404 from the United States, against $3,778,970 from Great Britain, out of which the Government estimated to receive a revenue of $1,627,500. Now he came to the other side of the case.

Copper bars—Great Britain, $76,000; United States, $24,000.

Manufactures of furs—Great Britain, $129,000; United States, $67,000.

Pig iron—Great Britain, $26,174; United States, $6,913.

Bar and other iron—Great Britain, $1,804,000; United States, $322,000.

Tin plates—Great Britain, $348,000; United States, $61,000.

Woollens (on the 2½ per cent. list)—Great Britain, $2,765,000; United States, $73,087.

On the 10 per cent. list—Great Britain, $2,756,000; United States, $74,000.

Blankets and coarse woollens—Great Britain, $7,107,000; United States, $162,000.

Other goods, however, by 2½ per cent—Great Britain, $2,885,000; United States, $622,000.

Earthenware—Great Britain, $360,000; United States, $15,000.

Other goods—Great Britain, $908,000; United States, $67,000.

The greater part of these imports were from Great Britain, and yet from them the Government only proposed to raise $505,000. Then the items on the 20 per cent. list would give $750,000:—Silk goods, $150,000; spirits and wines, $1,100,000; excise on spirits, $100,000—making in all $2,642,000. From this sum had to be deducted loss on sugar, $250,000; on tea, $90,000; on molasses, $100,000; and in drawbacks, $100,000. Total, $540,000—which, deducted from the $2,642,000, left a balance of $2,102,500 expected as a result of the increase in the tariff. He now came to the additional revenue expected from various articles as follows:—From agricultural implements, nothing; animals, $25,000; breadstuffs, $250,000; carriages, nothing; clocks, $5,000 additional; anthracite coal, $175,000; bituminous, $100,000; cotton, specific and *ad valorem*, $100,000; dried fruits, $30,000; gas fixtures, $5,000; locomotives, $20,000; tacks, etc., $30,000; glassware, coarse, $15,000; glassware, fine, $9,000; builders' and other hardware, $80,000; lard, hams and bacon, $25,000; books, $35,000; gunpowder, etc., $10,000; hats and caps, $37,500; marble and imitation marble, $15,000; copper bars, $10,000; furs, manufactured, $5,000; pig iron, $60,000; iron bars, $200,000; woollen goods, $180,000; silk goods, $150,000; spirits and wines, Customs, $110,000; spirits, excise, $100,000; duties from other countries and advance of 2½ per cent. in goods, $750,000. It was said that we were adopting a policy at variance with that of Great Britain. No man could say what the policy of Great Britain would be five years hence. A very significant answer was given by the Minister of Foreign Affairs when receiving a deputation, which asked whether some influence could not be brought to bear on those foreign countries adopting protective measures with a view to induce them to change their policy. The answer was that Great Britain had nothing to give. Its free trade policy furnished it with nothing to give. Canada, however, was now in a position to go to Paris and say that it had something to give in return for concessions granted. The same remark applied to Spain. It was said that a protective policy had produced Socialism and an irredeemable paper currency. Without entering into the merits of the question, he would ask what party in the United States favoured an irredeemable paper currency. The Protectionists and the Republicans opposed it. With respect to Socialism, which it was said protection would introduce into Canada, it originated in Germany, which was a free trade country, though now becoming protectionist. What caused the strikes in England? They were due to foreign countries under protective tariffs being able to send their manufactures into England, which was followed by English manufacturers announcing that they must reduce the wages of their hands or they could not compete with foreigners. If Great Britain adopted a different policy—he did not say whether it would or not—it would have something to offer other nations to induce them to admit its manufactures at lower duties. (Cheers.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT contended that the tariff took the largest amount of money from the pockets of the people, and placed the smallest amount in the public treasury. The country, he affirmed, now possessed a Finance Minister who acted in violation of every principle of finance. He reiterated his arguments to show that the people of Canada would lose a million dollars under the proposed sugar duties for no earthly reason but to benefit a couple of sugar refiners, but he acknowledged that the loss to the revenue would be half a million. He expressed his surprise that his hon. friend had not corrected that extraordinary anomaly of 15 per cent. duty on wheat and fifty cents a barrel on flour, which he claimed was discriminating against the Canadian miller. He warned the Government that their expectations of revenue on spirits could not be realized, as but little would be paid for six months, and then he was afraid illicit stills would be so numerous as to materially affect the importation of spirits. As to tobacco, he feared the discrimination in favour of native tobacco would cause people to enter into the manufacture of that article, and so affect the revenue he expects from the importation of foreign tobacco. He foretold that the revenue would be far short of its estimated amount, and that the only benefit would be the giving employment to something over half a million of people, and that the only effect of the tariff will be to tax the people four-fold in order to make up the deficit of two millions and a half he (Mr. Cartwright) had left behind him.

Mr. PLUMB defended the Minister of Finance from the charge of having spoken excitedly, reminding the last speaker that in 1874 he had attacked Mr. Tilley, who then had no seat in the House, in the grossest manner. It was true he had been ably answered by the member for Cumberland, but now his hon. friend the Minister of Finance was in the House, and had answered his predecessor in a manner that compared very favourably with the shrieks they had just heard. He compared the success of the last loan at 96 with that effected by the late Minister of Finance under the most favourable circumstances and which only realized 87½. He then gave a brief *resumé* of the events of the late Administration, commenting on them in condemnatory terms, and claiming that the new tariff had been necessitated thereby.

The House adjourned at 1 a. m.

THE SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 27.

CAMPBELL DIVORCE CASE.

On the reading of the petition of Mrs. Campbell for a bill of separation from her husband,

Mr. CORNWALL objected to any further proceedings being taken in the case until the 73rd rule of the House was complied with, the production of an exemplification of proceeding before the Court up to final judgment.

Mr. CAMPBELL'S impression was that it was necessary the exemplification should be produced before the House could decide on the bill.

Mr. REESOR said the reason why the exemplification had not been produced was that Mrs. Campbell had been advised it was not necessary in this case.

The reading of the petition was postponed until to-morrow to allow the necessary papers to be produced.

THE CENSUS.

The Census and Statistics bill was moved for its third reading.

Mr. POWER thought the measure was premature, and it was too complicated in its provisions. A much simpler and shorter method of taking the census could be adopted.

Mr. ALEXANDER hoped the Government in taking the census of 1881 would endeavour to prevent the expenditure under this bill from being in excess of what the last was.

Mr. CAMPBELL said it was the duty of the Government, prescribed by the terms of the British North America Act, to take the census, and they would endeavour to perform it as efficiently and economically as possible. If they should fail to do so, then it would be time enough to censure them.

The bill then passed, and was sent to the Commons.

IMMIGRATION.

The order having been read for resuming the adjourned debate on Mr. Alexander's motion to resolve that a select committee be appointed to consider the question of immigration and colonization, and the best means available for attracting to this Dominion men of enterprise and capital, through whose efforts our manufacturing industries may be fostered and extended,

Mr. READ said that he had long been of opinion that if we bought more than we sold we were growing poorer. Free traders thought otherwise. He pointed to our rapidly increasing debt as evidence that we were growing poorer. The new policy which had been adopted would, he believed, check this tendency. Already it had inspired hope in the country, and there were good prospects of improvement. There had never been a more fitting time to endeavour to establish manufactures in or midst, and he had no doubt that the National Policy would prove a success.

Mr. FLINT doubted whether this was a proper time to pass such a resolution as this. In the House of Commons the tariff was under discussion and until it came before the Senate such a resolution as this was premature. Until there was an improvement in the condition of the country not a dollar should be spent in trying to bring more population to Canada.

Mr. CAMPBELL objected to the granting of the committee, although he admitted that a great deal of valuable information had been elicited by the debate. He thought the Canada Company could do a great deal towards promoting immigration of the proper class of settlers. The policy of the Government was to encourage the immigration of those classes who were able to go upon and settle the wild lands. There were already too many unemployed labouring men in the Dominion, and the policy of the Government was to encourage only those who had sufficient means and experience to take care of themselves and assist in developing the country—such a class as the tenant farmers of Great Britain.

Mr. ALEXANDER desired to reply to the different members who had spoken. What had led him to occupy so much of the time of this House was a deeply-seated conviction that some such action as was pointed to by his motion, combined with the united action of the Government, the Parliament and the press, was necessary to make the new trade policy a success. When we saw the present Opposition party labouring to obstruct every movement of the Government, to sow discontent among the poor and unenlightened, giving a false colouring and complexion to everything in the hope of blocking all action of the Government, the tariff which is destined in the course of time to become a success, and bring a large measure of prosperity, will for sometime be oppressive to our people until we succeed by united action to hasten the introduction of manufacturing enterprise and bring thought it would be folly for the Government to compete in our own workshops, and thereby bring down the force of all such manufactures to the consumer, give widely extended employment to the poor and secure to our people the great advantage of not living in a position of dependence upon the rest of the world.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 27.

THE NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) introduced a bill to amend the Act respecting the Northern Railway Company.

Mr. MACKENZIE desired to draw the attention of the leader of the Government to the bill. The interests of the stockholders had been practically obliterated, and the English bondholders elected the majority of the Directors. The late Government were compelled to take active measures and seek the aid of Parliament to enforce the rights of the Crown and country. A final settlement had been arrived at so far as the interests of the country were concerned. The English bondholders since then had raised additional money to complete the undertaking. The present bill was an interference in defiance of the great mass of the people who had invested their capital in the undertaking.

Mr. ROBINSON thought the hon. gentleman had referred to the time twenty years ago, when the railway became involved in difficulties. At that time it was a question between the bondholders and stockholders as to which should apply themselves to the work of reinstating the road in such a position as would enable it to fulfil its mission in meeting the commercial requirements of the country between Toronto and Simcoe. The shareholders were perfectly willing that the road should be reinstated in their interest, but the bondholders were perhaps even more willing, and they invested £250,000 in order that they might receive dividends on the £250,000 previously invested.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said his attention had been called to the bill, and he quite agreed with the hon. member for Lambton as to the inadvisability of interfering in any way with the bondholders who had advanced their money under a certain state of the law. At the same time the statements of the hon. member for West Toronto were worthy of consideration and no doubt would receive the consideration of the Railway Committee.

The bill was read a first time.

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD moved that a select committee of nine members be appointed to examine and report upon the state of the superannuation fund and the working of the Superannuation Act, and to report on every case of superannuation and gratuity granted under the said Act since it was passed, with power to send for persons, papers, and records—said committee to be composed of Messrs. Costigan, Cimon, Cameron (South Huron), Geoffrion, Mills, Plumb, Ryan, Ritchie, and Wallace (Norfolk). Carried.

DEPARTMENTAL CHANGES.

Dr. TUPPER moved the House into committee on the following resolutions:—

That it is expedient to provide,

1. That the office of the Receiver-General shall cease to be held by a separate member of the Government, and that the duties heretofore performed by that officer shall be performed by the Minister of Finance.

2. That the Department of Public Works shall be divided into two branches, each presided over by a separate Minister, one of whom shall have the duties and powers now assigned to the Minister of Public Works as respects railways and canals, and the other the duties and powers now assigned to the Minister of Public Works as respects other public works—the Governor-in-Council to have power to determine what work shall be under the management and control of each of the said Ministers, and to assign the officers who shall be attached to each of the said branches.

3. That the Independence of Parliament Act (41 V., c. 5) be so amended as to render it unnecessary that any member of the Privy Council resigning the office he now holds and accepting one of the new offices aforesaid, be re-elected, if a member of this House; and that the Act for the establishment of the salaries and allowances of the judges and other public functionaries (36 V., c. 31) be amended by striking out the provisions for the salaries of the Receiver-General and of the Minister of Public Works, and by assigning a salary of $7,000 per annum to each of the Ministers presiding over a branch of the said departments.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the Crown had been made aware of the purport of the resolutions, and had assented to them.

The motion was carried, and the House went into committee, in which the resolutions were passed without discussion.

The committee having risen,

Dr. TUPPER introduced a bill founded on the resolutions.

The bill was read a first time.

THE CENSUS OF 1881.

Mr. POPE (Compton) moved the House into committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That the Minister of Agriculture shall cause to be prepared one or more tables setting forth the rates of allowances or remuneration for the several census commissioners and enumerators employed in the taking of the census of 1881—no such rate to exceed in the aggregate a total amount of three dollars for each day of like service for any census commissioner, and the same when approved by order-in-Council for any census commissioner, and the same when approved by order-in-Council shall be laid before Parliament within the first fifteen days of the session next ensuing.

2. That such allowances or remuneration shall be paid to the several persons entitled thereto in such manner as the Governor-in-Council shall direct, but shall not be payable until the service shall have been the person receiving the same have been faithfully and entirely performed.

3. That such allowances and remuneration and all expenses to be incurred in carrying into effect any act of the Parliament of Canada relating to such census shall be paid out of such moneys as shall be provided by Parliament for that purpose.

4. That the respective salaries of officers, clerks and other employees who may be appointed in virtue of any Act of the Parliament of Canada relating to the collection and publication of statistics, the fees or compensations to be paid for obtaining information, and the office and other contingent expenses incurred by reason thereof, for the purpose, shall be fixed by the Governor-in-Council, and shall be paid out of any moneys which shall be provided by Parliament for that purpose.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the Crown assented to these resolutions.

The House went into Committee upon them.

The resolutions were passed and reported without amendment.

A bill on the subject was reported from the Senate, and read a first time.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) said if anything was wanted to show the unpopularity of the tariff it was to be seen in the countenance of the Finance Minister, which, last night, weary and sad looking, showed that dealing with the tariff was not the most pleasant occupation in life, and that having dealt with it the wave of reaction which in September last swept the late Government from power was receding. He charged the Finance Minister with having repudiated his promises to the people of New Brunswick. Adverting to the tariff he declared that the Finance Minister might have met the deficit of $2,400,000 by curtailing the expenditure and reducing the salaries of Ministers and the indemnity of members, instead of increasing the taxes on the people. He contended that the United States had suffered under protection, and that in that country, from one end to the other, there was nothing but depression.

Mr. COCKBURN (West Northumberland) said the resolutions of the Finance Minister were to his mind exceedingly satisfactory as a whole. They met the requirements of the country and would answer the expectations and hopes of the country. As one of the representatives of the people, it was very gratifying to him to know that the promises with which the elections of the 17th September were won had been faithfully kept, manfully and nobly performed. (Hear, hear.) If this policy was not a sound policy the responsibility for it rested, not with a few, but with the many, the people themselves. (Applause.) It was the people's policy—a policy they had asked for, a policy they had obtained through the aid of those who felt the pulse of the people and saw the necessities of the country. This tariff was called a protective tariff. It was protective in one sense but only in one sense for it was still a revenue tariff and would not produce one farthing more revenue than was necessary in the interests of the country. At the same time it was so framed as to protect our valuable industries. But it was contended that in adopting such a policy we were departing from the example of England, in doing which we were guilty of disloyalty. He (Mr. Cockburn) denied that. Hon. gentlemen who had such an opinion should look back to the commencement of our history as a Dominion. What was the great argument used to induce the different provinces to unite in Confederation? It was that we should have an interprovincial trade which should make us independent of our neighbours on the other side of the line. That argument was used to induce Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Ontario to enter the Confederation. At that time we were threatened with the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty by the United States Government. The question was discussed in the Parliament of old Canada, and this was what one of the sponsors for Confederation—who spoke out in patriotic language, and who seemed to have in his mind Canada, in her present state, having a policy of her own—Hon. Geo. Brown said:—

> The Americans must therefore bear in mind that if they abolish the Reciprocity Treaty, they will not only lose that seven millions which they now receive for their products, but the carrying trade which goes with it. But on the other hand, when we have this Union, these products will, as they naturally should, go down the St. Lawrence, not only to the advantage of our farmers, but to the swelling of our own shipping interests. They have taken our goods and taken our products to England, to Europe, and to the Lower Provinces, and I say that one of the best features of this Union is that if, in our commercial relations with the United States, we are compelled by them to meet fire with fire, it will enable us to turn the current of our own trade to our own waters.

That was the sentiment of that gentleman on the subject of Confederation. The Finance Minister last told the House that from a variety of causes there would be a deficiency unless new taxes were imposed. The question of the hour was how that additional revenue could be secured, and on whom should it fall. Last year $25,000,000 worth of goods were admitted free from the United States, and $5,000,000 from England. When we knew that this large amount of goods, products of the soil chiefly, came in from the United States duty free and entered in competition with our own farmers, we were justified in saying that these products should not be allowed to come into this country and reduce the price of our own productions without bearing a proportion of the duties which were necessary to carry on the Government. It was monstrous to hold that the Americans should hold the free access to our markets for $20,000,000 worth of agricultural products, and that heavy duties should be levied on our products entering the United States. We heard much about free trade, but if there was not free trade on both sides it was not free trade. We were now adopting a policy which would restore prosperity to the Dominion, and would shut out large quantities of American goods which had caused such disastrous effects in our home market. Apart from that, Canada would become a better paying customer to the Mother Country than she had been during the last four or five years. In the collection of the extra revenue the discrimination was fairly in favour of Great Britain, which fact would show England that there was no intention on the part of Canada to do anything contrary to the interests of the Mother Country or to disconnect herself from that country. (Hear, hear.) This tariff he believed was a proper one after the Americans had refused so frequently our endeavours to secure reciprocal trade with them. He congratulated the Government upon having so nobly kept their promise in adopting the policy required by the people, and expressed his satisfaction on finding that the parties could now divide on a principle, instead of having to discuss Pacific scandals or mayhap Neebing Hotel purchases. It was fortunate that the trade question was the principle upon which the parties went to the polls, but he could not help remarking that in the discussion of the principle the professed Liberals showed themselves to be the Tories, while the Conservatives were the true Liberals. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. GIGAULT (Rouville) declared himself in favour of the proposed policy as being a patriotic one, and one which had already been tried and found to be successful in the United States, as he showed by reading copious extracts from the writings of Henry Clay referring to the different items in the new tariff, all of which the writer declared had reduced in price year after year under a protective tariff.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) denied that such a policy as this was expected as a result of Confederation. Neither was protection endorsed by the people of the Maritime Provinces. He represented a majority of the people of the Lower Provinces, and he could say this authoritatively.

Mr. SHAW said hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to think that those on the back benches had no right to express their views in the House, but they must recollect that all could not occupy front benches, and that the elections of September last left them so few in numbers that they did not extend to the back benches. Indeed, so few were they that they could sit round a table and become as it were Knights of the Round Table. He regretted to find that the line of argument of these gentlemen had descended into something like guerilla warfare on the Finance Minister, and it seemed to him that the members of this House should be more dignified than were hon. gentlemen opposite. The Finance Minister deserved credit for the manner in which he had brought down his tariff. He deserved thanks for the consideration he had given to the interests of his country, in which respect he contrasted favourably with the late Finance Minister, who, notwithstanding the state of the country, stood wrapped up in his own pride, moved neither by the cries of his friends nor by the curses of his enemies. A stand-still policy was not the kind of a policy that this country expected from its Government. (Hear, hear.) In regard to the contention that the proposed increase of the tariff was organized robbery, it could not be maintained that if a higher tariff than 17½ per cent. were needed by the country it should not be granted. There was no magic in that rate, and it was generally admitted that the revenue derived was insufficient to meet the requirements of the country. As a whole he was much pleased with the tariff, although he regretted that conciliation had not been given to the salt interest of Ontario, which required relief. A small duty placed on salt would have been some compensation and encouraged that industry. He presented the views of his constituents, but he was not possessed of some general information which no doubt was in the possession of the Finance Minister, and had led him to arrive at a different conclusion.

Mr. KAULBACH said the reduction of duty on tea and molasses would be generally accepted with approval by the poor people of this country. He expressed his approval of a policy calculated to favour the coal industry and pointed out that had not some endeavours been made to encourage the sugar trade the United States would have had the whole of our refining.

The House adjourned at 12.30.

THE SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 28.

PACIFIC RAILWAY SURVEY.

Mr. MACPHERSON moved for the appointment of a special committee to enquire into all matters relating to the survey, location and construction of the Canadian Pacific railway and telegraph west of Lake Superior, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to take evidence under oath, and to report to this House from time to time. He said that he expected to obtain most of the information he desired in Ottawa, from the Engineers' department. The enquiry was intended to extend only to that portion of the railway between Lake Superior and Red River, and to the telegraph west of Red River.

The motion was agreed to.

CAMPBELL DIVORCE CASE.

The order of the day being read for the reading of Mrs. Campbell's petition for a bill of separation from her husband,

Messrs. CORNWALL and KAULBACH urged the same objection as was raised yesterday, that the exemplification of proceedings before the Courts had not been filed with the petition.

After some discussion,

Mr. REESOR asked that the order be discharged, and be made the order for Monday next. He then gave the notices required.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 28.

RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. ROBINSON presented the petitions of the Toronto Board of Trade and the Corn Exchange, praying for the appointment of a Railway Commission.

THE TARIFF

Mr. RYKERT resumed the debate on the tariff. He said hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches had said very little that called for a reply, and indeed the peevishness and incoherent speech of the late Finance Minister in his reply to the present Finance Minister were evidences of the weakness of his cause; and the manner in which he smarted during the attack he suffered from the gentleman he had been slandering behind his back for a number of years was only too evident. Both he and the member for West Elgin had admitted that the leader of the Government had redeemed the pledges he had made to the country. In this the Right Hon. gentleman had set a worthy example to the hon. member for Lambton, who, though he promised many things and said that a politician who did not carry out in office what he advocated in Opposition, was a demagogue, failed entirely to carry out his principles, except the principle of holding to office as long as possible. Referring to the present advocacy by the Opposition of free trade principles he pointed out that before Ministers had taken their seats they were calling for the national policy; that the hon. member for North Oxford, now a strong free trader, had been a strong protectionist, and Mr. Workman, a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, had moved that our manufacturing interests, in which so large an amount of capital was invested, should be protected. He denied that the operation of a protective tariff had been injurious to the United States, and adduced as evidence of their prosperity the fact that the Americans had wiped out a large portion of their war debt. One of the benefits of the National Policy would be